University Senate Compensation and Budget Committee
Meeting Minutes
February 1, 2017

Members present: Stephanie Jamelske, Joey Bohl, Holly Hassemer, Carey Applegate, Melissa Boellaard, Robin Miller, Manda Riehl

Minutes of January 25, 2017 meeting approved as distributed.

Membership update: Mohammad Alasagheirin has resigned from the committee. We are waiting on the Dean position on the committee to be filled, per Tanya Kenney.

There was a discussion about the philosophy we should use in creating the pay plan. Clarification questions posed included:

- Which model was chosen most often last time it was used (11 years ago)?
  Answer—Flat/Percentage combination was most common—over 50% of departments used it. Additionally, the fixed dollar model hasn’t been updated in years.
- Can rates in Table 1 be changed? Answer—Stephanie Jamelske will check
- Does the committee want to discuss adopting a percentage instead of a flat dollar rate?
  Answer—we need a broader discussion about that will all committee members able to weigh in

Manda Riehl provided a handout about peer institutions’ pay plans for discussion which raised some philosophical questions:

- How much should the plan reward solid performance versus merit?
- Should we use flat or percentage model?
- Would the pay plan be easier to understand if the multipliers were removed?
- How big are the problems of compression and inversion?
- Do we have the authority to tell the chancellor how to use the discretionary amount or to define equity in a certain way (such as compression equity, internal equity, etc.)?

A general consensus was reached that simplifying the pay plan (by decreasing the number of models and removing some or all multipliers) would make the process more transparent.

A general consensus was reached that if we remove multipliers (which are an imperfect attempt to address compression and inversion), then we should increase the Chancellor’s discretionary fund and recommend/demand that those funds be used to target the most egregious compression/inversion issues. This would involve updating Section 5.4 in the pay plan, which could wait until after March 15 when the Chancellor is expected to weigh in on the Equity group work.

Discussion about what percentage of funds should go to paying out solid performance versus merit. The current model is 65% merit, 25% solid performance, and 10% Chancellors discretionary fund. Various combinations were discussed, with the general consensus being that the merit percentage could be reduced.

It was agreed that next week’s meeting would include a discussion moving to one model.

Minutes submitted by Holly Hassemer