

University Compensation and Budget Committee
November 9, 2018, 10am-11am McIntyre Library, Library Conference Room
Meeting minutes

Members present: Susan Ayres, Melissa Boellaard, Peter Hart-Brinson, Staci Heidtke, Bridget Kurtenbach, Robin Miller, Alex Smith, Ganga Vadhavkar, Tim Vaughan

Members absent: Josh Engle

1. Election of Secretary- Staci Heidtke volunteered
2. Review of previous meeting minutes. Peter moved to approve minutes as presented, seconded by Ganga.
3. Brief Introductions
4. Revision considerations for Section 6.1 of Comprehensive Salary Plan- Salary Adjustments from the Pay Plan
 - a. Committee has the latitude to adjust the discretionary portion of the funds, could be 0% or more
 - b. Classified Staff distribution is different from Unclassified. Committee has been told it is not an option to have three pools of money with separate lines (one for faculty, academic staff, classified staff).
 - c. From last year's implementation of the funds, inequities are noted between faculty and academic staff. Salary compression and inversion is exasperated when only use merit for salary adjustment.
 - d. When the committee increased the percentage of dollars for the discretionary fund, from 10% to 15%, this committee tried to be prescriptive. After submission, System notified this committee it could not be so specific. A series of things affected the final distribution. It ended up the committee was not able to provide input. Long-standing committee members indicate if they had known there would be no input into the discretionary fund distribution; it is likely it would not have been a 15% portion.
 - e. Discussion of the topic of the Equity Awards:
 - i. The Chancellor's staff, Deans and others made decisions on who received Equity Awards. Others provided data and information to others. Department chairs/directors assign merit. Chancellor said he wanted it to address internal inequity.
 - ii. Additionally, there is also other equity dollars to be used when have a singular inequity. Some staff/faculty use an e form, others do not- some do not know about it. Not clear where funds come from, assume it is finite pool of money, and it includes Post Tenure Review (PTR) dollars.
 - f. It was suggested by one member the policy be written before assign percentage of equity, merit and performance. Discussion on whether the committee focuses on the assigned percentage or is it more that money be distributed proportionally and transparently to all employees on campus.
 - g. Is there inequity over all four groups who received equity? Faculty received 45% of dollars, university staff got more, and academic staff got less.

- h. Topic of Trust and verify was raised- if we cannot prescribe a method for distributing money, can we ask for a public accounting process? After funds are distributed, receive a report of how the money is given with specifics the report should include. Not names but aggregating data by divisions.
 - i. Topic of retention instead of equity as a category of the pay plan. Some people need to retain on campus as compared to others. This is subjective, need to trust that there are people that know who should be kept here. Relative pay versus performance. Others indicate compression and inversion forces the need for equity instead of retention. Can retention funding be used to treat compression and inversion instead of equity funding? Pay plans will include performance ratings and salary, and that might be enough.
 - j. Member raised concern that some funding sources are being cannibalized. Example given is that reserve is used for nitr adjuncts and funding counteroffers when people present them.
 - k. Key questions to push to administration:
 - i. Can we label portion of pay plan Equity and Retention or just Retention instead of Equity?
 - ii. Where does money come from when staff and faculty indicate have counter offers?
 - iii. Where do recommendations come from for the discretionary portion? Department chairs and directors?
 - iv. Would it work for us to set aside a retention pool with the internal equity process outlined here (the one that was modified by Senate)?
 - v. Do you believe there will be money for a pay plan for the next biennial budget?
5. Adjournment at 11:00am, will invite Stephanie Jamelske, Mike Carney, David Miller to 11/30 meeting, 10 to 11am. Minutes submitted by Staci Heidtke.