




MOREHEAD, KENTUCKY 40351-1689

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 26, 1991

TO: C. Nelson Grote
President

FROM: Teresia M. Parker, Chair 
Staff Congress

RE: Recommended Staff Salary Increase for the 1991-92 Year

Your remarks at the budget meeting of Monday, February 25, 1991, were appreciated and seemed representative of statements you have made in the past regarding staff salaries. I am, however, disappointed with the recommended pool of only 8 percent. I can understand the position of University administration to not allow faculty salaries to regress below benchmark, although, in doing so, the priority committed to staff should not be allowed to diminish. I am convinced staff will not be pleased with this recommendation as it does not reflect the amount anticipated by staff to "make them a priority for 1991-92."

I would like to meet with you before the April 1, Staff Congress meeting. I need to understand the rationale regarding the University's final decision on 1991-92 staff salaries so I may be better informed to respond to questions raised by Staff Congress.

pc: Porter Dailey




MOREHEAD, KENTUCKY 40351-1689

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 6, 1991

TO: C. Nelson Grote
President

FROM: Teresia M. Parker,  Chair
Staff Congress

RE: Staff Congress Concerns Regarding Salary Increase

Thank you for your prompt response for a meeting to further discuss the recommended pool of funding for staff salary increases. I look forward to the opportunity to do so at our March 14 meeting.

As I expressed in my memo to you of February 26, members of Staff Congress and the constituents they represent do not feel 8% funding for staff salary increases addresses the unmistakable differences between the market value of Morehead State University exempt and non-exempt staff employees and the average for benchmark institutions.

Concerns and questions from Staff Congress, as discussed in the March 4, 1991, meeting are addressed below:

1. What was the rationale used in determining the 8% pool for staff salaries?
2. Why is 8% funding considered satisfactory for staff salary increases?
3. Why is a differential of only 1% (7% faculty vs. 8% staff) regarded as making a priority for staff salaries?
4. Does 8% funding of the staff salary pool take care of the inequities already existing in exempt and non-exempt staff salaries and bring staff salaries up to comparable market value for positions?
5. Staff Congress would like comparison results of where 8% will put staff in relationship to the regional institutions based on their expected increments for 1991-92.

Cost of living increases, without comparable salary increases, along with increased employee cost for insurance premiums, loss of holiday time, and loss of vacation and sick leave for new employees have partially been accepted in anticipation of previous commitments of administration that staff salary increases would be a priority for the 1991-92 fiscal year.

C. Nelson Grote
March 6, 1991
Page 2

Staff Congress has requested a response to these concerns by March 25, 1991, and if possible, I would also like to discuss these concerns in our March 14 meeting.

I will also be contacting Vice-President Dailey to request he be present at the April 1 meeting of Staff Congress.

pc: Porter Dailey
Staff Congress File