

Chair Report: Craig Dennis

\*Chair Dennis informed Staff Congress Representatives that committee chairs and vice-chairs will be elected during New Business.

\*Chair Dennis encouraged all representatives to read Article 2 of the Staff Congress Constitution. Chair Dennis wants all representatives to talk to their constituents to find out what their needs are so they may be brought to the attention of Staff Congress. Chair Dennis asks all representatives to send an email containing the top three concerns of their constituents. Emails with concerns may be sent to Chair Dennis, Vice-Chair Niles or Secretary Purnell. Chair Dennis encourages all representatives to touch base with their constituents every couple of weeks via email to ask for feedback or simply inquire if there are any new issues with their constituents.

\*Chair Dennis will work on getting new constituent lists to representatives (particularly the new representatives) as soon as possible.

Vice-Chair Report: Scott Niles

>Vice-Chair Niles reported that Secretary Purnell has updated the Portal information. Past copies of the newsletters and meeting minutes have been uploaded to the Portal in folders by year. Past Representative Allen suggested the Staff Concerns should be linked to the Campus Feedback section of the Portal and this has been implemented.

New Staff Congress Committee Chairs  
2014-2015

- ◇ Yvette Kell Committee Chair of Benefits & Compensation
- ◇ Lora Pace Committee Chair of Credentials & Elections
- ◇ Paige McDaniel Committee Chair of Staff Issues

Upcoming EAGLE Events



SOAR



Tuesday, July 15th

Next Staff Congress Meeting  
1:00 p.m. (Riggle Room, ADUC)



Monday, August 4th

Campus-wide CONVOCATION

Wednesday, August 13th

All on-campus and off-campus classes begin

Monday, August 18th





# STAFF CONGRESS

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

*In order to create a stronger bond within the staff, to promote cooperation among the administration, faculty, students, and staff at Morehead State University, we, the staff of this university, do establish a representative body to be known as the Staff Congress.*

**Logon to the Staff Congress Website**

via the **PORTAL**—We can be found under **Employee Services**



**Please click here to submit a Staff Concern**

**Click here to view and register for the latest Professional Development sessions**

### **Benefits & Compensation:** **Committee Chair Amy Moore**

\*No report was submitted

### **Credentials & Elections :** **Committee Chair Lora Pace**

\*Committee Chair Pace indicated the need to identify vacancies on the University Standing Committees that were a result of the Voluntary Buyout Program. An email will be sent to all staff to solicit nominations for appointments to standing committee membership. These nominations must be sent to Faculty Senate by August 15, 2014. We currently have two members of Staff Congress who will not be serving the entire year. We will discuss replacement of the two

members during the August meeting. Faculty Senate was supposed to audit all University Standing Committees, but it does not appear the audit has been completed. Chair Pace indicated she had looked at committees that had staff representation and started calling staff members to see if their committees had been meeting regularly. The Planning Committee met last year and are planning to meet more this upcoming year, but one committee (Wellness Committee) had not met at all during the past year.

### **Staff Issues:** **Committee Chair Kenna Allen**

\*Past Representative/Committee

Chair Allen agreed to look into submitted concerns until a new committee chair could be elected during the July meeting. The collected concerns will be given to the new committee chair at the end of today's meeting.

### **Sustainability Committee:** **Committee Chair Benji Bryant**

\*Past Representative/Committee Chair Benji Bryant submitted a report indicating the Sustainability Committee had not met over the summer; however, committee member Rep. McDaniel indicated the Sustainability Committee would meet on Tuesday, July 8th at 3:00 p.m.

### **Staff Regent Report:** **Mr. Todd Thacker**

Staff Regent Thacker reported the Board of Regents met on June 5<sup>th</sup> and approved personnel actions, approved presenting the Founder's Award to Keith Kappes, ratified the personnel roster, and approved the budget. President Andrews will receive a thirteen percent (13%) raise this year and an additional thirteen percent (13%) raise next year. The Board of Regents has elected to extend President Andrews's contract for an additional year and he will receive a retention bonus of ten percent (10%) of his salary in June 2015. Staff Regent Thacker reported that he looked at the Staff Congress body as a random sample for the employee compensation plan. The people sitting on Staff Congress ran the gambit of percentages in the raises they received. Staff Regent Thacker felt it only fair that President Andrews be brought to market like everyone else. Staff Regent Thacker indicated that President Andrews is the second most tenured President in the state and he is also the second lowest paid President in the state, excluding University of Louisville and the University of Kentucky. If anyone feels they were put into a grade that is unfair or wrong, they should go to Human Resources and discuss the situation.

### **Cabinet Report: Ms. Beth Patrick**

VP Patrick was unable to attend today's meeting. No report was submitted.

### **Human Resources Report:** **Mr. Phil Gniot, Human Resources Director**

Phil Gniot discussed the Voluntary Buyout Program aspects and addressed questions that had been submitted to him during the June 2, 2014 meeting he was unable to attend. Mr. Gniot stated sixty-eight (68) people had elected to apply for the buyout and all were approved with the exception of one (1) person who backed out of the program. Forty-eight (48) people had already chosen to submit resignations and were not allowed to participate in the Voluntary Buyout Program as indicated in the guidelines, bringing the total number of people leaving university employment to one hundred sixteen (116). Initially, the plan called for ninety (90) persons to leave university employment under the proposed Voluntary Buyout Program. The mix on the salaries represented by those leaving employment is yet to be determined and it is not currently known if the target was met based upon the numbers presented by Mr. Gniot.

*(HR report continued, next page)*

The University was trying to be proactive with instituting the buyout so employees would not have to undergo a reduction in workforce. Our Voluntary Buyout Program was patterned after the program Eastern Kentucky University offered their employees.

Northern Kentucky University implemented a reduction in workforce as did the University of Kentucky. Western Kentucky University is looking at implementing a buyout, also. The Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) has limited our ability to increase tuition. We are looking at our existing organization to do without the positions of those who will be leaving university employment and try to shift duties within their units. We think about half of the positions that have been vacated will be filled once the positions/duties have been reviewed. There was a question as to whether we have a date for those who may be part of the reduction in workforce---no decisions have been made as to whether there will be a need for lay-offs. We have a Reduction in Workforce Policy (*PG-58 Reduction in Full-Time Staff Work Force*) and we can enhance this policy, if need be. We can take this existing policy and add favorable features to it before implementation. This is a lesson we have learned from watching Eastern Kentucky University approach a similar situation. Other universities within the state are considering this approach, as well. If this is implemented and the augmentation of the existing policy takes place, it will have to be approved before it can be implemented with favorable features. Again, no final decision has been made on workforce reduction as work is currently being completed to see if we can work within the constraints of the budget. If we see this approach will not work with the budget constraints, we will have recommendations soon if the need for workforce reduction needs to be considered.

Staff Congress had submitted a list of questions to be addressed regarding the employee compensation plan. The summary data indicates the increases received by exempt employees varied greatly—some exempt employees received double-digit percentage increases while some exempt employees received no increase at all. A lot of things came along at the same time that affected how the grade structure was realized. We added grades to our scale so we have a total of twenty-one (21) grades to add flexibility to our grading structure. We took the experience market number of the grading system from CUPA data as the positions are benchmarked. We tried to get as many from CUPA as we could. The current experienced market is the CUPA mean for that position. The minimum of the grade is arithmetically structured. The desk audits that were conducted studied the exempt positions and the Fair Labor Standards Act principles were applied to these positions—this is the reason we see some overlapping grades. The exempt or nonexempt grade of a position was determined by the answers to certain questions during the audit. For those who moved from exempt to nonexempt, we chose to give those individuals half-way to experience market. Once that was done, we looked at the structure of the grades. We then applied twenty-five percent (25%) to the minimum salary to determine experience market. We received data that suggested large schools used thirty-three percent (33%) to apply to minimum salary to reach an experienced market level, so we ultimately went with applying the thirty-three percent (33%) to determine our experienced market level. The thirty-three percent (33%) was ultimately approved for implementation. We currently have 397 exempt positions and we put those positions in the most appropriate grade on our twenty-one (21) point grading scale. If the position was close to two grades, we were told to take a conservative approach and place the position in the lower grade. It would ultimately be easier to move people up a grade upon review instead of moving people down a grade after continuing our study. Some positions have questions regarding their grade—if that is the case, please contact Human Resources and we will review after we have approval to do so. We will go to other Kentucky institutions and look at their pay and gather data to determine if our pay is correct or if it needs to be changed. To request a title or grade review, you must go through People Admin—this gives us a proper method to bring the request up and move forward through the system. If your Vice President approves the review, then we will follow-up and do a review. If your supervisor doesn't think the job has changed substantially, they can request a review, but we will not do the lengthy job questionnaire as part of the process. All VPs will have knowledge of what is going on during any reviews. Those interested in a review can go to the supervisor and request or the supervisor can initiate the process on their own. We will make all recommendations based on CUPA data and data obtained from other Kentucky institutions. Institutions who cooperate best with us are Eastern Kentucky University, Western Kentucky University, and Northern Kentucky University. University of Louisville and University of Kentucky will not be used because they are in a different category (Ph.D. granting institutions). To gain the experienced market, the premise established will remain in place—a person must be in the position for seven (7) years. If a person is hired with minimum qualifications, they would start at the minimum end of the salary range and be at experienced market within seven (7) years as all points on the range should shift each year. Human Resources will recommend these shifts take place on the salary range scale so the range shift should be expected each year of the employee's time in position. There is currently a committee working on the details for additional compensation for those employees who are considered high performers. The year before last we implemented a program in which a performance-based reward system was instituted with a nonrecurring reward going to the top twenty percent (20%) of employees identified as high-performers. As of now, the committee has not decided if any future performance-based system will be instituted or, if a system is put into place, if the reward will be recurring or nonrecurring.

*(HR report continued, next page)*

**Human Resources Report:  
Mr. Phil Gniot, Human Resources Director**

If an employee is not a high performer, the flexibility of the current grading system would allow a supervisor to slow the employee's increase each year and require an action plan be submitted for that employee. This is a type of reverse incentive plan for those who are not high performers. Stats on the employee compensation plan: 748 staff of which 369 are nonexempt. Of the 369 nonexempt, 311 received increases. Of the 379 exempt staff, 262 exempt employees received increases. A total of 573 will receive increases in July for a total of 77% of staff members. Of the 748 staff, 87 employees receive an increase of 2% or less (equivalent to 11% of total staff). Of the staff, 175 employees did not get increases due to being at market or above market (equivalent to 23% of total staff). Mr. Gniot has agreed to break these figures out into exempt and nonexempt for the next meeting. Mr. Gniot indicated that he, along with Suzanne Hogge and Ryan Hill, looked at position by position when deciding who went into each group. Their recommendations were then sent for additional review by the Cabinet.

Mr. Gniot informed representatives when the recruitment aspect of a position is complete, the candidate's past employment history and skills will be evaluated for similar job duties, past experience, or qualifications that are above the minimum required that may affect the person's starting salary. At this point, the hiring supervisor will be asked to submit documentation that will aid HR in determining if the candidate should be started above entry salary. A representative asked if it was true all grade 10 market positions were not evaluated. Mr. Gniot confirmed that grade 10 market positions were not reviewed as the people in these positions report directly to Cabinet-level individuals and have been identified through the use of CUPA data to be in the correct grade. Another representative asked if an employee leaves through the Voluntary Buyout Program and someone is hired back into their position at more money than the incumbent, how does that save money? Mr. Gniot stated that the hiring process takes some time and the university would recoup some salary savings until the individual actually started work at Morehead State University. That is why not all positions that were vacated will be opened back up for hire. A representative wanted to know when the HRA funds would be deposited into the employee's account (Voluntary Buyout Program participant). Mr. Gniot replied the HRA funds will be deposited into the employee's account upon the termination of their employment.

Another representative asked Mr. Gniot if there was a cost associated with the new Wellness Program. Mr. Gniot stated the first year costs associated with the new program would be \$63,000 and the following year the fees would drop to \$37,000. Mr. Gniot is going to schedule a formal presentation on the Cerner wellness website and features for the next Staff Congress meeting.

**OLD BUSINESS: NONE**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**MOTION:** To approve Yvette Kell as the Chair, Benefits & Compensation Committee; Lora Pace as the Chair, Elections & Credentials Committee; and Paige McDaniel as the Chair, Staff Issues Committee.

**PROPOSED:** Scott Niles, Staff Congress Vice-Chair

**SECONDED:** None Needed

**CALLED FOR VOTE: MOTION PASSED**