Ball State University Staff Council
Minutes #3
Thursday, October 19, 2017
1:15 pm
Student Center, Room 301-02


Substitutes: None

Unexcused Absence: Matt Gaither

Excused Absence: None

Guests: Andrea Stuffel, employee relations, Gracie Reiff, Human Resources, Kate Stoss, Human Resources, Bernie Hannon, Business Affairs, Greg Carbo, President SGA

I. Call to Order–The meeting was called to order at 1:15p.m. by Sarah Newell, Staff Council President

II. Speaker – President, Geoffrey S. Mearns spoke briefly and opened the floor for questions.

III. Roll Call – Cary Witter called the roll of representatives and substitutes. Roll call showed 29 representatives and 1 unexcused absence, and 5 guests. A quorum was constituted for the meeting.

IV. Approval of Minutes –A motion was made and seconded (D. Frankland/E. Palmer) to approve the Minutes of September 21, 2017. The motion carried.

V. Committee Reports
   a. Employee Relations – Angela Pickett, No report
   b. Public Relations – Heather Melton, School supply drive has ended
   c. Elections – Hank Gerhart, No report
   d. Hospitality – Angie Zahner, we may adopt one large and one small family this year. The adopt a family project has started taking applications so we should know our family/families soon.
   e. Research – Christine Edgeman, No report
   f. Salary & Employee Benefits – Tamara Edwards, No report
   g. Angels for Life – Tori McClain, No report
   h. Special Appointments
      Public Safety – Hank Gerhart, No report
      Jane Morton Award – Adam McLachlan, details should be forthcoming in mid to late November
IV. Old Business

**RFI #1 2016-2017**: Assigned to Staff Council President
With the new Kronos system, an employee has the ability to clock out in 15 minute increments. I am asking that the Handbook for Nonexempt Staff Personnel, paragraphs 4.1.7 Paid Sick Leave and 4.1.8 Vacation, be changed to allow 15 minute increments. This would be a simple change and there would be no need for Board approval since an employee would already have the time allocated to be used.

7/6/2016 Question has been submitted to Human Resources.

10/3/2016 Update: Kate scheduled a meeting to discuss this question but it was canceled. Awaiting response from Kate Stoss, HR.

10/20/2016 Update: Kate Stoss is revising the employee handbook, she intends to cover these concerns.

11/20/2016 Update: Kate Stoss sent revisions to Kevin Kenyon and Bernie Hannon for approval.

12/15/2016 Update: Sarah Newell will send a request to get an official confirmation that the paid time off is available to use in 15 minute increments.

1/19/2017 Update: No update

2/16/2017 Update: Employee Handbook is currently in the process of being updated.

3/13/2017 Update: No update at this time.

3/16/2017 Update: Kate Stoss, Director HR, prepared revisions to the employee handbook; Kevin Kenyon, Interim Associate VP for HR and Administrative Services, and Kate Stoss reviewed the wording and submitted the handbook to Bernie Hannon, VP Business Affairs and Treasurer, for approval.

4/20/2017 Update: No update at this time.

5/18/2017 Update: The updated Employee Handbook is scheduled to be complete by the beginning of July.

6/15/2017 Update: The updated Employee Handbook is scheduled to be complete by the beginning of July.

9/18/2017: Awaiting update.

9/21/2017: All the handbooks have been combined, edited and reviewed. HR is working on indexing the handbook. It should be published soon.
10/16/2017 update: The updated staff handbook for 2017 has been published and can be found on the University Human Resource Services website under Forms, Policies, and Guides. The handbook states (under section 4.1.7.1 Paid Sick): “Only paid sick leave hours accrued and reported in Kronos on pay dates may be used. For non-exempt employees, paid sick leave may be used in - 15 minute increments.” And (under section 4.1.8.1 Vacation Nonexempt Staff) “Vacations are to be scheduled in advance and at a time agreeable to the supervisor and in accordance with the needs of the department. Vacation may be used in 15 minute increments; however, the request to use vacation will not be approved by the supervisor if the absence of the employee from the workplace would require that a substitute or replacement be employed.”

Motion to resolve was requested by Angela Pickett with a second by Sharon Harper, motion carried RFI resolved/closed.

RFI #2 2016-2017: Assigned to Research Committee
I learned today in a Kronos time keeping meeting that it is an HR policy that non-exempt staff cannot use their lunch hour at the beginning or end of their shift. I have been here for 16 years and honestly never knew this. We have been hearing from Shana Rogers that if your supervisor approves flexibility in your work shift then that won’t change. To be able to use your lunch hour at the beginning or end of your shift is a huge benefit. You use much less vacation or sick time and are at work more. This encourages a wellness environment, a balance between work and life/home, and is less stressful when trying to make appointments or take care of family life issues. Why does it matter if one day we work 8-4 or 9-5 as long as we get our hours in for the day, our supervisor approves it and our office is covered? Shana said in the meeting I attended that this is a BSU policy not an FSLA policy. Therefore, if it is a BSU policy then it can be changed. It seems counterproductive to add a layer of bureaucracy on top of federal overtime laws. I am requesting that the policy for the lunch period be changed to allow staff members to take their lunch hour whenever they need to with the approval of their supervisor. This is an antiquated policy that doesn’t fit in today’s modern times of companies offering flexible work shifts for their employees.

10/20/16 Update: Department of Labor doesn’t require a lunch or coffee break be provided by the employer. Employers do not have to provide a lunch period. The policy in the handbook is in the best interest of the employee. Please refer to the supervisor and work out any changes in the scheduled breaks.

With the new information, motion to resolve by Robert Weller and seconded by Melissa Perry.

Kurt Noel started discussions that this information isn’t currently presented this way in the handbook. Kate Stoss is going to work with her team and amend the information to ensure language is updated in the handbook. This RFI will remain open until changes are made.

11/17/2016 Update:
The policy will not be changed to allow a Staff member to work an 8 hour day without a lunch period. While neither state nor federal wage and hours laws mandate lunch periods it is in the best interest of the employee and employer to allow employees a lunch period. Staff are not permitted to work an 8-hour day without at least a 30-minute lunch period preceded and followed by an extended work period. The handbook will be updated to clarify that a Staff member may shorten their
lunch hour to no less than 30 minutes and they may use that remaining time at the beginning or end of their shift. Changes to an employee's schedule must be approved by the employee's supervisor.

2/2/2017 Update: This RFI is in the process of being adopted to the Employee Handbook. It will remain open until then.

2/16/2017 Update: Employee Handbook is currently in the process of being updated.

3/13/2017 Update: No update at this time.

3/16/2017 Update: See update for RFI #1.

4/20/2017 Update: No update at this time.

5/18/2017 Update: The updated Employee Handbook is scheduled to be complete by the beginning of July.

6/15/2017 Update: The updated Employee Handbook is scheduled to be complete by the beginning of July.

9/18/2017: Awaiting update.


10/16/2017 Update: Staff Handbook 2017 under section 3.3.4.2.1 Meal Period states: “As with rest periods, lunch hours are to be preceded by and followed by an extended work period. At the discretion of the supervisor, an employee may take a thirty (30) minute unpaid lunch during the academic year.”

Motion to resolve was requested by Angela Pickett with a second by Cindy Dillingham, motion carried RFI resolved/closed.

RFI # 26 2016-2017 Research and Salary and Employee Benefits
It’s great that Ball State lowers cost for master’s classes for employees, but why are courses that are offered only online or in other cities more expensive? I would love to see all classes offered at the lower cost. In my degree program, several courses are only offered online or at the “Fishers Campus” which is considered off campus. I couldn’t afford to take what I wanted this semester. Please advocate for a change! Those who don’t make much money but want to improve themselves would appreciate it.

3/13/2017 Update: This RFI was forwarded to the Bursars office. We are awaiting a reply.

3/16/2017 Update: This RFI was forwarded to the Bursar’s office. Kate Stoss, Director HR, hopes to provide more information in the next meeting.
4/20/2017 Update: No update at this time.

5/18/2017 Update from Kate Stoss, Human Resources: Human Resources is in the process of reviewing the formula for how it generates the fees for on-campus and off-campus courses. The current cost structure does not reflect changes in fees and tuition associated with graduate studies.

6/13/2017: No update at this time.

6/15/2017 Update: Kate Stoss has requested more data from the Bursar’s Office.

9/18/2017: Awaiting update.

9/21/2017: Kate Stoss indicates that a committee is reviewing the policy and will make recommendations to VP Hannon regarding possible changes. Any changes to the policy must be approved by the Board of Trustees.

10/6/2017 Update: The review committee has met and is conducting research. Kate Stoss will get back with Staff Council once a proposal is put together.

10/19/2017 Update: Kate Stoss indicated that Scott Stachler is researching the impact of this policy.

RFI #46 2016-2017 Salary and Employee Relations/
Giving blood is so important and I always try to help when I can. However, it’s very difficult, at times, to walk to Pruis, go through the process of giving blood, and then get back to the office within an hour. It’s impossible in the summer with a 30-minute lunch break. Is there any way the university would consider allowing employees to participate in this endeavor “on the clock” if we could provide proof to our various supervisors that that was where we were? I feel like so many more employees could participate if time weren’t an issue. I don’t mind giving up a lunch break for this- it’s a minor inconvenience, but I can’t help but think participation would be much higher if we weren’t dinged on time.

6/13/2017 Update: This is under consideration but no update at this time.

6/15/2017 Update: Kate Stoss is working on a proposal concerning this RFI.

09/18/2017: Awaiting update.

09/21/2017: Kate Stoss has requested Staff council send HR a proposal on how we could document the time that the employee spends at the blood drive – i.e. when they arrive and leave. Tori McClain will meet with Kate to discuss.
**10/04/2017 Update:** Kate Stoss drafted this proposal. It is waiting on approval from Vice President Hannon:

Staff Council sponsors five to six blood drives per year as part of their Angels for Life program. The blood drive is coordinated with the Indiana Blood Center, a 501C 3 non-profit organization. We encourage employees to schedule a time to donate blood, but the program also accepts drop in donors. A current staff employee has asked if s/he could attend the Ball State-sponsored blood drive during her regular work hours and be compensated for the time. This individual noted that s/he cannot always complete the donation process during the lunch hour, especially if there is a large turnout. We believe that donating blood is a volunteer opportunity and would be permissible under the Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment Policy. Thus, the employee could donate blood at a university-sponsored event and be compensated. In keeping with the policy, the following provisions must be met:

1. Pre-approved by the supervisor
2. Tracked by the employees and
3. The supervisor must retain the records for auditing purposes.

All Angels for Life participants are tracked on a sign-in sheet and Staff Council has agreed to add an additional column to track sign out times. After each blood drive, Staff Council would forward a copy of the sign in sheet to Human Resources/Payroll should there be any questions or concerns.

If interested, an employee can find the Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment Policy in section 5.5 of the newly published Staff Handbook.

Motion to resolve was requested by Ashley Pilmore with a second by Cathy Cummingham, motion carried. RFI resolved/closed.

**RFI #2 2017-2018**

Since North Quad was renovated there has been no dedicated lounge space. Until recently, North Quad 160 which was controlled by Modern Languages and Classics was used by students, faculty and staff as an impromptu lounge because that is where the vending machines are located but if there was an even schedule in that room, then no one could use the room of get to the vending machines. This summer the decision was made to give that space to Athletics to be used as a study room for athletes. Now there will be no space available for lunch breaks, work break, breaks for students in between classes. No one in the building knows if there will be access to the vending machines or not. I appreciate that the athletic students need a space to study but I don’t appreciate that in a building full of permanently housed academic offices there is no dedicated place for staff members to be able to access vending or have a place to eat lunch.
without having to go to a separate building to access those places. Where are students supposed to sit in between classes or on their lunch breaks? At lease faculty members usually have a private office. I can’t think of another building on campus that doesn’t have a dedicated break room/ lounge area. Please have a dedicated break room put in place somewhere in North Quad that is accessible to all students, staff, and faculty that are housed in the building.

9/18/2017: Awaiting an update.

9/21/2017 Update. Kate Stoss incorporated various sources for this response:
The university has a fiduciary duty to assign facility space for highest and best use that that best benefits the university as a whole. To that end, a Space Committee examines all requests for use of space on campus and makes a determination for facility use that is driven by what is best for the campus. A decision was made to convert a little used lounge space in North Quad to a student study table space, necessary to meet the academic needs of students, who happen to be student athletes. Incidentally, the study space previously use for this purpose as a student study table was repurposed to make room for the Math Emporium in Bracken Library, because that was determined by the Space Committee the highest and best use of that space at that time.
While it is unfortunate that some people may no longer be able to use that specific room in North Quad as a lounge, the vending machines and lounge furniture that was removed from room NQ 160 were relocated to other areas, it is a very short walk to Ball Gym, Lucina Hall, Elliott Dining or the Pittenger Student Center.
The Space Committee will consider a request to repurpose other existing space in North Quad to a new lounge space and will make that determination based on the highest and best use of existing space. Once the Health Professions Building is occupied, estimated to be in fall of 2019, the spaces currently occupied by departments that will be moving into the Health Professions Building will be open for consideration for use by the Space Committee. At that time, the Space committee will have other options for relocating existing space use, including the student study table, should they make that determination.

During discussion, Tamara Edwards gave a brief narrative of some of the issues with North Quad 160. Tamara spoke about a newspaper article in which Dr. Marilyn Buck said the room was picked because it was the only room available on campus that could hold 100 people and was in little use. According to R25 the room is only shown to hold 36. If that is the case they are also in a Safety and Fire code violation. The room had 269 reservations for the academic year of 2015-2016. So it was not in little use. The reservations were scaled down some in the 2016-2017 year to accommodate the amount of students using it as a lounge. Tamara said that the vending machines have been re-installed on the second floor. However they are not easily accessible for ADA purposes. She also brought to the attention of the staff council that the doors nearest to this room are locked and cannot be opened from
the inside. They do not have breakaway bars. It was suggested that contact be made to Tim Kirby in Risk Management to address this safety issue. Sarah Newell will make contact with Tim Kirby.

10/13/17: Awaiting reply from Tim Kirby.

10/19/17: Tamara Edwards presented the following detailed information regarding room usage:

North Quad houses 11 different units at Ball State University ranging from Advising, University College, to seven Academic Departments.

Academic Advising
Academic Systems
College of Sciences and Humanities Deans Office
Criminal Justice and Criminology
Modern Languages and Classics
Philosophy and Religious Studies
Political Science
Psychological Science
Social Science Research Center
Social Work
Sociology
University College

These units employ 181 faculty, staff and professional personnel. Along with the Learning Center NQ also has 11 class rooms, several small conference rooms, and numerous small Psych. Labs. Please see the breakdown of classroom usage Per R 25 below

Monday 85 classes
Tuesday 66 classes
Wednesday 84 classes
Thursday 69 classes
Friday 70 classes

The student total for these classes is approximately 3080. Each classrooms hold between 18 and 55 students. If you average each class meeting at 20 students that would mean that on a weekly basis there are 7480 times students are coming and going through NQ.

Student Athlete Study Tables have also reserved NQ 291, 292, 293 Sunday- Thursday from 6:00-11:00pm. So no other class or event can reserve these classrooms. That is a total of 16 ½ hours of classroom space that is unusable from Monday-Thursday besides NQ 160. There is also a room set up to be used as a Student Athlete Study Table adjacent to the Learning Center in NQ.
The stack area in NQ is sitting open and unused. Why not use it to either put a lounge in NQ or use it as the Student Athlete Study Table area. It would need to be renovated but would solve the problem of the removal of the only common area in NQ. It is a much better option than putting the students in the basement storage area which was told to us was a possibility.

RFI # 5 2017-2018
Staff Council has presented several RFI’s and gained the proper approval for their inclusion into the Employee Handbook but several are over a year old since that approval and have still not been added to the Handbook. The last promise date was July 2017. Can we have a definite date when the Handbook will be updated?
*RFI #15 2013-2014, Expand family sick leave days from 5 to 10 days, approved July 2016 to included in the Handbook.
*RFI #10 2015-2016, Assignment of one-day bereavement for stepsiblings, approved July 2016 to be included in the Handbook.
*RFI #1 2016-2017, Allow 15 minute increments for Paid Sick Leave and Vacations, approved June 2017 to be included in the Handbook.

9/18/2017: See update for RFI #1 2016-2017. Kate Stoss reiterated that an email went out to all BSU employees regarding the implementation/effective date of this policy. This will be added to the employee handbook which is currently being indexed.

10/16/2017 Update: The updated Staff Handbook has been published and can be found on the University Human Resource Services website.
RFI #15 2013-2014 can be found under section 4.1.7.1: Full-time exempt and non-exempt staff (regular and temporary) may use up to eighty (80) hours/ten (10) days of sick leave per fiscal year for the care of a family member.
RFI #10 2015-2016 can be found under section 4.1.3: An employee will be allowed one (1) day of time off with pay in the event of the death of an employee’s other relatives defined as (...) Step-Sibling.
RFI #1 2016-2017 can be found under section 4.1.7.1: Only paid sick leave hours accrued and reported in Kronos on pay dates may be used. For non-exempt employees, paid sick leave may be used in - 15 minute increments.

Motion to resolve was requested by Angela Pickett with a second by Sharon Harper, motion carried RFI resolved/closed.

RFI # 6 2017-2018
Why are staff and service employees discriminated against when they decide to retire at an age prior to 62? Faculty and professional staff members who make much higher salaries and can afford to pay higher health
care premiums in retirement are not required to pay the added 20% of the total health care premium until they reach age 65. Why are staff and service employees required to pay it? Generally speaking staff and service salaries are significantly lower than faculty and professional staff over the course of their employment but these are the groups the university has decided should pay higher health care premiums if they wish to retire earlier than age 62- even when they meet the rule of 85! Employees that meet the rule of 85 have been the “face of the university” dedicating their lives to the University- yet get treated so unfairly on the policy when they retire! It really disappoints me and makes me angry after the dedicated service of staff and service personnel. I am asking Staff Council to advocate and make a change in this policy for staff employees. Perhaps at least look into changing this policy so that staff employees meeting the rule of 85 do not have to pay the added 20% when they retire early or make the staff and service policy the same for all employees- regardless of job classification. The policy (below) should make staff council angry enough to try to make a change for us!

Policy reads: Under age 62 and retire on or after July 1, 2015, you will pay the active employee health care premium plus an added premium of 20% of the total health care premium until you reach age 65.


10/06/2017 Update from Angela Gregory, Manager of Employee Benefits:
This 20% added premium (...) was eliminated on 1/1/16, and is no longer in effect.

Please contact Angela Gregory in the Office of Payroll and Employee Benefits if you have any additional questions.

Motion to resolve was requested by Cathy Cunningham with a second by Kim Bechdolt, motion carried RFI resolved/closed.

V. New Business

RFI # 7 2017-2018
Suggestion: Creation of an employee recognition award for outstanding service employees who are currently working at Ball State. A recent call to HR made me aware that the awards programs only exist for staff, professional staff, and faculty or service members who retire. As out most front-facing customer service arm, it seems fitting that we should have a way to recognize and honor those who exemplify “rolling out the red”.

10/16/2017 Update:
According to Kate Stoss, “Roll out the Red” has been retired. Marta Stephens, Human Resources Programs Coordinator, says that Service employees are recognized in May for years of service starting at the 10-years
of service milestone and at each consecutive five-year increment. We also recognize employees who retire within the fiscal year. You’ll find information about our staff and service employees recognition on our site at www.bsu.edu/hrs/recognition. Direct any questions regarding service employees to Brian Scott.

Staff Council would also like to note that the A. Jane Morton Award for Staff was initiated and is funded from an endowment from the Morton family.

Motion to resolve was requested by Cheryl Simpkins with a second by Diane Frankland, motion carried RFI resolved/closed.

RFI # 8 2017-2018

Since it has been approved and only awaiting the Handbook to be revised, would it be possible for an email to be sent out by HR to supervisors stating that the “15 minute increment” for vacation time and sick time is currently in effect. This will preclude the possibility of another delay in issuing the revised Handbook.

10/16/2017: Staff Handbook is published. Supervisors may refer to the handbook.

Motion to resolve was requested by Angela Pickett with a second by Kim Bechdolt, motion carried RFI resolved/closed.

RFI # 9 2017-2018

I have worked at the university for 5+ years. This week I was told that I was in violation of a University Technology policy. The policy, as told to me by my department chair, is that no staff employees are to receive new computers, ever. They are only to get hand-me-downs from faculty. The University, through UTS, is on a 4-year rotation of computers, ergo, every 4 years an employee is eligible to request a new computer through the College Plan.

Every year I have worked here I have requested computers, on behalf of my department, on the College Plan, for Faculty, Staff, and Professional staff. I have written lengthy justifications for this technology, and been very clear which computers were assigned to staff, and/or faculty. My requests have always been granted. Please explain how the University can set such a policy, where staff are not granted new computers and where we are supposed to function on computers that are between 4 and 8 years old. This is not equitable, this creating a hostile work environment where staff feel we are second class citizens, servants or slaves to faculty overlords. Where is the Equal Opportunity for access to technology? How come in the past few years, past chairs, associate deans, and UTS have always signed off on these computer upgrades and funded them through the college plan every year, but just NOW this is a violation of a long standing policy? I don’t understand how Ball State as an equal opportunity employer can have a policy in place that will treat staff poorly and limit their access to technology in favor of faculty access to technology.
In the world where we operate today all employees need Equal Access to technology, and this policy, if it truly exist, needs to be changed to reflect equally among all employees. Staff work in symbiosis with faculty to create the rich and warm University environment for our students.

Staff should NEVER be made to feel like second class citizens by our administration. Staff should be guaranteed a computer replacement every 4 years, (or whatever schedule Ball State ends up being on in the future for technology replacement.) If we are not included into the college plan purchases there should be policy statements created so that we are guaranteed the same access to technology as is granted to faculty. I also think this is a poor management of the UTS college plan if it doesn’t include EVERY EMPLOYEE in the college in said plan...this to me seems like poor planning. If staff aren’t going to granted anything but basically 4 year old crappy computers, they need to change the name of the College Plan to Technology Only for Faculty. I just do not understand how we are Equal opportunity if there is a policy stating staff cannot be granted new computers, and only get hand-me-downs. Staff are equally as important as Faculty to the University System and providing students services, by allowing this policy to in place, Ball State is basically saying Faculty are important, Staff are not. This is blatant discrimination between classes of workers. Technology and computer access is something every employee needs to do their job, and everyone should have equal access, and there should be no difference among faculty and staff when creating or administering plans and budgeting for computers. 

Steps Taken: I believe there should be a section in the employee handbooks, or included in the code of operations regarding technology being distributed fairly and equitably to ALL employees regardless of employee type. I personally have scoured all of my emails and there are absolutely no directives from any of years past that say the College Plan is just for Faculty...it says Department Technology Needs in more places. Pam Wills I know orders computers for the Annual Technology Plan, and I’m not sure where everything else comes from...maybe Gary Moore? I would like to know in writing, in the minutes, through the RFI where the University truly stands on access to technology. If Staff are to only receive used machines from faculty, this needs changed immediately. A Lenovo that is 4 years old is pretty much trash, and at the end of its life. Staff jobs are too important to leave to old technology. Could you imagine a Ball State PD officer with an 8 year old computer? Or the registrar, or Financial Aid. WE NEED ACCESS TO TECHNOLOGY JUST AS MUCH AS FACULTY. WE ARE NOT SECOND CLASS CITIZENS and should not be treated as such under this Ball State Policy. I’d also like to know where this policy is written down, if it’s in the Code of Operations or exists in UTS, or is a Financial Policy. I think this policy is utter Bullshit and is just another means to divide the University workers and perpetuate a culture of Have and Have Nots...

10/13/2017 Response from Loren Malm, Interim Vice President for Information Technology:

1. There is no university policy nor any Information Technology rule, guideline, or general recommendation which would prohibit a staff employee (or any other employee) from being assigned new computing equipment. As with any other resource such as furniture or supplies, the department or unit may allocate a portion of its supply and expense budget for computers, and these may be assigned to staff or other employees. Decisions regarding the use of the unit’s supply and expense budget are at the discretion of the
unit’s leadership and the University Budget Office. If the staff member has attempted to work through their unit leadership and the unit’s leadership has indicated they are unable to use their assigned supplies and expense budget (which is derived from the universities’ General Fund) for acquisition of computer equipment for any of their employees (staff or otherwise) we believe the University Budget Office can assist with that issue.

2. The requestor appears to have been misinformed about the university being on a “4-year rotation of computers.” There is not a university or Information Technology prescribed rotation schedule. We would note that depending on the usage profile a four-year rotation may be too long in some cases and too short in others; often the useful life is extended much longer. We are aware of computer labs, many administrative offices, many faculty, and many others throughout the university currently using computers which have been in service longer than four years. Some departments and units do set their own rotation schedule, however these vary widely depending on the unit and are really more internal guidelines than policies or mandates. We are unaware of any department which mandates or guarantees as an entitlement a particular rotation schedule. Finally, we note there is no such lifecycle policy in place at the IT or institutional level and certainly not one which would limit staff or any other grouping of employees to “used” computers. Rather than a prescribed replacement schedule, we would encourage all university units to allocate funding from their supply and expense budgets to support the resources all employees under their leadership need to perform their duties successfully – this will vary by unit and function and Information Technology will assist units with an analysis of their environment if requested to do so.

3. We do note many units (academic and administrative) reallocate computers and other technology amongst their employees as new computers or technology is purchased. It is somewhat uncommon for a computer to be purchased and used by a single employee until the computer is so old it must be excessed. Faculty who oversee some of the more technology-intense labs on campus are frequently required to make the computers last longer than four years, and often what drives the replacement is an incompatibility with new releases of high-end software which has particular system performance requirements. For example, we have two computer labs on campus right now where the hardware is too old to run the current version of Adobe Creative Cloud – these older computers are quite capable of running more commonly used office software such as Word, Excel, and Outlook however, and it would be a shame to simply discard these computers when replaced since they are fully capable of serving in an alternate role.

4. A number of areas are getting a great deal of additional life out of their computers by making two low-cost upgrades – increasing the RAM where possible and changing out the older mechanical hard drive for a new solid-state drive. These upgrades can usually be done for a small fraction of the cost of buying a new computer (typically in the $100 – $200 range) and in many instances the effective increase in performance is so great the end user experience is just as good as if they had received an entirely new computer. Information Technology is planning to do this with our aging Helpdesk computers and as a result we anticipate getting several more years of life out of them. We would be happy to assist any university unit with this type of analysis (if you would like assistance, please start with your LPS, or if you have no LSP through a Helpdesk ticket) to see if these types of lower-cost upgrades might be right for the computers in your unit. Additionally, IT has noticed a number of computers being sent to excess which still have a
significant amount of service life remaining – in some cases the warranty was even still in effect. We rescue these computers and re-allocated them to units where they are needed.

5. University computers used in student labs, classrooms, and assigned to individual employees are funded through multiple sources – only a portion of the university’s computers are purchased through the annual academic technology planning process (referred to here as the “College Plan”). The “College Plan” is a set-aside of a portion of student technology fees, and while we agree all university employees need the appropriate tools and resources to complete their assigned work, it is neither possible nor appropriate to use student technology fees to meet the individual technology needs of every university employee. Departments and units are assigned supply and expense budgets for the very purpose of obtaining and maintaining computers and other supplies and equipment needed to support their administrative functions. The direct allocation of university funds to the supply and expense budgets of university units, as a portion of the general fund, recognizes the importance of these needs and does not limit the use of this budget to faculty or any other particular employee group. The unit’s supply and expense budget is the appropriate source of funding for computers used to support administrative functions, and the requestor should discuss their needs with their direct supervisor.

6. For the past several years the “College Plan” the requestor refers to has been funded entirely by the student technology fee, and the priority for this particular fund allocation is the technology students themselves directly utilize and interact with in their studies. The use of student technology fees for faculty assigned laptops and related technology continues to be permitted, since these computers are typically used by the faculty in the classroom or related instructional setting. Personal computers assigned to administrative units, administrative staff, and other non-teaching roles are properly funded from the unit’s supply and expense budget rather than from student technology fees. This is not a reflection of one group of employees being valued over other groups of employees, it is about meeting unit needs through the appropriate budget lines. We believe that in all of the examples provided by the requestor (University Police, the Registrar, Financial Aid) the unit’s supply and expense budget is used to fund needed personal computers. None of these units are funded by student technology fees for the reasons described above – again this has nothing to do with the distinction in the “type” of employee, but rather it is an important distinction between employee roles (instructional vs. administrative and support) and which budget should be used to fund identified needs.

Once again, we emphasize we are unaware of any policy, guideline, or directive limiting the assignment of staff employee computers to those which have been previously used by faculty. The leadership within an individual unit could certainly make a determination their assigned supply and expense budget is faced with demands outweighing the need for new office computers; this would be a unit level decision best addressed through that unit’s leadership. We also agree with the requestor’s underlying proposition all employees should be allocated the appropriate tools and resources to complete their assigned work, and to this end we recommend employees (again, all employees) work through their supervisor and unit leadership regarding these needs if the employee feels unable to complete their assigned work due to a lack of assigned resources. Finally, we stand ready to help any unit evaluate their existing computers and technology and
note this type of evaluation frequently reveals opportunities for low-cost upgrades which greatly extend the viable service life of the existing computer.

Motion to resolve was requested by Ellie Palmer with a second by Cheryl Simpkins, motion carried RFI resolved/closed.

VI. Announcements

- Angels for life Blood Drive Schedule
  November 15-16, 2017
  January 17-18, 2018
  March 21-22, 2018
  May 24, 2018

- United Way campaign is underway. Please consider giving.

- **Buy One Get One (BOGO) Ball State Faculty, Staff, and Alumni:**
  Buy one regular adult ticket and get one free. Present BSU ID at the Emens box office to claim. Tickets are available at the Emens box office (temporarily moved to Sursa box office), all Ticketmaster outlets, and charge-by-phone at 800-745-3000 or online at [www.ticketmaster.com](http://www.ticketmaster.com).

- November 8, 2017—Bria Skonberg - Jazz (Pruis)
- November 11, 2017—The Revelers - Cajun (Pruis)

Next meeting will be Thursday, November 16, 2017 in SC 301-2 at 1:15 p.m.

*Note the December meeting will be held on December 14th in the Architecture Building as approved by Staff Council.

VII. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Angie Zahner with a second from Sharon Harper, motion carries. The meeting adjourned at 2:15pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Cary Witter, Staff Council Secretary