Ball State University Staff Council
Minutes from Meeting #7
February 15, 2024
Location: Student Center Multipurpose Room (L28)
Time: 1:15PM

Members Present:
Sherry Boylan, Sherry Clark, Tiffany Edwards, Lisa Etchison, Nichole Flick, Hank Gerhart, Tasya Hannon, Nick Havranek, Krista Hayes, Dee Hoffman, Melissa Hull, Doug Jennings, Suzie Jones, Monica Kappes, Jodi Landreth, Maya McCullaugh, Courtney Quinn, Chris Raleigh, Amber Spaw, Christine Sprunger, Mike Talhelm, Maija Thompson, Jeremy Waymire

Excused Absences: Tonya Johnston, Kathy Weaver

Guests:
Darrell Clark, Melvin Cole Jr., Alan Finn (Vice President for Business Affairs and Treasurer), Geoffrey Mearns (Ball State University President), Brenda McCreery, Melissa Rubrecht, Kate Stoss

I. **Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order at 1:15PM.

II. **Speakers –** Ball State University President Geoffrey Mearns

   a. President Mearns began with expressing gratitude to staff and thanked us for our service to the students and our commitment to their success, which is evident through enrollment numbers which continue to rebound.
   b. He noted that the University is continuing to work towards operationalizing Human Resources into an Office of People and Culture, devoted to employee professionalization and well-being.
   c. He then discussed the Village Project at length:
      i. The village was historically a vibrant commercial district, but, since the 1990's, the area has been on a slow, steady decline. There's not enough economic opportunity yet to attract community members from a wide demographic. BSU has received a $35 million Lilly endowment with the goal to help make campus and its surrounding areas more attractive places for students and faculty to come and to stay after work and/or post-graduation.
      ii. BSU began acquiring real estate in 2007 with a long-term master plan to include the newer campus buildings to connect the heart of campus to the village.
      iii. The next phase will bring in the performing arts center. BSU's theater program auditions 1,500 high school seniors every year to select 40 to admit, so they're incredibly competitive, but the areas in which they perform haven't been renovated since the 1960s so these existing spaces will be updated to serve as ADA compliant classroom, audition and rehearsal spaces. We hope to house Muncie Civic Theater summer productions in the performing arts center, as well as provide free performances for a Summer 2025 concert series at the outdoor amphitheater.
      iv. From an economic revitalization standpoint, our students bring in 35-40,000 guests to Muncie, so when we bring in that quantity of visitors, we need to provide more restaurants and shops to cater to their needs. BSU will also oversee a hotel with a rooftop lounge and bar that will connect to the performing arts building, and our Barnes and Noble will be relocated and expanded to serve not just our students for textbooks and spirit gear, but the broader community. Our entrepreneur programs and hospitality programs will work with these areas, but our pre-existing University Hotel will be converted to other uses, and this private hotel will still accept academic unit FOAPs and funds to house unit guests. Rates are yet to be determined for these purposes.

     v. In terms of living space, BSU will additionally construct single-family cottage-style residences, townhouses and apartments. Parcels of land are east and west of Dill Street. If the city will allow BSU to vacate that block, we can create green space for the area's residents.

     vi. For timeline, The Barnes & Noble and home construction will begin 2025.

     vii. Parking issues continue to be a concern, especially as shuttle buses don't run when students are not in session and given the rate differentials across various campus lots, but the new construction shouldn't impede upon our existing parking structures.

     viii. Local community members have had concerns about water run-off and flooding as a result of campus construction, but water retention systems have been created to prevent run-off which Jim Lowe could talk in greater detail.

     ix. In terms of accessibility and/or vehicular congestion, the city may potentially change Calvert from two-way to one-way street to accommodate valet parking and also potential drop off areas on University and Calvert. Emergency transport routes to hospital are a requirement, so that will prohibit the closure of many blocks.

III. **Roll Call** – Silent roll call taken by Melissa Hull.

IV. **Approval of Minutes from January 18, 2024** -- A motion was made and seconded (N. Havranek / C. Raleigh) to approve the January 18, 2024, minutes as presented. The motion carried.

V. **Committee Reports**
   a. Employee Relations – Monica Kappes: No report.
   b. Public Relations – Amber Spaw: No report.
   c. Elections – Dee Hoffman:
      i. Ginger Mills had to resign from Staff Council for personal reasons.
      ii. A replacement representative has been found in Tonya Johnston who will begin March 2024.
      iii. We are working to find a new committee chair for the Elections Committee.
   d. Hospitality – Tasya Hannon: No report.
   e. Research – Nick Havranek: No report.
      i. As per Dee Hoffman, Staff Council website being updated between herself, Nick Havranek, and potentially Sherry Boylan.
   f. Salary & Employee Benefits – Christine Sprunger: No report.
   g. Angels for Life – Lisa Etchison
      i. For the January 23-24 blood drive, 8 first-time donors were registered, and 49 blood products were collected, impacting up to 147 local lives. The numbers were generally lower due to poor attendance driven by the weather.
      ii. Given the lack of engagement with the Benny wings display and the concerns about Staff Council's responsibility for its maintenance, it has been decided not to reemploy it at the next blood drive March 19-20, 2024.
      iii. The committee is working with Greek Life to request that sororities and fraternities devote some of their philanthropic service hours to promoting Angels for Life. On the day before and days of both drives, Greek students could, at the scramble light, Atrium, Student Center, etc., pass out promotional fliers with QR codes to register donors. They could also share the events on snapchat and other social media and direct donors to Pruis.
      iv. ROTC will allow the posting of fliers at West Quad; Housing and Residential Life may allow advertising in halls, but they'd require about 120 copies of fliers to market there. Michelle Jones from Versiti will send out new fliers.
      v. We may work to increase engagement with the drives by creating cross-college donation competitions, and work with Village restaurants and/or digital signage.
   h. Special Appointments:
     • Public Safety –Jeremy Waymire:
       i. The Public Safety Committee has experienced difficulty in finding two required

student representatives within student government to serve.

      ii. There are still 6-7 vacancies at the University Police Department, so recruitment remains an issue. The administration is looking into it.

     iii. Public Safety is working now to promote its Lunch and/or Dinner with a Cop program through fliers with a QR code. This is now open to students, faculty, and/or staff during the academic year.

- Jane Morton Award – Dee Hoffman:
  - i. Technical difficulties prevented an end of January nomination opening, but the award should open soon for promotion/signage.
- Women of Ball Family Leadership Legacy Fund – Dee Hoffman:
  - i. Applications will open soon. More information in March 2024, but we should be able to award up to $1,000 either individually or collectively.
  - ii. The deciding committee will be drawn at random from all staff council representatives once applications are submitted (to allow staff council reps the opportunity to apply as well).
- Traffic Appeals Committee – Jeremy Waymire:
  - i. Student representatives have not yet been found for this committee.

VI. **Old Business**

RFI #23 2022-2023 1/19/2023 Assigned to Alanna Lewis; Reassigned to Dee Hoffman and Monica Kappes (Employee Relations)
Please reconsider the steps and policies in place when using SciQuest and or Chrome River. With the latest updates to funds/access and so on, the amount of hoops one has to jump through is outstanding in order to 'properly' submit a reimbursement, have it approved AND make sure that the FOAP is correct while then also submitting a form later in order to have the funds replenished in the foundation account.

2/14/23 – Update from Alanna Lewis
Amy is sharing the questions with Stephen Wachtmann, Associate Vice President of Finance and Treasurer, and will have a response for staff council by the March meeting. There is a Foundation board meeting this weekend that they are preparing for and didn't have the time to prepare a response. They are aware of the challenges people are facing on campus and have been in contact with department heads about a solution.

2/16/23 – This RFI remains open.

3/13/23 – Response from Amy McClure (Controller, BSU Foundation)
It is important to note that the University and the Foundation are two separate entities. Both entities are required to follow the regulations and compliance rules established for each entity, including those relating to substantiation of expenses and withdrawals. The University (both the Controller and Budget Offices) and the Foundation have been working together to create automated processes to assist and expedite the withdrawal submission process.

3/16/23 – Discussion at Staff Council, we know they are working on it, we want more communication, and Alana will be speaking with the BSU Foundation.

04/19/2023 Response from Missi Jones, Director of Accounts Payable
Is it possible to get some examples of the specific issues/concerns for this one? We have many guides and trainings available online to assist with the proper submission of reimbursements, but if any of that needs clarification, we would be happy to know what those are so we can make them more useful to the end users.

04/20/2023 – Discussion at Staff Council: Alanna Lewis will coordinate a ZOOM meeting with Missi
Jones to discuss specific examples that have been sent to Alanna.

05/15/2023 – Alanna is asking for detailed directions or a list of documents that the Foundation requires when submitting reimbursements.

06/13/23 Update from Alanna Lewis
I working on a draft copy of instructions on how to submit paperwork to the Foundation am for withdrawals

07/20/23 Update from Alanna Lewis
No conclusion at this time. Alanna met with Missi Jones. Kate Stoss was asked to look into this as well.

08/17/23 Update from Alanna Lewis
Stephen Wachtmann has reached out to Lisa Bevans regarding this issue and we are awaiting word from them.

9/7/23 - RFI reassigned to Dee Hoffman and Monica Kappes (Employee Relations)

9/18/2023 Update from Lisa Bevans
We are very much engaged with the Foundation to get to a final solution. Once it is agreed upon, it will be widely communicated to the campus community.

9/21/23 – Motion made and seconded (C. Sprunger/L. Etchison) to table this RFI until February 2024. The motion carried.

2/15/24 Awaiting response from Amy McClure (Controller) and Lisa Bevans (Associate Vice President, Office of University Controller).

RFI #4 2023-2024 6/28/2023 Assigned to Amber Spaw (Public Relations)
It would be beneficial if when a person leaves or comes into a new position that a form would be available to fill out to let everyone know they will need access to in the system on a specific date to start so there will not be any flaws or interruptions in the transition. I have contacted Kevin Ginther and he says that access to Banner cannot be given to the new person until the old is out of the position. It makes sense but couldn't a form be created so that the last week of the previous person can fill out the form and put the date of the new person taking the position comes. At my previous position at a University the IT had a form that allowed for this transition. It was triggered by the AC and then HR confirmed the end date.

9/19/23 – Response from Todd Meister (AVP Information Technology/Chief Enterprise Architect)

IT consistently works towards automating access to systems and has developed a process called Permissions to Positions (P2P). This process automates granting permissions to systems for users based on their position. For a number of systems on campus we maintain a mapping of permissions to systems based on the position number. With systems that support a feed of users (automatic, generally each morning), we generate the list of users who should have access to the third-party system and what role that person (position) should have in the system. This file is driven by the HR system and specifically the position start/end date. Each morning a new file for the system is generated with the correct permissions for each user based on who is currently filling the position today.

Human Resources manages the start and end dates and this is a key component of the P2P process. In the past we have completely automated this process from end to end, granting new employees access to the new user on their start date and removing access on their end date. The removal process works well. However, we do have cases where users (or their supervisors) request access beyond the end date. However, some systems owners expressed concern by automatically granting access to systems on the start date. Our new approach to this is to provide a ServiceNow ticket to the supervisor prior to the employee being granted access. In most cases we are unable to grant access to the systems prior to their actual start date. We believe automating processes like these increases efficiency and consistency and provides a thorough audit trail. We've also discovered that most system owners/supervisors would like to discuss system access and provide instructions prior to granting access. In these situations, the supervisor can wait to approve the ticket until they have a conversation with the new employee or until the new employee goes through training.

Here are some documents which explain account lifecycle management and system-level access: Account Lifecycle Management
https://ballstate.navexone.com/content/dotNet/documents/?docid=3348&public=true

User Access to Systems
https://ballstate.navexone.com/content/dotNet/documents/?docid=3573&public=true

9/21/23 – Motion made and seconded (D. Hoffman/L. Etchison) to send this RFI back to the committee for more research. Motion carried.

• The assignment of access by position does not work the way they say it does.

• Selecting the correct Service Now forms and completing them is cumbersome, the labeling of systems needed is unclear, and the access timeline takes too long.

• Supervisors need a new employee access form that is based off the permissions and access the previous person in the position had.

10/13/23 – Update from Amber Spaw

I went back to Todd Meister with a list of questions that I gathered from the discussion at the last meeting. Todd responded that the system he explained in the original email grants permissions to systems for users based on their position. New employees would not need to use the ServiceNow form to select the systems and roles necessary to complete their job. I asked if it was a new system because in our experience new employees are still made to enter Service Now tickets for each system that they need access to. Todd reached out to some other folks in IT then gave the response below. Per Todd:

> **Short Story:** The process I described is on hold for the moment, but we are in the process of bringing it back online. Long Story: We started our P2P process several years ago. The goal is to "enroll" systems in the P2P process as we bring them online. This included associating permissions/roles for a system to a position number and then automatically applying changes as users move in and out of positions. This was in place for some systems until one area realized this was happening automatically. At that point we needed to reassess the process. The soon to be rolled out process will allow systems to pause the automation allowing a supervisor and/or a system owner to work with the new employee prior to granting access to the system.

I reached out again to see if there is a timeline for when this will be in place but have not received a response.

1/5/2024 - Response from Phil Shaffer (Director of Enterprise Information Systems)

I'm not Todd, but I can give you some insight into what has been happening. Admittedly, progress has been slower than I had hoped. Some of that was because of a couple of 'sooner

than later' projects that took time away, but mostly it has been technical challenges. The process we've developed, while functional, has issues with data integrity – creating duplicate records and losing others. It's imperative for us that the system we deploy is reliable and efficient, hence the additional time spent on testing and debugging to resolve these issues. We have been having weekly meetings on this and other aspects of P2P and I do think we've made great progress. I'm hopeful we will have a working renewal system soon. I'd be happy to provide another update prior to your next meeting.

1/18/24 – Motion made and seconded (A. Spaw / C. Sprunger) to keep RFI open until February to address further updates.

2/12/24 – Update from Phil Shaffer (Director of Enterprise Information Systems)

I'm happy to report that we have the infrastructure working for supervisors and appropriate data stewards to approve when a new person is hired. This infrastructure will also allow us to do annual renewals for audit purposes.

Our first system will be the Emergency Alert system for campus which has very few administrators and we can ensure that things are working in the live system as we expect. After that, we are planning on working with the controller's office on permissions to external finance systems.

We will proceed cautiously and evaluate how each new system is working, but eventually we intend to utilize P2P for all system access on campus. I'm sure that large systems like Banner are high on people's radar and I want to assure you that we are working towards mapping out the hundreds of unique permissions within that system and the appropriate approvers beyond the supervisor. That work will continue while we are evaluating the smaller systems that are being onboarded first.

2/15/24 Motion was made and seconded (A. Spaw / M. Hull) to close this RFI. Motion carried.

RFI #14 2023-2024 1/02/2024 Assigned to Christine Sprunger (Salary & Employee Benefits)

I think I am among the majority of employees who have been here for 5, 10, or more years. We like our jobs and our community. **We don't want to leave, but we would like our jobs to keep up with the cost of living and pay our bills. We deserve living wages.**

We live in Muncie, comparatively it is one of the cheaper places to live. We've made it our home, we have children to raise, they attend school here, and like it or not, Ball State is one of the largest employers in the county. Unless we want to commute an hour or more, there just aren't a lot of jobs. Ball State is reaping rewards of staff who are out of options to leave.

Looking at the starting rates, it seems like the University is rewarding employees who don't' yet work here by bumping starting wages higher and higher, while current employees have gone without raises, and are approaching being paid less than the new hire rates. I keep hearing "if you don't like it leave," but that is not an option for many, and frankly that is a terrible attitude to have in human resources or from campus leadership.

We should focus on employee retention, instead of attracting inexperienced workers for higher pay. Last year, when the revised salary ranges were presented to the campus via Staff Council by Kate Stoss, we were promised we can ask for raises commensurate with our years of service. But

those who asked were ignored and others were told by their supervisors that they tried to give raises, but they were "shut down by HR." I don't know what to believe, but I heard Kate speak impassioned to help employees with the idea of letting departments add additional raises if they can afford them. It was one way to get more pay for workers, but to then have it be shut down so blatantly, or at least so I was told is extremely crushing.

It's time for the University to put pay protections in for current employees who have given years of their lives because they believe in the mission, values, and merit of this University.

I've proposed a couple of solutions to make things more equitable.

The first solution to live-able wages and protection for current employees is a mandatory wage gap. The Excel Table uses my own information for a grade 10, where I have legacy information, but also illustrates it with salaries taken from the public record from employees at level 11 and 12 respectively who have been here for a similar time frame. See separate spreadsheet. (Added to bottom of RFI.)

Overall you'll notice that in 10 years, there hasn't been much of a wage increase for current employees. Other government jobs comparable in every way have increased more, and overall that has done nothing to allow these to be live-able wages, especially with inflation.

I am asking for a new wage policy to be instituted, that includes a **mandatory wage gap between new hires, and current employees.** This wouldn't apply to an individual unit, and look at the pay between workers of the same class in the same department, but throughout campus. If you're a 10, or an 11 or a 12, whatever the starting wages are for a given year, you should be guaranteed to be making a certain percentage above that rate, and if you aren't because of the years without raises, and the years where the starting rates were adjusted with higher percentages than our raises, in the mindset to attract new talent, your pay should be adjusted accordingly per your years of experience.

These would not elevate anyone over wage caps, because any who are at or above the cap for the job class would be within the wage gap guarantee already.

We have wage gaps for supervisors & supervisees of 5% but nothing between a new hire and current employee in the same job class.

In a year, if they bump the new hire rates again, and current employees don't get a raise, I'll be making less than the new starting rate. Even if they bump to the new starting rate, it's embarrassing and disgusting that a current employee with 10 years of institutional knowledge will be making the exact same as a new hire who can't even figure out Duo. But it's possible a new hire, might be making even more than the current employee if they qualify for the 25th percentile starting rate. It's unclear if a current employee could be bumped to the 25th percentile new hire starting rate, if they fall below the new starting rate and need to be adjusted up.

My pay with 10+ years should be in the 75th percentile ($20.33), but my wages aren't even in the 25th percentile for my job class ($16.87) if the wage gap were instituted, it would increase my pay to $17.50 which would be of great help to my household, and I would still not be up to the max starting rate of $17.58.

The Wage Gap should be based on years of service. Very few folks would qualify for the 15+ and even the 10+ since they're being driven off in droves, but the ideation behind it, is a protection and a reward for loyalty and years of service. It would be one way to adjust wages of those who have gone through the lean years, changes to the evaluations and weathered every single storm, and hit ever curve ball thrown at us over the years. If you've rolled our the red, and stopped the Ball State bounce, you are not being paid enough. If you look at the examples, except those with the 15+ rates, for a level 10 most would be close, but not even over the 25th percentile or max starting rate and some folks who have

been here less time, but started out at higher wages already, because their wages have maintained an appropriate gap.

There should never be a negative wage gap between new hires in the same job class on campus, and the discretionary hiring amount are creating negative wage gaps for some employees, but not all.

Proposed Gap Percentages (see attached sheet to look at the numbers) (Added: see end of RFI for that chart)

2-4 Years 4%
5-9 Years 6%
10+ Years 8%
15+ Years 10%

The other problem, is the inequity being created on campus by allowing departments to set new hire rates up to the 25th percentile. As a person who monitors the job postings on campus frequently, I have seen the extra pay being give, and if wages could be increased for current employees to KEEP their jobs, we wouldn't have to have higher wages for NEW people. We're in this terrible habit of rewarding strangers who may work here instead of those of us who work here right now. We're throwing away the birds in the hand and frantically grabbing for the birds in the bush.

First of all everyone in the job class, regardless of their unit, should have the same starting rate. If that is not possible, then instead of the wages being set by what the unit can afford, and on a very discriminatory basis (the Pay Scale PDF is very vague on how these higher rates are awarded), it should be granted by a specific factor scale. If you meet criteria 1 + x cents. If you meet criteria 2 +x cents. There can be as many criteria as needed to bump the wages up to the 25th percentile. BUT this should also be applicable to current employees too. If you complete a master's degree, and that was a preferred qualification for the job, and part of the factors allowing the higher rate, you should be able to get your pay pumped, especially if you are a current employee who doesn't make up to the 25th percentile.

Even if you don't do something like finish a degree, you should still be able to ask for compensation review against the new hiring salary factors, and then they can determine if you qualify for the extra pay points. I appreciate the consideration of wiggle room to attract new talent, but when most folk aren't even making the 25th percentile of their job class after 5 or 10 or 15+ years, we don't feel valued or appreciated for our institutional knowledge and loyalty when new folks are being hired and earning higher wages from their start.

Also if we change jobs on campus, we're not being offered the chance at higher pay. I interviewed for another position that was a 10, and I asked the supervisor if they could start me at either the 25th percentile $17.58 or would consider adjusting the rate for my years of service I would bring to their position, $20.33. Their response is that they there would be no adjustments for years of service, or for the additional factors to qualify for a higher starting rate, since I worked here, and had a current rate above the starting rate, but not anywhere near the 25th percentile, I would keep the same rate. However if I was walking in from the outside of the University, those factors could apply to a new hire, but not to a current employee changing departments. Now they aren't HR, so they might be speaking out of turn, but that is wrong if it is indeed true, as it is, another example of people who don't yet work here getting better treatment and pay ahead of current employees.

The Staff Pay Scale document mentions criteria but no actual monetary values to these items, no formula to determine that is applied equally, so it's just discriminatory, and "because we said so" in nature. If a new hire can qualify for extra pay, why can't a current hire also qualify for higher pay up to the 25th percentile based on the factors? I would have hired in at a higher dollar amount than I'm making now, if there would have been 25th percentile in 2013, but that didn't apply then, and I'm not

making the 25th percentile now after 10 years. Even with the wage gap idea proposed, it still won't move the needle very much past the 25th percentile wages for even those who have been here 15 years or more.

The bottom line is, "no new hire in a job class is worth more than a current employee," regardless of where they work on campus. **The job class is a job class, which is meant to standardize starting pay, but now there are no standards.** Compensation is supposed to be fair/equitable and based on job class and years of experience. We have the years of experience percentiles, but I don't know a single person who is being compensated per their years of experience, and added now there are other employees with less experience being paid more in the same class. **IT's time to address inequities in pay and do something to reward current loyal employees.** Instituting the wage gap, and or review for compensation factors would be two ways this could be fixed. Unless you just want to bump everyone up to the 25th percentile starting rate, who is under it, or adjust everyone up to the correct salary percentile per years of service…. I'd be happy with any or all of the above.

2013 New Hire Rate	2023 New Hire Minimum Rate	2023 Max New Hire Rate (25%)	Actual Employee Salaries 10+	Actual Wage Gap 2023 Minimum	Wage Gap New Hire Max	Wage Gap 3% (2+Yrs)	Wage Gap 5% (5+Yrs)	Wage Gap 8% (10+Yrs)	Wage Gap 10% (15+Yrs)	Wage Cap
Level 10										
$14.92	$16.20	$17.58	$16.60	(D4-B4)/D4 2.41%	(D4-C4)/D4 -5.90%	B2*1.03 $16.69	B2*1.05 $17.01	B2*1.08 $17.50	B2*1.10 $17.82	$21.70
Level 11										
	$18.25	$20.13	$19.02	(D7-B7)/D7 4.05%	(D7-C7)/D7 -5.84%	B7*1.03 $18.80	B7*1.05 $19.16	B7*1.08 $19.71	B7*1.1 $20.08	$25.75
Level 12										
	$19.85	$21.83	$22.75	(D9-B9)/D9 12.75%	(D9-C9)/D9 4.04%	B9*1.03 $20.45	B9*1.05 $20.84	B9*1.08 $21.44	B9*1.1 $21.84	$27.75
	Sample Data sourced from SalaryReport_FY23 & employee's own paycheck history and Pay Scale Document on HR's Website									

1/12/2024 Update from Christine Sprunger
Awaiting response from Kate Stoss (Senior Executive Director, Human Resources).

1/18/24
This RFI will be addressed in February once response is received**.**

1/30/24 Response from Kate Stoss (Senior Executive Director, Human Resources)
There are a variety of methods that organizations can elect to administer compensation such as a single rate plan, where all employees in a pay grade earn the same base rate regardless of performance or seniority. Another option is a step plan, which has a focus on seniority, but not performance. In a step plan, an employee's base rate is determined by years of service (step one at hire, step two after one year, step three after two years, etc.) and they typically cap out fairly quickly. A third option is merit based, which has a primary focus on performance with an element of seniority.

Faculty, Professional, and Staff employees are provided increases based upon merit in keeping with the direction provided by our Board of Trustees. When the University announces the annual increase budget (this past year it was 3%), employees are not guaranteed the percentage increase and managers distribute the amounts based upon performance. For Staff, an employee must have a performance appraisal score of 2.8 to be eligible for the general portion of the increase and 3.5 to be eligible for merit. 70% of the increase is set aside for meritorious

performance. As a result, there may be two Staff employees at the same pay grade with similar seniority, but the base pay is different due to merit increases.

Staff pay ranges are reviewed annually and increased a fraction of the overall merit pool. This helps ensure that current employees will be paid more than those being hired in at the minimum. When determining the new pay range minimums, Human Resource Services reviews the impact on current employees to help avoid compression. In limited circumstances, some current employees (those who were hired after the salary increase deadlines for example) will fall below the newly established minimums. When this occurs, those employees automatically receive a salary increase to bring them to the new minimum. In years where we could not provide an annual increase or the increase pool was limited, the Staff salary ranges were not adjusted.

Under the Staff pay plan, new employees may be hired between the minimum and 25th percentile of the range in recognition that individuals we are hiring may have years of experience in their profession. A newly hired employee's salary shall normally be set at the minimum of the range. In cases where circumstances necessitate, a starting rate may be greater than the minimum if the qualifications of the candidate exceed the minimum. If a department would like to offer the candidate more than the minimum, the Human Resources Partner conducts an equity review to ensure that the offer will not create pay compression (i.e. the HR Partner ensures that there is pay differential between the newly hired individual and those with more seniority). The Human Resource Partner shares the equity review with the hiring department to determine the appropriate pay level for the new employee and the department can adjust the rates of current employees to prevent compression and in recognition of seniority. Please keep in mind that the percentile/years of service formulas that were established for internal equity adjustments serve as guardrails and are not guarantees.

There have been departments that made changes to the pay for current employees when it was necessary to offer pay above the minimum for a new hire. The Human Resources Partner for the area works with the unit to determine appropriate increases. When departments inquire about pay adjustments, the Human Resources Partner consults with the manager to determine if the request is in keeping with the pay policies.

The changes made to the Staff pay plan in 2022, provide supervisors with more flexibility in providing increases outside of the annual salary increase cycle and mirror pay practices in place for Professional employees. A department may ask for an adjustment if there are equity issues created by a newly hired employee, for retention purposes, or when an employee takes on additional duties that do not result in an upgrade. In addition, we increased the amounts provided when an employee is promoted or their position is upgraded. The changes were made in response to feedback that we received for the need to hire and retain Staff employees.

As mentioned in previous RFI responses, a Board of Trustees committee was developed to place focus on HR-related issues and People and Culture (Human Resources) has developed a number of strategic initiatives. As a result of these discussions, Human Resource Services redefined one of our vacant positions so that it will have a focus on compensation administration and assist us with implementing strategies that are market competitive and internally equitable. The individual in this role will participate in the design, implementation, and administration of compensation programs and policies. We are in the process of recruiting for this role. Our goal is to review and make recommended changes to administration to ensure that our total compensation package is competitive and help us retain.

2/15/24 Additional responses from Kate Stoss (Senior Executive Director, Human Resources) during meeting

- Increase wage budgets now include filled and vacant positions (to allow units to award from a higher wage pool when there are vacancies).
- When vacancies in areas result in additional work for staff, the duties of which are outside of the staff member's job description, additional overtime can be paid in lieu of comp time if approved by supervisors. If tasks are the same as what's already being done or accomplished within the same workday, no additional compensation is granted.
- A job audit process can be initiated to discuss when staff are assigned ongoing additional duties outside of their existing job descriptions.
- Because increases are not centrally funded, departments have to come up with additional funding for wage increases determined via job audits. In most academic units, Deans and their Budget Directors make determinations on the location of the funding.

2/15/24 Motion was made and seconded (C. Sprunger / A. Spaw) to close this RFI. Motion carried.

VII. **New Business**

RFI #15 2023-2024 1/02/2024 Assigned to Nick Havranek (Research)

Are there any plans to allow staff to celebrate/view the solar eclipse in April?

2/2/24 Response from Dayna Thompson (Planetarium Director)
Information about the April 8 total solar eclipse and Ball State's planning is online at www.bsu.edu/solareclipse2024. The website and calendar will continue to be updated as more is planned. Solar eclipse glasses will be distributed at various sites on campus starting March 18 (Student Center, Emens, Dining Halls, etc.) and are currently available at all Brown Planetarium public programs. All members of the university community are encouraged to review the safety information online so they can enjoy the rare celestial event on Monday, April 8, 2024.

2/15/24 Motion was made and seconded (L. Etchison / M. Kappes) to table this RFI until March. Motion carried.
- Melissa Rubrecht: 70,000 pairs of glasses will be made available across campus.
- Dee Hoffman: will request that Dayna provide glasses at the March 2024 meeting.
- Kate Stoss: will return to Darrell Clark for additional information on staff celebrations/viewings. Havranek will follow up with Stoss as needed.

VIII. **Announcements**
   a. Emens BOGO Events
   - *Feufollet*, Tuesday, February 20, 2024 at 7:30PM in Pruis Hall
   - *Burke, Kennedy, and O'Leary*, Friday, March 8, 2024 at 7:30PM in Pruis Hall
   - ~~*Melody Angel*, Friday, April 12, 2024 at 7:30PM in Pruis Hall~~ **CANCELLED**
   b. The Staff Council meeting's March Speaker will be Dayna Thompson (Planetarium Director) and Jackie Buckrop (Special Assistant for Academic Operations) re: the Solar Eclipse on April 8, 2024 and how to stay safe.
   c. Ball State Employees have access to Udemy courses for free:
   - To get to the courses, go to my.bsu.edu and scroll down to Udemy. Sign on to Udemy using a single sign on. Once in Udemy, you will see a Ball State logo in the upper left corner. Next to that, click on Explore, then Categories, then Learning and Development resources!
   - The Learning and Development team can also create custom courses. They are working on this with help from our campus partners. They are also working on taking the courses from the online training week last fall and putting them online so people can have access to the content at any time.

d. Save the Date: The annual Staff Conference will be on Friday, April 19, 2024. Lindsay Boccardo will be the nationally ranked keynote speaker presenting.
e. Maija Thompson: The Student Supervision Appreciation Banquet will be Wednesday, April 10, 2024 at 10:00AM. April 8-12 is national student employment week.

IX. **Adjournment**
A motion was made and seconded (C. Sprunger / M. Thompson & N. Flick) to adjourn the meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:33PM.