

Ball State University Staff Council
Minutes from Meeting #6
January 18, 2024
Location: Student Center Multipurpose Room (L28)
Time: 1:15PM

Members Present:

Sherry Boylan, Sherry Clark, Tiffany Edwards, Lisa Etchison, Faith Flick (for Ginger Mills), Hank Gerhart, Tasya Hannon, Laura Hargraves (for Nichole Flick), Nick Havranek, Krista Hayes, Dee Hoffman, Melissa Hull, Doug Jennings, Suzie Jones, Monica Kappes, Jodi Landreth, Maya McCullaugh (for Kathy Weaver), Courtney Quinn, Chris Raleigh, Amber Spaw, Christine Sprunger, Mike Talhelm, Jeremy Waymire

Excused Absences: Nichole Flick, Ginger Mills, Maija Thompson, Kathy Weaver

Guests:

Darrell Clark, Melvin Cole Jr., Jenni Flanagan, Jackie Mead, Melissa Rubrecht, Kate Stoss, Andrea Stuffel, Rhonda Wilson

- I. **Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order at 1:16PM

- II. **Speakers** – Jenni Flanagan (Assistant Director of Engagement, Wellbeing and Culture), Rhonda Wilson (Executive Director of Engagement, Wellbeing and Culture) and Darrell Clark (Associate Vice President for People and Culture), Employee Engagement Survey
 - a. Ball State is committed to focusing on People and Culture to make our University a better place to work and to help our colleagues experience even greater fulfillment at work. Focusing on employee engagement is a way to achieve these goals. (Employee satisfaction, which is different, will be addressed by other mechanisms.)
 - b. Employee engagement is the involvement and enthusiasm of employees in their work and workplace. Employees can become engaged when their basic needs are met and when they have a chance to contribute, a sense of belonging, and opportunities to learn and grow.
 - c. The Q12 Engagement Survey from Gallup will be used at BSU for five consecutive years to aid in conversations and actionable results. Engagement is not a one-time event, and it is what happens after the survey that leads to team growth and improved performance.
 - d. The survey has twelve questions addressing four levels of employee engagement: Basic Needs, Individual, Teamwork and Growth. Participants will use a simple five-point scale that ranges from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1) to rate each statement. There are four additional questions.
 - e. Gallup will send employees an email with their unique survey link from support@mail.gallup.com on Monday, Feb 12. The survey will take 10 minutes to complete. Marketing has made fliers and will hang these on timeclocks for those staff who might not otherwise see it. Only full- and part-time staff will be polled (not students/TAs or adjuncts).
 - f. Employee opinions are valued and secure. Team results, not individual employee results, will be reported in aggregate. For data to display on a report, at least five members of a team need to complete the survey; if a unit is smaller than that, the report will go to the next level supervisor.
 - g. In the next Together We Fly newsletter, there will be a link to FAQs on website.

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

- IV. **Approval of Minutes from December 14, 2023** -- A motion was made and seconded (H. Gerhart / C. Sprunger) to approve the December 14, 2023, minutes as presented. The motion carried.

IV. Committee Reports

- a. Employee Relations – Monica Kappes: No report.
 - b. Public Relations – Amber Spaw: No report.
 - c. Elections – Ginger Mills: No report.
 - d. Hospitality – Tasya Hannon:
 - Presents delivered to mother of Salvation Army; Tasya will provide pictures at a later point.
 - From December meeting: Guardian Scholars did incredibly well and gifts were appreciated.
 - Email Dee Hoffman with thoughts about whether to support both programs (both inside and outside community).
 - e. Research – Nick Havranek: No report.
 - f. Salary & Employee Benefits – Christine Sprunger: No report.
 - g. Angels for Life – Lisa Etchison
 - There will be an upcoming blood drive 1/23-1/24/24.
 - Link for sign-up: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/18OJY8R1joTjUFsnuAxRUGM72i-PoHUmErsCkXfkl_Fw/edit?usp=sharing
 - There is now a sign for the wheel to explain that it's only to be spun at the top of the hour. Everyone who donates will receive an incentivizing coupon.
 - Instructions now include push towards social media, especially on first day, to increase donation. We will now provide swag (black bags) to those who post. UMC/materials handlers will provide Benny Wings on Tuesday, January 23 in the morning so that students can get picture taken with that, but please be mindful of protecting the structure.
 - Michelle Jones may wish to work with local restaurants to incentivize social media advertising (perhaps with certain hashtags).
 - Pictures can be taken and sent to Jan Wright in UMC.
 - Public Safety –Jeremy Waymire: No report.
- Jane Morton Award – Dee Hoffman:
- Nomination applications will go out by the end of January 2024.
- Women of Ball Family Leadership Legacy Fund – Dee Hoffman:
- More details to be provided in February.
- Traffic Appeals Committee – Jeremy Waymire:
- Students have now been found that are willing to serve on this committee so it will meet to address the collection of appeals soon.

V. Old Business

RFI #23 2022-2023 1/19/2023 Assigned to Alanna Lewis; reassigned to Dee Hoffman and Monica Kappes (Employee Relations) **TABLED UNTIL FEBRUARY 2024 BY MOTION 9/21/23**

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.

RFI #3 2023-2024 6/22/2023 Assigned to Jeremy Waymire (Public Safety)

I am requesting that the visitor parking area be reassigned to the upper floor in McKinley parking garage and that staff be allowed to utilize the bottom level as was the practice in the Emens Parking garage. In RFI #8 2022-2023, the reason given by Nick Capozzoli was "When the Emens garage was torn down and replaced with the NY Ave. garage, visitor parking was intentionally assigned to the 1st floor to be consistent with the parking plans of the McKinley Ave. and Student Center garage". This line of thought gave no consideration to the Staff who are paying \$450+ to park in a garage every working day and prioritizes visitors who may utilize the garage a "few" times a year during the normal work day. This has also generated RFIs concerning handicap parking locations and number of spaces. An RFI

concerning congestion around the Parking metering system was also generated. With the Foundational Science Building and Health Professions Building locations, McKinley Garage is the closest place to park for those individuals with disabilities. If this was changed, the only cost would be in changing the signage.

9/14/23 – Response from Rhonda Clark (Captain, BSU UPD)

Over the last couple of years, the need has been made clear that more visitor parking was needed around campus. To identify where parking should be implemented, parking services did a yearlong evaluation of both the McKinley and New York parking garage, and determined they were both under parked and that additional visitor parking could be added without reducing the number of permits sold. Making the ramps from the 1st to the 2nd floor metered parking was the logical solution as it was a natural continuation of the existing visitor parking in those garages. When the Emens garage was torn down and replaced with the NY Ave. garage, visitor parking was intentionally assigned to the 1st floor to be consistent with the McKinley Ave. and Student Center garage.

Parking Services will continue to monitor the usage of disabled spaces in the McKinley garage. Should a determination be made that more spots are necessary, they will be added. Should an employee need an accommodation to use disabled spaces on the 1st floor or the ramp, they should contact our office and we will work to accommodate them. Parking Services will continue to monitor parking garages and all parking lots under the direction of Justin Smith, the new Director of Parking Services.

9/21/23 – Motion made and seconded (G. Mills/A. Lewis) to close this RFI. After discussion and voting, the motion failed and this RFI will remain open.

- No new information was provided in the response. The question of a justification for maintaining uniformity across all parking garages was raised.
- It was noted that as there seem to be more spots on the fourth floor of the McKinley Garage than on the first floor, then it would appear to be advantageous to make the fourth floor visitor parking, as Parking Services indicated that there was a need for additional visitor parking in reference to a similar RFI last fall. While it is understood that having visitor parking on the first floor creates a positive image for the university, users Page 3 of 6 of the area are not really all visitors but students going to class or employees parking there for convenience.
- There are still issues concerning handicapped parking in the McKinley Garage – number of spaces and accessibility.

1/10/2024 – Response from Justin Smith (Associate Director of Public Safety and Parking Services)

There's a lot that goes into the decision my predecessor made. I have had this conversation already in my short time in parking with members of the Department of Public Safety and have made my own observations which might help. The original decision to have visitor parking on the first level of all three garages was made to keep parking consistent and as simple as possible across campus. This makes things easier for everyone, faculty, staff, students, and visitors. Next, the McKinley garage and New York garages are equipped with elevators. The Student Center garage does not have an elevator. Therefore, we could not change all of the garages where parking could accommodate visitors on the top floor and host disabled drivers in the Student Center due to the lack of elevator. It's very important that we keep parking congruent across campus. It's our view that since the McKinley garage has an elevator, we are able to better accommodate our workers who need disability parking on the top level. This allows us to simultaneously accommodate visitors in the Student Center garage on the first floor while still maintaining a parking floor plan that's similar in all three garages.

Moving the paid parking to the top floor of R7 is more than just a cost of signage. The signs are posted at the entrance, each level, and each floor in multiple locations, yes. But they are also posted online and would need multiple communications sent to university members of such a change. One of the big expenses would be that there are 4 pay stations in R7. These pay stations require 220-volt electricity running to them that would have to be cut in the concrete and rerun (if possible) to new locations. They also require hard wired internet service to each station for communication purposes, which would be another issue and cost.

A final factor that was considered in making the decision not to move the paid parking to the top floor of R7 is in regard to contractor parking. Contractors are assigned to the top floor of R7. They too would have to be relocated elsewhere. Moving forward, the village is also expected to continue developing. With the addition of the new hotel/performing art center, we will continue to evaluate parking use and needs for the garage.

I hope some of this information provides some incite as why decisions were made. I want to also say that we value everyone's opinion and take the suggestion seriously. We understand the expense of parking and that everyone wants close and convenient parking. It's a complicated topic that we strive to make as simple as possible and will continue to evaluate. If there are specific needs related to disability parking, individuals are always encouraged to contact parking services directly and in conjunction they may reach out to John Bowers office for short terms accommodation at Employee Relations: ADA Coordinator.

1/18/24 – Motion made and seconded (J. Waymire / A. Spaw) to close this RFI. The motion passed.

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.

VI. New Business

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 (Executive Director, Human Resources).

1/18/24

This RFI will be addressed in February once response is received.

IV. 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

b. President Mearns may serve as guest speaker in February 2024. Confirmation will occur via the agenda.

VII. Adjournment

A motion was made and seconded (C. Raleigh / J. Waymire & C. Sprunger) to adjourn the meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:08PM.