Student Technology Fee

Dr. Fraser presented the report and recommendations of the FY2005 Student Technology Fee (STF) Subcommittee of the University Senate Committee on Information Systems & Technology. Eighty-two proposals requesting $6.8M and a Provost request to continue $586K in FY2004 awards for staff and other continuing expenses, which could not be off-loaded to regular state funds, were considered by the subcommittee. The subcommittee recommended funding 57 proposals for $4M plus the requested continuing funds.

Dr. Fraser highlighted the following from the report of the subcommittee:

- The subcommittee urged transfer of staff positions from the STF to regular state funds after FY2005. The subcommittee modified the pre-proposal/proposal process to a stage 1/stage 2 proposal process to facilitate IS&T and Facilities reviews and got good compliance. The subcommittee recommended a cap on requests for security devices or systems in order to stem the erosion of funds for actual instructional technology. The subcommittee curtailed subsidization of student printing. The subcommittee proposed development of a plan to re-use computers, which are replaced by STF grants, but are still useable elsewhere in the university. The subcommittee had reservations about funding purchases of laptops, tablet PCs and PDAs, which the subcommittee felt students should be encouraged to purchase on their own. The subcommittee recommended development of limits on STF grants for construction and renovation.

Dr. Henry thanked the subcommittee for its work. He asked if the subcommittee had discussed the funding of student assistant positions rather than graduate assistant positions. Dr. Fraser replied that the subcommittee recognized that graduate assistants carried the hidden cost of tuition waivers.

Dr. Tai asked about the types of security devices or systems requested. Dr. Fraser indicated there was the full range including on-line cameras, recorders, keypads, etc.

Dr. Henry asked about the funding of computer labs given the emphasis on innovative uses of technology. Dr. Fraser responded that these labs were generally used for specialized software for particular disciplines. Ms. Hurt pointed out the subcommittee had excluded university-level subscriptions such as ARTstor. Dr. Fraser conceded some licenses and databases had been funded, but cautioned that inflation for these would reduce the future funding availability unless fees were raised.
Dr. Henry asked about replacement of outdated equipment bought with STF in prior years. Dr. Fraser again warned that funding for such would limit funds for innovation.

Dr. Tai made a motion to accept the funding recommendations of the subcommittee as-is. Dr. Kelley seconded the motion. The motion passed.

**Salary (Raise) Administration**

Dr. Henry listed three issues to be addressed: (1) staff raises and pay plan minima; (2) faculty raises; and (3) use of FACP discretionary funds (e.g., salary compression).

Dr. Henry noted the Governor had not yet signed the state budget, and he was expected to call a special session of the legislature to resolve budget issues. Dr. Henry added that the Board of Regents would not act on tuition and fees until its May 18-19 meeting, with the university budget still due back to the Board of Regents by May 24.

Dr. Henry explained the salary pool would be based on 2% average raise effective January 1, 2005, with the allocation of funds holding to a cap of $1,600 (2% of $80,000), but the distribution of raises not bound by the cap.

Dr. Henry recommended that staff raises generally be 0% or 2%, with 1% raises for employees recently hired and excess pool dollars from any 0% and 1% raises used to reward a few outstanding employees.

Mr. Rackliffe reported this scheme had been discussed with the chief administrative officers group and the Finance & Administration directors. He cited concern among the Finance & Administration directors about raises for employees under formal disciplinary actions. He relayed their recommendation that such employees should receive 0%.

Dr. Henry asked if the employees not written up formally for similar offenses would still be eligible for raises and if any increase in the pay plan mimina would still apply to employees under formal disciplinary action. Mr. Rackliffe replied to the latter that the employees would not have earned the new minima. Dr. Hudson urged that managers be allowed to address such issues on their own. Dr. Fritz commented that the Enrollment Services directors had agreed with the 0%-2% scheme, but that disciplinary policies were too inconsistent to set a rule regarding employees under formal disciplinary actions. Dr. Henry questioned how employees could be legally denied increases to the pay plan minima.

Mr. Rackliffe reminded that FACP had only raised pay plan maxima the last time that there were raises. He pointed out the last two years with raises had had 79 exceptions to the raise percentage range. He offered one suggestion that the raise range be 0% to 5%, leave pay plan minima as they are, and raise pay plan maxima 5%. Dr. Henry stated that raising pay plan minima might help hiring. Dr. Adamson observed that since some recent hires at the low end of the pay plan ranges would be getting 1% raises so raising the minima by 1% might make sense.

Dr. Kelley spoke in favor of the 0%-1%-2% scheme. Dr. Tai asked if pay plan minima adjustments
would have to come from the raise pool. Mr. Rackliffe answered this would be the case since January 1, 2005 salaries would be compared to December 31, 2004 salaries in the analysis for the Board of Regents.

Dr. Huss observed that hiring at the minima was not a requirement. Dr. Kelley spoke for keeping the current pay plan minima. Dr. Kaminshine spoke for a 2% increase in the pay plan minima to attract higher quality employees. Dr. Huss stressed the need to reward people whose performance is tops.

Dr. Kelley made a motion to keep the current pay plan minima and raise the maxima by 5%. Dr. Huss seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Kelley made a motion to use a 0% to 5% range for staff raises with raises at integer percentages between. Dr. Huss seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Henry directed discussion to faculty raises. Dr. Tai asked about a cap on faculty raises. Dr. Henry replied there would be no cap as with staff. Dr. Adamson asked about the source of funds for extra dollars for FACP and discretionary pools. Mr. Rackliffe responded that the 2% pool calculation include student assistants, graduate assistants and vacant positions.

Dr. Adamson urged attention to the lowest paid faculty. Mr. Rackliffe asked if this implied a cap for top paid faculty. Dr. Adamson replied that both should be addressed. Dr. Henry cautioned against sending a negative signal to top paid faculty. Dr. Hudson pointed to the relative significance of 2% for top paid faculty versus higher raises for lower paid faculty. Dr. Tai suggested adding 0.5% breaks in the range of raises rather than only integer percentages.

Dr. Henry asked if it was the desire to set aside some dollars from the pool for low paid faculty. Dr. Huss objected on the grounds there had been no raises this year and that the distance from market would increase. Dr. Adamson suggested keeping the 2% for merit and do adjustments separately for compression, inversion, market, etc. Mr. Rackliffe estimated the pool beyond the 2% merit to be about $200K. Dr. Adamson identified newly promoted associate professors as particularly disadvantaged and suggested tying adjustments to promotion raises in August.

Dr. Hudson made a motion to use the 2% faculty raise pool for merit raises. Ms. Bradley seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. Henry proposed that the FACP discretionary pool be earmarked for faculty salary compression. Dr. Hudson made a motion to that effect. Dr. Tai seconded the motion.

Dr. Jacobs commented that market was an aggregate mechanism, not applicable to individuals. He distinguished between analysis of performance relative to the market and category entry salaries. Dr. Henry noted a target group of faculty hired three years ago versus brand new faculty in same rank. Dr. Huss questioned focusing on the three-year group. Dr. Henry replied that these were the most vulnerable. Mr. Rackliffe characterized the issue as internal equity.

Dr. Hudson urged commitment to help a broader range of faculty in better budgetary years. He cited the sentiment of the University Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs to start with the lowest
paid faculty with so little funding to allocate for this purpose. Dr. Adamson reiterated the point made by Dr. Hudson, and noted that salaries for new hires become markers for subsequent years.

Dr. Kaminshine held that there was a difference for smaller colleges with a combination of new hires at higher salaries and faculty plucked away as morale killers. Dr. Adamson noted that summer dollars could be used to attract new faculty without intensifying salary inversion problems. Dr. Huss explained that the Robinson College of Business benchmarked faculty salaries to those of new hires, and that 3-4 year faculty were at the 90% level this year and recently promoted at 80%. Dr. Hudson acknowledged the problem, but observed there was too little money available this year to address it. Dr. Huss qualified the initiative to applying to the widest gaps. Dr. Hudson characterized the focus on low paid faculty as ethical. Dr. Tai added that it was a moral issue as well.

Dr. Kelley suggested due to the complexities among colleges that the $200K be put in the overall pool. Dr. Colarusso concurred that the Robinson College of Business had a serious problem when full professors were paid approximately the same as new assistant professors.

Ms. Hurt pointed out the Library had addressed internal equity with its own dollars last year. Dr. Fritz suggested it was a practical issue to focus on low paid faculty. Dr. Henry responded that there was a larger issue of morale.

The motion to use the FACP discretionary pool for faculty salary compression with the distribution to be determined later passed.

Mr. Rackliffe reviewed the schedule for salary administration with files to be available to chief administrative officers on April 26 and due back in three weeks. Dr. Tai asked about rules for raises for persons on soft money. Dr. Henry replied that the same rules would apply to all. Dr. Colarusso asked about percentage raises for faculty, integer or half percentages? Dr. Henry answered half percentages and reiterated avoiding 1.8%, 1.9%, etc. less than 2%. Dr. Huss asked about instructions along with the files. Mr. Rackliffe indicated there would be a spreadsheet and instructions once approved by Dr. Patton on April 27.
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