Summary of April 19, 2010 meeting with Dr. DeCenzo regarding the Staff Salary Compression Study:

Members present: Regina Lee, Tim McCormick, Debbie Hamm, David Klauder, Lori Cox, Carolyn Hickman-Williams, Trenny Neff, Regis Miner, Barbara Scott, Denny French, Ronnie Jordan, Kevin Perry, Holly Legg, and Poppy Hepp

Member Absent: Travis Overton and Jenna Jazwinski

Dr. Decenzo instructed the group as to the methodology used behind the staff compression study. The factors considered were:

1. date employee placed in a slot
2. date at the agency (CCU)
3. pay band
4. market salary
   a. difference between market salary and current salary
5. experience
6. education
7. certificates or licenses held
8. work performance

All staff in classified positions were reviewed. It was determined that 467 eligible positions were reviewed; of the 467, 67 positions were determined not to have an inequity and 400 potentially could receive “relief.” Of the 400 names presented, there were 37 employees excluded. The following are the reasons for exclusions:

1. employees currently earning more than $60,000
2. 2 direct reports to Will Garland and Dr. Decenzo
3. 9 employees based on performance
4. 2 excluded due to upcoming retirement
5. salaries are already within market range

A total of 363 salaries are being adjusted – 91% of eligible employees – 78% of total staff.

Dr. DeCenzo went on to explain why/how the above exclusions were determined:

1. The $60,000 – There was a significant statistical break between employees earning above $60,000; it would have pushed some employees over the $100,000 salary and CCU did not want to jeopardize the study.
   a. The question was raised, “is it possible for those individuals to receive an increase later in 2010 if their supervisors submit justification?” Dr. DeCenzo replied that “…it was possible that an increase would be available on an individual basis…”
2. Direct reports – Dr. DeCenzo did not want anyone to view the study as self-serving, and also based on time/grade – felt as though increases for the two direct reports were not warranted.
3. Performance – based on input with VP’s and supervisor’s some employees were not awarded monies due to poor performance

4. Retirement – self explanatory

The increases are scheduled to go into effect July 1, 2010, unless a decision by the state causes the university to make a last minute change to have the increases go into effect on June 30, 2010. The increases will be in equal increments over the next 3 years (July 1, 2010, July 1, 2011 and July 1, 2012).

**Percentage of increase varies from person-to-person – not an “across-the-board” increase. Length of employment was NOT a factor.

Employees receiving increases will be notified via letter this week. The letter will indicate the total amount of the adjustment and the breakdown for the next 3 years.

**104 employees will not be receiving any increase. Employees already inline with the market will receive a letter indicating such.

All ITS employees will be receiving an increase due to competition in the marketplace. When concerned was expressed regarding several facilities staff members over $60,000. Dr. DeCenzo indicated there was a possibility that this group of employees could be reviewed.

**LAYOFFS:**
2 classifications that were affected:
   1. annual contracts not being renewed – this affects 12 – 14 individuals
   2. others being RIF’d (Reduction in Force) – 10 – 12 individuals – only staff, no faculty
   3. Total of 22

The above cuts result in a 10 – 20% salary savings.

The VP’s are to speak to those employees being affected by the cuts. Once the board approves, CCU will assist those employees with such things as resume writing, access to labs and job counseling for 6 months.