

Wage Study Task Force
February 17, 2005

Thursday, 11:00 - 12:30

Notes originally submitted by Courtney Cronley

Present: Fran Ansley, Mary Rogge, David Linge, Martie Gleason, Mike Herbstritt, Alan Chesney, Elizabeth Gentry, and Courtney Cronley

In continuation of previous meeting discussions, the group sought to clarify what information is needed from HR in order to update the 2000 Living Wage Study. The issue was raised about the accuracy of comparing pre-IRIS data with post-IRIS data. For instance, HR did not have “pay grades” for all exempt staff before IRIS so it will be more difficult to conduct pre and post-IRIS comparisons for exempt staff.

The group did decide on three tables, which it asked HR to provide at the next meeting. These tables were as follows:

- **Table 1** – the same as Table 1 from the 2000 study but reflecting the new pay grade system (e.g. 30 – 53 rather than 1-13) and including exempt as well as non-exempt employees
- **Table 2** – same as Table 2 from the 2000 study but reflecting the changes that have occurred since then in terms of average wage and amount of change and including the exempt category; essentially just add a fourth column for 2004
- **Table 3** – reflecting the total number of employees by status, changes between 2000 and 2005; we want this table to include the number of privatized workers

The committee decided to contact Aramark and at least try to get a pay scale from the company and the number of people employed at UT

The HR folks also mentioned that several employment surveys are conducted in the area, which might be of interest to the committee, particularly one they guessed might be titled the Tennessee Valley Personnel, an annual study of how UT operates as a competitive employer in Knoxville. This study might offer some insight into the issue of non-exempt workers. HR said that they would attempt to get the results from the most recent survey before the next meeting.

The group also discussed the idea of eventually developing a table that shows the cost of benefits added to minimum salary and then shows the progression over time. The group did not formally request this table from HR at the meeting, however.

The group also engaged in a brief discussion about the need to be cautious in not shifting the focus away from non-exempt employees and onto faculty wage conditions, i.e. the interest in the rising number of non-tenure track positions.

The three co-chairs decided to meet separately prior to the next meeting to further define the committee’s goals/focus. The co-chairs also decided that they would like to build the wage update/expansion into the UT system as a regular annual task, which a committee helps to facilitate for HR.

