

2017-2018 Faculty Senate Living Wage Study

UTK Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee (April 18, 2018)

INTRODUCTION

This report was developed through the UT Knoxville Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee during the 2017-18 academic year. Members of the committee who authored the study include Sarah Eldridge, Jon Shefner and Beauvais Lyons with support from Faculty Senate Graduate Research Assistant Brooke Killian. The report is based on documents provided by Mary Lucal, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Human Resources, with the assistance of Robert Chance, Director of UT Payroll and [Janice Hodge](#) and [Julie Hunt](#) from the Human Resources Department.

Since 2000 UTK Faculty Senate has issued reports and taken a public position expressing its concern regarding compensation for the lowest paid workers on our campus. These reports studied compensation for our regular university employees and our contract workers, employed by major contractors to provide dining and custodial services.

This report provides an historical context and is built on earlier reports compiled for the UTK Faculty Senate in 2000-2001, 2005, and 2010-2011. In March 2001, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution in support of a living wage for all full-time campus workers. The initial goal was to complete this study at five-year intervals. A record of documents posted on the UTK Faculty Senate website, as well as major findings, including several charts are summarized below. While this report is intended to stand alone with no specific recommendations, it may be cited as the basis for future Faculty Senate resolutions. We also hope this report will inform budgetary and planning priorities for the university.

PRIOR UTK FACULTY SENATE REPORTS, FACT SHEETS AND RESOLUTIONS

2010-11 Wage Study:

<http://senate.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/16/2011/08/2010-2011-Living-Wage-Study.pdf>

2005 Living Wage Study:

<http://web.utk.edu/~senate/wagestudy2005.shtml>

2000 Living Wage Fact Sheet:

<http://web.utk.edu/%7Esenate/LivingWageFactSheet.html>

March 2001 Resolution on the Living Wage:

<http://web.utk.edu/%7Esenate/ResLivingWage.html>

2000 Wage Study:

<http://web.utk.edu/~senate/docs/topical/2000WageStudy.pdf>

A Living Wage Fact Sheet, which explains how the living wage of \$9.50/hour was determined for the first Living Wage Study in 2000:

<http://web.utk.edu/%7Esenate/LivingWageFAQ.html>

WEB RESOURCES THAT INFORM THIS STUDY

2017 U.S. Federal Poverty Guidelines

<https://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty-guidelines>

American Institute for Economic Research – Cost of Living Calculator

<https://www.aier.org/cost-living-calculator>

DEFINING A LIVING WAGE

While there is no universal living wage standard, and concepts of a living wage vary in different studies, it is important to understand how the living wage standard was set at \$9.50/hour plus benefits for Knoxville in the original 2000-2001 study. The following passage is from the 2005 wage study:

The fundamental idea behind a living wage is that an employee who works full time and year round should earn a wage sufficient to pay for the basic, bare-bones needs of a family living in today's America, without having to resort to needs-tested public benefits, crime, or private charity. Living wage standards are developed first by specifying basic necessities for different family types, pricing those needs in actual local markets, and compiling the costs into a range of family budgets. The next steps are to choose a family type deemed a reasonable standard around which to construct a common measure for the locality or institution in question, and then to figure the hourly or annual compensation that would be required to support the necessities budget of that family type in that place. As explained by the Economic Policy Institute: The ability of families to meet their most basic needs is an important measure of economic stability and well-being. While poverty thresholds are used to evaluate the extent of serious economic deprivation in our society, family budgets -- that is, the income a family needs to secure safe and decent-yet-modest living standards in the community in which it resides -- offer a broader measure of economic welfare.

Basic family budget measurements are adjustable by family type because expenses vary considerably depending on the number of children in a family and whether or not a single parent or a married couple heads a family.

It is important to note that a basic family budget is indeed "basic." It comprises only the amounts a family needs to spend to feed, shelter, and clothe itself, get to work and school, and subsist in 21st century America. Hence, it includes no savings, no restaurant meals, no funds for emergencies—not even renters' insurance to protect against fire, flood or theft.

Additionally, to help understand how the original wage rate of \$9.50/hour plus benefits was calculated, footnote 4 (pages 16-17) from the 2000 living wage report states:

The amount of a living wage is determined by each local living wage campaign, taking the local cost of living into account. In 1998, the Knoxville Living Wage Campaign advocated a starting wage of \$9.50 per hour plus benefits for City of Knoxville employees. The UTK Council for a Living Wage and Worker Justice was formed in 1999 and also defines a living wage as \$9.50 per hour plus benefits. The local campaigns used a combination of two methods in determining that amount. (1) More than 40 open meetings were held in which workers and other members of the Knoxville community participated. They constructed and discussed monthly budgets in an effort to reach consensus on the minimum income necessary to support a family of four in Knoxville. These meetings set \$9.50 per hour plus benefits as that minimum amount. Many variables were considered in their deliberations, such as assuming two income providers in the household rather than one. However, child care costs and other factors would have necessitated a substantially higher living wage. Participants also expressed concern about the destructive consequences for quality of family life when wages are so low that both parents must work (often at more than one job) to provide a living income.

MARKETS AND WAGES

Concurrent with this study, UT has initiated a system-wide project to look at the position classification system and conduct a market competitiveness assessment. Currently there are 25 job families with 789 job titles. One of the goals of this project is to establish more clearly defined job titles based on clearer descriptions of their duties. This new position classification is anticipated to be implemented by early 2019. For the purposes of this study, and for continuity with prior studies, we used the current (soon to be replaced) job classification system. Any new position classification system will impact future iterations of this study.

As was noted in the 2010-11 study: *While market data can be useful for higher paying faculty and staff positions, many argue that the bottom end of the employment scale has a different dynamic, one in which the market forces do not always operate in*

the best interests of our communities, the region and the state. They also observe that due to its size, UTK itself plays a substantial role in shaping local labor markets and setting local wages, a fact that raises real questions about the use of market studies in this context.

TARGET WAGE(S) FOR 2017-2018

- COLA adjusted: \$13.48/hour plus benefits (\$28,038.40 annually)
- 133% of Federal Poverty Standard: \$15.73/hour plus benefits (\$32,718.00 annually)

Given the longstanding critique of methods of calculating the Federal Poverty line, in this 2017-2018 study we not only apply COLA calculations to the hourly rate of \$9.50/hour in 2000, but also included calculations based on 133% of the current Federal Poverty Standard for a family of four. We chose this additional metric because the university awards students with this level of family income the maximum amount for need-based Pell Grants.

Using a cost of living (COLA) calculator, \$9.50/hour plus benefits in 2000 translates \$13.48/hour plus benefits into 2017, an annual salary (40 hours/week, plus benefits) of \$28,038.40. 133% of the 2017 Federal Poverty Standard for a family of four in 2017 is \$15.73/hour plus benefits, an annual salary (40 hours/week, plus benefits) of \$32,718.00. Chart 1 reflects these two new target rates of pay.

As a point of comparison, the [MIT Model](#) has a living wage calculator calibrated by county which calculates a living wage at \$23.05 and hour for a family of four with one wage earner [for Knox County](#).

REASONS WHY AN UPDATED LIVING WAGE STUDY IS NEEDED

- 1) The 2010-11 study showed that the university had made significant progress in lowering the number of full-time workers who made below the living wage target of \$12.02/hour. At the time the study was presented, the Faculty Senate publically commended the university for this progress and encouraged continued attention to this issue.
- 2) Since the 2010-11 study, in response to the desire to improve the quality of services, as well as the impact of the prior studies, the university terminated contracts to outsource custodial workers, bringing them back onto the state payroll with its associated health insurance and retirement benefits. While this represents progress for full time workers on campus, this study provided us an opportunity to assess the impact of this growth in the lowest job classifications, as well as longevity data associated with these positions.

- 3) The university was recently in the process of considering outsourcing all, or major portions of facility workers. Now that a decision has been made not to pursue this, it is a good time to assess our compensation for these employees.

TABLES ACCOMPANING THIS REPORT

Table 1: 2017 Annual Poverty Guidelines

Tables 1 and 2 show the 2017 Federal Poverty Guidelines, listing annual and monthly compensation. 133% of the 2017 Federal Poverty Standard for a family of four in 2017 is \$15.73/hour plus benefits, an annual salary (40 hours/week, plus benefits) of \$32,718.00. We chose to add this second benchmark because 133% of the Federal Poverty Standard is what is used by the university to determine need-based Pell Grant eligibility for our students.

PERCENT OF POVERTY – ANNUAL SALARIES									
FAMILY SIZE	100%	120%	133%	135%	150%	175%	185%	200%	250%
1	12,060.00	14,472.00	16,039.80	16,281.00	18,090.00	21,105.00	22,311.00	24,120.00	30,150.00
2	16,240.00	19,488.00	21,599.20	21,924.00	24,360.00	28,420.00	30,044.00	32,480.00	40,600.00
3	20,420.00	24,504.00	27,158.60	27,567.00	30,630.00	35,735.00	37,777.00	40,840.00	51,050.00
4	24,600.00	29,520.00	32,718.00	33,210.00	36,900.00	43,050.00	45,510.00	49,200.00	61,500.00
5	28,780.00	34,536.00	38,277.40	38,853.00	43,170.00	50,365.00	53,243.00	57,560.00	71,950.00
6	32,960.00	39,552.00	43,836.80	44,496.00	49,440.00	57,680.00	60,976.00	65,920.00	82,400.00
7	37,140.00	44,568.00	49,396.20	50,139.00	55,710.00	64,995.00	68,709.00	74,280.00	92,850.00
8	41,320.00	49,584.00	54,955.60	55,782.00	61,980.00	72,310.00	76,442.00	82,640.00	103,300.00

For families/households with more than 8 members, add \$4,180 for each person

Table 2: 2017 Monthly Poverty Guidelines

PERCENT OF POVERTY – MONTHLY SALARIES									
FAMILY SIZE	100%	120%	133%	135%	150%	175%	185%	200%	250%
1	1,005.00	1,206.00	1,336.65	1,356.75	1,507.50	1,758.75	1,859.25	2,010.00	2,512.50
2	1,353.33	1,624.00	1,799.93	1,827.00	2,029.99	2,368.33	2,503.66	2,706.66	3,383.32
3	1,701.67	2,042.00	2,263.22	2,297.25	2,552.51	2,977.92	3,148.09	3,403.34	4,254.18
4	2,050.00	2,460.00	2,726.50	2,767.50	3,075.00	3,587.50	3,792.50	4,100.00	5,125.00
5	2,398.33	2,878.00	3,189.78	3,237.75	3,597.49	4,197.08	4,436.91	4,796.66	5,995.82
6	2,746.67	3,296.00	3,653.07	3,708.00	4,120.01	4,806.67	5,081.34	5,493.34	6,866.68
7	3,095.00	3,714.00	4,116.35	4,178.25	4,642.50	5,416.25	5,725.75	6,190.00	7,737.50
8	3,443.33	4,132.00	4,579.63	4,648.50	5,164.99	6,025.83	6,370.16	6,886.66	8,608.33

Table 3. Total Number of Employees by Pay Grades 30-38 (longevity included)

Currently the university has 455 full-time employees who make below the target living wage of \$13.48/hour plus benefits (with longevity), and 770 employees falling below the higher goal of \$15.73/hour plus benefits (with longevity) based on 133% of the Federal Poverty Standard. As some of these employees may receive overtime pay, total compensation for some is higher. As a point of comparison, in 2010-11 we had 1,141 full-time employees who fell below our target wage of \$12.08/ hour plus benefits, and in 2005 we had 1,468 full-time employees who fell below our target wage of \$10.73/hour plus benefits. This table shows that we have made significant progress since the prior study in 2010-11, and represents a lower number of employees than we anticipated since the ranks of lower paid state workers grew as we insourcing most of our custodial workers since the previous study.

Pay Grade	Total # of Employees	# of Employees Below \$13.48	Mean Years of Service	Median of Years of Service	# of Employees Below \$15.73	Mean Years of Service	Median of Years of Service
30	250	223	4.0	4.0	244	5.1	4.0
31	67	50	7.4	6.0	57	9.5	7.0

32	67	32	5.1	4.5	61	9.9	7.0
33	76	18	7.3	5.0	51	7.6	5.0
34	198	72	2.3	2.0	126	4.4	2.0
35	340	37	3.9	2.0	130	5.3	4.0
36	301	23	2.5	2.0	68	4.5	4.0
37	244				23	2.9	2.0
38	251				10	1.3	2.5
Total		455			770		

Table 4: Regular, Full Time Active Employees by Grade Level

This table provides information on the number of workers in pay grades 30-37, as well as the gender make-up of each job classification.

Pay Grade	Females	Males	Total Employees	Pay Grade Hourly Min	Pay Grade Monthly Min	Pay Grade Annual Min	Average Hourly Rate	Average Monthly Rate	Average Annual Rate
30	124	126	250	\$9.50	\$1,646.67	\$19,760.00	\$11.08	\$1,920.10	\$23,041.18
31	15	52	67	\$9.75	\$1,690.00	\$20,280.00	\$11.92	\$2,065.89	\$24,790.73
32	29	38	67	\$10.00	\$1,733.33	\$20,800.00	\$12.80	\$2,218.47	\$26,621.61
33	45	31	76	\$10.30	\$1,785.33	\$21,424.00	\$14.36	\$2,489.18	\$29,870.18
34	112	86	198	\$10.75	\$1,863.33	\$22,360.00	\$14.36	\$2,489.24	\$29,870.90
35	208	132	340	\$11.52	\$1,996.80	\$23,961.60	\$16.29	\$2,823.76	\$33,885.12
36	162	139	301	\$12.41	\$2,151.07	\$25,812.80	\$17.54	\$3,039.45	\$36,473.44
37-NE	137	100	237	\$13.37	\$2,317.47	\$27,809.60	\$19.98	\$3,462.59	\$41,551.05
37-Ex	7	0	7	\$13.37	\$2,317.47	\$27,809.60	\$16.58	\$2,874.37	\$34,492.43
38-NE	89	69	158	\$14.40	\$2,496.00	\$29,952.00	\$21.22	\$3,677.35	\$44,128.21
38-Ex	53	40	93	\$14.40	\$2,496.00	\$29,952.00	\$21.19	\$3,673.80	\$44,085.56
39-NE	33	74	107	\$15.51	\$2,688.40	\$32,260.80	\$22.96	\$3,979.41	\$47,752.95
39-Ex	98	50	148	\$15.51	\$2,688.40	\$32,260.80	\$23.05	\$3,994.61	\$47,935.36
40-NE	9	4	13	\$16.70	\$2,894.67	\$34,736.00	\$24.25	\$4,202.69	\$50,432.31

40-Ex	159	99	258	\$16.70	\$2,894.67	\$34,736.00	\$24.82	\$4,302.72	\$51,632.61
41	100	80	180	\$17.99	\$3,118.27	\$37,419.20	\$27.19	\$4,712.34	\$56,548.11
42	127	131	258	\$19.39	\$3,360.93	\$40,331.20	\$31.68	\$5,491.16	\$65,893.96
43	78	64	142	\$20.90	\$3,622.67	\$43,472.00	\$35.48	\$6,149.14	\$73,789.72
44	70	77	147	\$22.52	\$3,903.47	\$46,841.60	\$45.70	\$7,920.96	\$95,051.49
45	34	55	89	\$24.26	\$4,205.07	\$50,460.80	\$46.01	\$7,974.27	\$95,691.29
46	27	42	69	\$26.14	\$4,530.93	\$54,371.20	\$61.37	\$10,637.50	\$127,650.01
47	13	27	40	\$28.18	\$4,884.53	\$58,614.40	\$65.17	\$11,296.52	\$135,558.18
48	11	24	35	\$30.35	\$5,260.67	\$63,128.00	\$69.22	\$11,998.32	\$143,979.83
49	2	3	5	\$32.72	\$5,671.47	\$68,057.60	\$92.22	\$15,984.22	\$191,810.60
50	1	2	3	\$35.24	\$6,108.27	\$73,299.20	\$91.22	\$15,811.53	\$189,738.33
51	0	0	0	\$37.98	\$6,583.20	\$78,998.40			
52	4	7	11	\$40.91	\$7,091.07	\$85,092.80	\$135.57	\$23,498.71	\$281,984.55
53	0	0	0	\$44.10	\$7,644.00	\$91,728.00			

Table 5: Cost of Employee Benefits

One important issue to consider as part of employee compensation is the cost of benefits. We include this table because we live in an economy where health insurance is typically provided by employers, and doing so as a public-sector employer is consistent with our public mission, and helps to ensure we have a stable, dedicated work force. This table also provides a context for considering the real costs to providing these benefits.

Pay Grade	Minimum Salary	Annual Leave	Holidays	Retirement	Health Insurance		Social Security	401(k) Match	Total Benefits (8)	% of Min Benefits	Total Salary (10)
30	9.50	0.44	0.48	1.79	3.48	Emp Only	0.73	0.29	7.20	0.76	16.70
30	9.50	0.44	0.48	1.79	5.20	Emp+Child	0.73	0.29	8.93	0.94	18.43
30	9.50	0.44	0.48	1.79	7.28	Emp+Spouse	0.73	0.29	11.00	1.16	20.50
30	9.50	0.44	0.48	1.79	9.01	Emp+Spouse+Child	0.73	0.29	12.73	1.34	22.23
31	9.75	0.45	0.49	1.84	3.48	Emp Only	0.75	0.29	7.29	0.75	17.04

31	9.75	0.45	0.49	1.84	5.20	Emp+Child	0.75	0.29	9.02	0.92	18.77
31	9.75	0.45	0.49	1.84	7.28	Emp+Spouse	0.75	0.29	11.09	1.14	20.84
31	9.75	0.45	0.49	1.84	9.01	Emp+Spouse+Child	0.75	0.29	12.82	1.31	22.57
32	10.00	0.46	0.50	1.89	3.48	Emp Only	0.77	0.29	7.38	0.74	17.38
32	10.00	0.46	0.50	1.89	5.20	Emp+Child	0.77	0.29	9.11	0.91	19.11
32	10.00	0.46	0.50	1.89	7.28	Emp+Spouse	0.77	0.29	11.18	1.12	21.18
32	10.00	0.46	0.50	1.89	9.01	Emp+Spouse+Child	0.77	0.29	12.91	1.29	22.91
33	10.30	0.47	0.52	1.94	3.48	Emp Only	0.79	0.29	7.49	0.73	17.79
33	10.30	0.47	0.52	1.94	5.20	Emp+Child	0.79	0.29	9.22	0.89	19.52
33	10.30	0.47	0.52	1.94	7.28	Emp+Spouse	0.79	0.29	11.29	1.10	21.59
33	10.30	0.47	0.52	1.94	9.01	Emp+Spouse+Child	0.79	0.29	13.02	1.26	23.32
34	10.75	0.49	0.54	2.03	3.48	Emp Only	0.82	0.29	7.65	0.71	18.40
34	10.75	0.49	0.54	2.03	5.20	Emp+Child	0.82	0.29	9.38	0.87	20.13
34	10.75	0.49	0.54	2.03	7.28	Emp+Spouse	0.82	0.29	11.45	1.07	22.20
34	10.75	0.49	0.54	2.03	9.01	Emp+Spouse+Child	0.82	0.29	13.18	1.23	23.93
35	11.52	0.53	0.58	2.17	3.48	Emp Only	0.88	0.29	7.93	0.69	19.45
35	11.52	0.53	0.58	2.17	5.20	Emp+Child	0.88	0.29	9.66	0.84	21.18
35	11.52	0.53	0.58	2.17	7.28	Emp+Spouse	0.88	0.29	11.73	1.02	23.25
35	11.52	0.53	0.58	2.17	9.01	Emp+Spouse+Child	0.88	0.29	13.46	1.17	24.98
36	12.41	0.57	0.62	2.34	3.48	Emp Only	0.95	0.29	8.25	0.66	20.66
36	12.41	0.57	0.62	2.34	5.20	Emp+Child	0.95	0.29	9.98	0.80	22.39
36	12.41	0.57	0.62	2.34	7.28	Emp+Spouse	0.95	0.29	12.05	0.97	24.46
36	12.41	0.57	0.62	2.34	9.01	Emp+Spouse+Child	0.95	0.29	13.78	1.11	26.19
37	13.37	0.62	0.67	2.52	3.48	Emp Only	1.02	0.29	8.60	0.64	21.97
37	13.37	0.62	0.67	2.52	5.20	Emp+Child	1.02	0.29	10.32	0.77	23.69
37	13.37	0.62	0.67	2.52	7.28	Emp+Spouse	1.02	0.29	12.40	0.93	25.77
37	13.37	0.62	0.67	2.52	9.01	Emp+Spouse+Child	1.02	0.29	14.13	1.06	27.50
38	14.40	0.66	0.72	2.72	3.48	Emp Only	1.10	0.29	8.97	0.62	23.37
38	14.40	0.66	0.72	2.72	5.20	Emp+Child	1.10	0.29	10.70	0.74	25.10

38	14.40	0.66	0.72	2.72	7.28	Emp+Spouse	1.10	0.29	12.77	0.89	27.17
38	14.40	0.66	0.72	2.72	9.01	Emp+Spouse+Child	1.10	0.29	14.50	1.01	28.90
39	15.51	0.71	0.78	2.93	3.48	Emp Only	1.19	0.29	9.37	0.60	24.88
39	15.51	0.71	0.78	2.93	5.20	Emp+Child	1.19	0.29	11.10	0.72	26.61
39	15.51	0.71	0.78	2.93	7.28	Emp+Spouse	1.19	0.29	13.17	0.85	28.68
39	15.51	0.71	0.78	2.93	9.01	Emp+Spouse+Child	1.19	0.29	14.90	0.96	30.41
40	16.70	0.77	0.84	3.15	3.48	Emp Only	1.28	0.29	9.80	0.59	26.50
40	16.70	0.77	0.84	3.15	5.20	Emp+Child	1.28	0.29	11.53	0.69	28.23
40	16.70	0.77	0.84	3.15	7.28	Emp+Spouse	1.28	0.29	13.60	0.81	30.30
40	16.70	0.77	0.84	3.15	9.01	Emp+Spouse+Child	1.28	0.29	15.33	0.92	32.03

Tables 6 A-B: Aramark Employees

Since the first living wage study in 2000, the Faculty Senate sought to get information on the wages and benefits for workers with major outsourced contractors, specifically custodial and food service workers. Fortunately, since 2001 the university chose not to renew custodial contracts with GCA Services (out of Cleveland, Ohio) due to a variety of factors, including poor service levels, campus safety, theft and other factors. At no point did we receive any wage data from GCA. With the exception of the College of Veterinary Medicine, all custodial work at UTK and UTIA is currently done by state employees. Over 20 years ago the University began contracting with Aramark for food services, and state employees were grandfathered in as part of this contract. In 2011, 34 former state employees remained. Today, about five employees remain as state employees working for Aramark.

In 2011 the average rate of pay for Aramark workers was \$8.64/hour. With the exception of managers, most workers do not receive any benefits, with 252 of their 779 employees working 35 hours/week or more. In 2017 the average hourly rate for all employees is \$9.47/hour (AutoSum Average from Excel) and \$10.58/hour for those working 35 hours/week or more. Vice-Chancellor Cimino informs us that they are having trouble retaining many entry-level positions and are looking at raising their minimums.

Table 6A: Aramark Job Titles, Number of Positions, and Compensation				
Title	Employees	Minimum	Median	Maximum
Student Worker	429	\$8.15	\$10.08	\$12.00
Food Service Worker	205	\$8.24	\$11.48	\$14.71
Lead Food Service Worker	29	\$10.00	\$12.30	\$14.59

Cook	18	\$8.50	\$12.48	\$16.46
Lead Supervisor	17	\$10.25	\$12.78	\$15.30
Cashier	16	\$8.50	\$9.92	\$11.33
Gen Util Worker	15	\$8.35	\$12.24	\$16.12
Lead Cook	14	\$10.46	\$13.33	\$16.19
Lead Student Worker	13	\$9.00	\$11.00	\$13.00
Lead Cashier	11	\$9.25	\$11.10	\$12.94
Baker	5	\$9.00	\$12.00	\$15.00
Driver	3	\$10.00	\$11.50	\$13.00

**Excludes Barista (1), Catering Service Worker (2), and Grill Cook (1)*

Table 6B: Part-Time and Full-Time Aramark Employees	
Hours	Number of Aramark Employees
40	200
37	1
36	1
35	50
32	1
30	45
29	1
25	10
20	462
15	8

TEMPORARY WORKERS

An area that this current study does not address is compensation for temporary workers, nearly a half of whom are employed with the Department of Athletics, which hires term employees as ushers and gate attendants. As noted in the 2010-2011 study, these numbers can change depending upon the event schedules. While our previous report did have a chart in the 2010-2011 study showing the extent of this work, this is not included in the current report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

While this report does not accompany a resolution to the Faculty Senate, a few guiding principles should be considered for the Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee in the future. These are:

- 1) The University should be commended for its progress in increasing the wages of the lowest paid workers as well as insourcing many custodial workers who were previously employed by GCA. The improved appearance and morale of the campus can be attributed to this development.
- 2) The university should recognize that despite the progress that has been made, a continued emphasis on improving compensation for the lowest paid workers should be a priority. Efforts should be made to increase the minimum hourly wage and to use minimum across the board raises for all workers as was done during some previous years.
- 3) The Faculty Senate should continue to repeat the living wage study at least every 5 years.
- 4) The university should continue to develop mechanisms to support low wage workers, possibly expanding the categories of sliding scale for employee parking tags and other methods.