

March 25, 2011

**Memorandum**

TO: Shirley C. Willihnganz  
Executive Vice President and University Provost

CC: Robert Staat, Chair, Faculty Senate  
Brent Fryrear, Chair, Staff Senate  
Human Resources Advisory Committee

FR: Sam Connally  
Vice President for Human Resources

RE: Recommendations regarding HR-related Cost Saving Strategies  
and Staff Salary Increase Guidelines for FY 2011-12 (Corrected)

Preparatory to the Executive Leadership Team budget deliberations next week, I am writing to convey final HR recommendations regarding HR-related cost saving strategies consistent with the original charge to the Human Resources Advisory Committee. Recommendations regarding staff salary increase guidelines for FY 2011-12 are also enclosed.

As always, our goal in total compensation is two-fold: (1) to promote market competitive salaries and (2) to maintain a balanced and sustainable benefit program over time that will support the University's ability to recruit, retain, recognize, and reward top quality faculty and staff. I believe the following recommendations will help achieve these dual objectives.

Costs saving strategies in tuition remission were published for constituent group review on February 9, 2011. Other HR-related cost saving strategies were published in draft budget scenarios presented to constituency groups by the Vice President for Finance throughout February. Vice Presidents and Deans were invited to convey comments directly to VPHR (for summary), while the Faculty and Staff Senates have submitted recommendations directly to you and the President, as appropriate under our shared governance model. Constituency groups were generally supportive of proposed cost saving strategies, except where noted in this discussion document.

I appreciate the opportunity for HR to be part of these discussions and for the opportunity to submit these observations and recommendations to the Executive Leadership Team for its consideration. Please advise if additional information is needed. Thank you.

**Recommendations regarding Cost Saving Strategies**

**1. Proposal to Adopt 5-Year Retirement Vesting**

Currently, UofL employees are subject to a one-year waiting period (which may be waived based on immediate preceding employment with another higher education institution), but vests immediately upon enrollment in our retirement program. This proposal would establish a five-year vesting requirement for employees hired after the effective date.

**Constituency Feedback:** Both the Faculty & Staff Senates concur.

**Observations:** Vesting requirements are common for defined contribution plans in higher education, such as UofL's retirement program. I do not believe that adopting a vesting period will have a material adverse impact on the University's ability to recruit faculty and staff, while a vesting requirement may also increase retention among staff employees with less than five years of service.

Savings will accrue over the vesting period, approximately as illustrated below:

Year 1: No projected accrued savings  
Year 2: \$250,000 per year  
Year 3: \$550,000 per year  
Year 4: \$750,000 per year  
Year 5:  $\geq$  \$1.0 million per year each year thereafter

Because tenure-track faculty serve a probationary period of six years, it is notable that the savings that will accrue from adopting a vesting period will generally derive from term faculty and staff employees who do not serve at least five years. It would be preferable to eliminate the waiting period (which is generally not a provision of retirement plans that also entail a vesting period), but the cost of eliminating the waiting period would effectively offset any savings, so is not achievable within current budget constraints.

**HR Recommendation:** I concur with the proposal to adopt a five-year vesting requirement, while maintaining the current one-year waiting period.

## **2. Proposal to Reduce Retirement Contributions for New Employees**

The University currently contributes 7.5% of base salary on a non-contributory basis and an additional 2.5% of base salary on a contributory basis up to IRS maximums. This proposal would eliminate the 2.5% match for new employees hired after the effective date.

**Constituency Feedback:** Both the Faculty and Staff Senates oppose this proposal.

**Observations:** I believe we should proceed with significant caution before we make material changes to our retirement matching program. A survey of our peer institutions documents that the average retirement matching contribution for public, research institutions with defined contribution plans is 9.0% of salary, with a range from 3.0% to 14.5%. In other words, we are within the center of the range of maintaining a market-competitive retirement program in relation to peer institutions.

Generally, retirement programs are structured on a non-discriminatory basis, and I would be very cautious about adopting a two-tiered benefit plan for the University, based on date of hire. Further, I believe our retirement matching percent is a material factor in sustaining the University's ability to recruit and retain top quality faculty and staff.

**HR Recommendation:** I recommend that we maintain current matching contributions for our retirement plan, with the commitment that HR will seek additional health plan savings to offset this item in the current draft budget scenario (as described in the following section).

Note: Vice President Curtin concurs with this recommendation, and this line item may already have been removed from the current budget scenario.

### **3. Health Benefit Plan Changes**

#### **a) Allocate Health Plan Savings to Salary Increases**

As you are aware, the University realized annual savings of approximately \$4.1 million (across all fund sources) by rebidding the health plan in 2010. Vice President Curtin has proposed and the Executive Leadership Team has approved allocating \$2.0 million in general fund savings to support salary increases for faculty and staff during FY 2011-12.

**HR Recommendation:** This represents a legitimate “re-balancing” of our total compensation equation by allocating benefit cost savings directly to support salary competitiveness, supporting the President’s 2020 scorecard goal of attaining 100% of market salaries for faculty and staff. I concur in this proposal.

#### **b) Form Prescription Drug Purchasing Coalition**

As reported previously, the University of Louisville has agreed in principal to partner with the University of Kentucky and Eastern Kentucky University to form the “Kentucky Rx Coalition” – a joint drug purchasing coalition. Preliminary estimates are that the University will save 5.0% of its total prescription drug expense for annual savings of \$500,000 - \$600,000 (across all fund sources).

**Constituency Feedback:** This proposal was not included in cost saving strategies published for comment, but was included in Faculty & Staff Senate briefings.

**HR Recommendation:** Vice President Curtin has proposed that we book \$275,000 in potential savings in the general fund for FY 2011-12. I concur in this proposal.

#### **c) Reduce Prescription Drug Network**

CVS Drug Stores (which owns Caremark prescription drug plans) and Walgreen’s Drug Stores (which owns Express Scripts prescription drug plans) are engaged in a national market share competition. During 2010, Caremark unilaterally excluded Walgreen’s from its prescription drug network. In response, Express Scripts has offered a discount on our prescription drug purchases of approximately 1.0% if we reduce our prescription drug network to exclude CVS. This would drive additional savings of approximately \$130,000 in the health plan (across all fund sources).

**Constituency Feedback:** This proposal was not included in cost saving strategies published for comment, but was included in Faculty & Staff Senate briefings.

**Observations:** Employees would retain their current Express Scripts ID cards and Express Scripts would automatically transfer all existing prescriptions from CVS to Walgreen's, presenting only minor disruption for current employees. We would also lose independent pharmacies in electing the smaller network, but retain all other major chain retailers such as Kroger, Wal-Mart, and Meijer. Employees would retain the option to transfer prescriptions to any network provider (other than Walgreen's).

**HR Recommendation:** I recommend we reduce the prescription drug network (to exclude CVS and independent pharmacies) as a mid-year change, effective July 1, 2011 to realize additional health plan savings of approximately \$130,000 per year.

#### **d) Reduce Health Plan Waiver**

The University currently contributes \$2,340 per year to a flexible spending account for each employee who declines our health insurance (which costs \$7,063 per year), "sharing" a portion of the savings when employees decline our health insurance. The health plan waiver program costs the University approx \$2.5 million per year (across all fund sources), of which \$2.0 million is budgeted, representing an annual deficit of \$500,000.

In earlier HRAC discussions, we determined that elimination of the waiver, in its entirety, would undoubtedly increase health plan costs to the university, based on the proportion of employees that would re-enroll in the health plan (at a net cost of \$4,723 per year for each employee who returns to the health plan). Long term health plan enrollment rates among comparable institutions (without a waiver program) range from 93% to 98% of benefit-eligible employees, compared to UofL's enrollment rate of 82%.

An alternative proposal has emerged to reduce the health plan waiver from \$195 to \$175 per month, representing annual savings of \$240 per participant or approximately \$360,000 per year (across all fund sources).

**Constituency Feedback:** This proposal was not included in cost saving strategies published for comment, but was included in Faculty & Staff Senate briefings.

**Observations:** I do not believe a moderate reduction in the value of the health plan waiver will trigger disproportionate re-enrollments in the health plan that would overwhelm savings. However, as a health plan design change, any reduction in the waiver amount would need to be effective January 1, 2012, concurrent with the new health plan year.

**HR Recommendation:** I concur in the proposal to reduce the health plan waiver from \$195 to \$175 per month, to be effective January 1, 2012.

#### 4. Proposal to Eliminate Retirement Health Benefits for New Employees

The University currently pays \$1,297 per year to each retiree or retiree spouse/partner toward the cost of retirement health insurance for employees who retire with seven years of service and age 60 or total service and age equal to 75. Retirement health is budgeted separately from the health plan and costs the university approximately \$1.5 million per year.

**Constituency Feedback:** The Faculty Senate voiced no specific concern; however, the Staff Senate recommends we defer action on this proposal until we have more information regarding higher education practices and cost savings potential.

**Observations:** Retirement health is an “unfunded liability” as there is no reserve account to fund future retiree health expenses. The cost of retiree health can only increase over time and place a potential strain on future operating funds of the university.

From a market perspective, retirement health does not materially contribute to the University’s ability to recruit or retain top quality faculty and staff – yet its long-standing presence among the University’s benefit package will require a thoughtful transition if this benefit is to be reduced or eliminated. To help inform a discussion of this proposal, Human Resources has commissioned a comprehensive benefits study among peer institutions from the Education Advisory Board.

**HR Recommendation:** I recommend we defer further discussion of retiree health benefits until we receive results of a benefit study among peer institutions.

Note: I understand that Vice President Curtin concurs with this recommendation and that we have booked no savings for this proposal in the FY 2011-12 budget.

#### 5. Proposed Tuition Remission Program Changes

The University currently provides tuition remission and mandatory fee waivers to regular FT faculty and staff up to six credit hours per semester and for regular PT faculty and staff up to three credit hours per semester. In addition, the University currently provides full tuition and mandatory fee waivers for the dependent children of regular FT faculty and staff. For FY 2009-10, tuition remission was budgeted at \$5.4 million (across all fund sources), but cost just over \$6.5 million, leaving a fiscal year deficit of approximately \$1.1 million. The current annual deficit competes directly with salary increase proposals for any new funding in FY 2011-12.

**Observations:** The HRAC review of the tuition remission program was the most exhaustive benefit study in some time. A number of documents were made available through **HR Items of Interest** to the University community for a public discussion of this benefit including a summary of cost saving proposals, full discussion documents, a program history of the tuition remission program from 1954 through the present, a survey of tuition remission among KY public institutions, and a survey of tuition remission or tuition assistance programs among doctoral/research peer institutions.

Most KY public and peer institutions match the University's employee benefit, providing six credits per semester. However, UofL's dependent tuition remission stands out as the most generous among KY public institutions (at 300% of the benefit value at UK for dependent children) and is highly competitive among peer institutions.

**a) Proposed Changes for Employee Tuition Remission Benefits.**

- 1) **Require Employees to Pay Student Fees.** The original Board of Trustees' tuition remission program expressly provided the program would cover tuition only and would exclude all student and course fees. This proposal would require employees to pay student fees. Estimated Savings: \$110,000.

**Constituency Feedback:** Both the Faculty & Staff Senates concur in this recommendation.

**Observations:** In recent years, the University has "bundled" certain mandatory student fees in its tuition – representing approximately \$18 per credit hour – inadvertently creating a situation where the tuition remission program has become responsible for paying both tuition and mandatory student fees, exceeding the scope of the Board of Trustees' original tuition remission program.

**HR Recommendation:** I concur in the proposal to require employees to pay student fees.

- 2) **Establish a Performance Standard.** The HRAC proposed that the University establish a performance standard equal to "C" or better (or a 2.0 semester GPA for multiple courses) to maintain continuing eligibility for tuition remission (with up to three unsuccessful attempts for 1<sup>st</sup> time college attendees).

**Constituency Feedback:** The Faculty Senate concurs; the Staff Senate recommends that we rely on the regular academic standards of the colleges as sufficient program control, without establishing a separate performance standard.

**Observations:** I understand that the regular academic standard for students to remain in "good standing" could result in an employee failing to meet proposed performance standards for up three consecutive semesters (at six credit hours per semester) before losing eligibility to participate in tuition remission – and would then require disenrollment for one semester before re-enrolling.

Two of our sister KY institutions already require a "C" or better to continue tuition remission, as do three of our peer institutions. Most critically, the academic standing standard applies most readily to degree seeking students and does not lend itself as readily to employee tuition remission (which permits lifelong learning in any subject area, with or without seeking a degree). Most private entities with tuition assistance programs and most public universities require a performance standard for open-enrollment tuition assistance programs (that do not require job relatedness and do not require the employee to be degree

seeking). Also, the academic standing standard would not effectively address withdrawals after the drop/add deadline which are an area of concern.

**HR Recommendation:** I recommend we adopt the performance standard, as proposed. Cost savings were not estimated for this proposal, but a performance standard would help ensure effective use of limited tuition remission funds, consistent with the Provost's charge to the Human Resources Advisory Committee to identify strategies to "tighten up" administration of the tuition remission program.

- 3) **Require Employees to Pay Graduate School Surcharges.** Selected graduate programs include a tuition surcharge, including Urban & Public Administration (\$900/semester), the Professional MBA program (\$595/semester), and Law (\$3,228/semester). Medicine and Dentistry also charge substantial tuition surcharges, but are not open to part-time students. This proposal would establish a cap on employee tuition remission at the regular graduate tuition rate, and would require employees to pay graduate program surcharges. Estimated savings: \$10,000 - \$15,000.

**Constituency Feedback:** The Faculty Senate voiced no objections; while the Staff Senate recommends that we maintain equal access to all degree programs for employees. The Dean of Law observed, "These savings will come almost entirely at the expense of non-faculty employees working in professional school units (where their interests most likely lie). This move would destroy much of the individual tuition benefit for those employees."

**Observations:** The HRAC endorsed an approach to equity that the tuition remission rate for graduate studies be the same across all disciplines (independent of degree program) by requiring employees to pay any graduate program surcharges. The Staff Senate has approached the question of equity from a different perspective, emphasizing that all degree programs that permit part-time enrollment should be equally available to employees, regardless of the degree program selected and without requiring employees to pay graduate program surcharges.

**HR Recommendation:** I recommend we accept the Staff Senate's recommendation to continue to provide full tuition remission for all graduate programs.

#### **b) Proposed Changes for Dependent Tuition Remission Benefits**

- 1) **Clarify Definition of Eligible Child.** This proposal would include a definition of eligible children to include biological, adopted, and step children and legal wards up to the age of 26 and would provide that Human Resources will audit 100% of dependent eligibility upon the dependent's 1<sup>st</sup> semester of enrollment.

**Constituency Feedback:** The Faculty and Staff Senates both concur in this recommendation, but the Staff Senate recommends this change “exclude any current tuition remission dependents.”

University Counsel notes that legal guardianships end at age 18 in Kentucky (unless the child is disabled) and Audit Services voices caution with respect to adding legal wards, noting this will complicate program administration and could lead to program abuse.

**Observations:** The definition of dependent children (biological, adopted, or step children) has been in effect since 2005 and should not require any grandfather provisions – particularly in light of the fact that IRS guidelines define dependent children as being under the age of 24. Current policy provides that children are eligible provided the employee claims the child as a dependent for tax purposes or provides more than 50% of the child’s support. While IRS dependency for tax purposes remains age 24, the age 26 threshold is equivalent to the recently adopted eligibility guidelines for health insurance. It is notable that the University’s current six year graduation rate (representing ages 18-24 for traditional college students) is less than 50%. Consequently, affording dependent children an opportunity to pursue their undergraduate degrees up to age 26 (encompassing eight years for degree completion for traditional college students) would support the University’s goal promote the 55,000 degree initiative.

With respect to inclusion of “legal wards,” the intention is to include children for whom the employee is (or was during the child’s age of minority) the primary caregiver for and responsible for the financial support of a child who has resided with the employee for more than one year (as defined in KRS 403.270) and where such custodial responsibilities have been recognized by a court of competent jurisdiction – who are deemed by the HRAC to be equivalent to “step children” who are included in current policy. With respect to auditing dependent eligibility, it would appear reasonable to require employees to provide a copy of court-approved guardianship documents – just as we might require copies of employee income tax returns or other written certification of financial support. I do not believe adding legal wards will unduly complicate program administration.

**HR Recommendation:** I concur in the proposal to add legal wards (or appropriate equivalent language, as advised by University Counsel) to the existing definition of children and recognize eligibility through the end of the semester in which the child attains the age of 26.

- 2) **Re-establish 12-month Waiting Period.** The University’s original tuition remission program required a 12-month waiting period for dependent children to become eligible. This proposal would re-establish this limit.

**Constituency Feedback:** Both the Faculty Senate and Staff Senate concur.

**Observations:** No savings are estimated for this change, but it will promote a more sustainable benefit.

**HR Recommendation:** I concur in the proposal to re-establish a 12-month waiting period for dependent children eligibility.

- 3) **Establish a Service Requirement for Continuing Dependent Eligibility.** The University continues to provide tuition remission for the children of employees who die in active service, become permanently disabled, or retire. Retirement requires seven years of continuous service, but there is no service requirement for death or disability. This proposal would require employees to have seven years of continuous service to “vest” in the continuing dependent eligibility (equivalent to the years of service required to establish retirement eligibility).

**Constituency Feedback:** The Faculty Senate concurs; the Staff Senate concurs with a recommendation that the vesting period be five years (instead of seven years), equivalent to the proposed vesting period for retirement contributions.

**Observations:** There would obviously be a moderate (but entirely random) difference in cost savings potential over time for five or seven year vesting; however, the Staff Senate focus on five years to vest in tuition eligibility would be consistent with traditional vesting concepts for retirement (i.e., the employee vests in university retirement matching contributions, even if the employee has not met the age & service requirements to establish retirement eligibility).

**HR Recommendation:** I concur with the Staff Senate recommendation to adopt a service requirement of five years for continuing dependent eligibility for employees who die in active service or become permanently disabled (equivalent to the five-year vesting requirement proposed for the retirement program).

- 4) **Require Dependents to Pay Student Fees.** As previously discussed for employees, this proposal would require dependents to pay student fees of approximately \$18 per credit hour. Estimated savings: \$220,000.

**Constituency Feedback:** Both the Faculty & Staff Senates concur.

**HR Recommendation:** I concur in the proposal to require dependent children to pay student fees.

- 5) **Establish Credit Hour Limit.** The current dependent tuition remission program subsidizes the 1<sup>st</sup> undergraduate degree with no limits on number of years or total credit hours before the first degree. This proposal would establish a total credit hour limit at 140 hours attempted. Estimated savings: \$86,000 - \$129,000.

**Constituency Feedback:** The Faculty Senate concurs; while the Staff Senate concurs in establishing a total credit hour limit, but recommends the limit be set equal to the “average number of credit hours” that current undergraduate students actually take to graduate (instead of 140 credit hours). The Staff Senate also recommends that any credit hour limit apply to newly enrolled dependents only (so as not to undercut current students).

**Observations:** The alternative recommendation to set a credit hour limit based on “average number of credit hours” taken by current undergraduate students (if this is materially greater than 140 hours) seems a reasonable proposal. Since the Staff Senate discussion, the Office of Institutional Research has documented that, over the past three years, the weighted average number of credit hours to graduate for individuals participating in the tuition remission program is 139.1 credit hours – so, the proposed credit hour limit of 140 hours appears adequate.

**HR Recommendation:** I concur with the proposal to a establish credit hour limit of 140 hours chargeable to the tuition remission program for undergraduate degree completion (including transfer credits).

With respect to the Staff Senate proposal to exempt currently enrolled students from a credit hour limit, it would appear sufficient to defer enforcing the limit for one year from the date of adoption to allow a reasonable transition for currently enrolled students to complete degrees in progress, making this change effective July 1, 2012. I do not recommend we waive this requirement altogether.

- 6) **Require Dependents to Pay Distance Ed Surcharge.** Current tuition remission pays 100% of cost for both on-campus and distance education courses; however, distance ed courses include a 30% surcharge. This proposal would require dependents to pay the distance ed surcharge, limiting tuition remission to the regular undergraduate tuition rate. Estimated savings: \$130,000.

**Constituency Feedback:** The Faculty Senate concurs. The Staff Senate does not support this recommendation, offering the rationale that, while dependents should be required to pay “student fees” (as discussed above), the distance education surcharge is “still solely a tuition charge.”

**Observations:** The original Board of Trustees’ tuition remission program was explicit in excluding all student and course-related fees, providing for the remission of tuition only. Whether billed as tuition or segregated as a “course fee,” the distance education surcharge is clearly a separate fee for the convenience of taking a course on-line, over and above the tuition for the same course offered on campus.

Since the Staff Senate discussion, the Provost has reported that a 10-year review of the University’s distance education tuition policy has recently been completed. The resulting proposal would permanently “de-couple” the distance education surcharge from the regular on-campus tuition rate beginning Fall 2011.

Under the current proposal, distance education fees would be billed separately as course fees beginning FY 2011-12, would no longer be a flat 30% surcharge, would be reviewed annually by the Tuition & Fees Committee, and would be approved by the Board of Trustees. It is also notable that distance education courses currently comprise only 5.0% of total courses at UofL, so the impact of this decision on dependents would be moderate.

**HR Recommendation:** I recommend we require dependents to pay any distance education surcharge (whether billed as tuition or billed as a course fee).

Note: It is intentional that there is no corresponding proposal to require employees to pay distance education fees for on-line courses. In refraining from offering such a proposal, the HRAC expressly recognized that there is a mutual employee-institution interest in preserving unrestricted access to on-line courses for employees, which permits employees to take courses with minimal disruption to the work environment that would otherwise result from travel time or work-day scheduling requirements to attend on-campus courses.

### **Recommendations regarding Staff Salary Increase Guidelines**

Salary increases in recent years have been one-time payments or fixed dollar amount increases to base salary. The last percent of salary increase pool was 2007, followed by three one-time payments or flat dollar amount salary adjustments, as illustrated below:

2007	4.0% Salary Increase Pool (2.5% Across-the-Board + 1.5% Merit)
2008	\$ 700 one-time payment
2009	\$ 700 base salary adjustment
2010	\$1,200 one-time payment

#### **1. Include Regular Part-Time Faculty & Staff**

During “normal” years, when salary increases are processed as a percent of salary, regular part-time faculty and staff have been included in salary increase calculations. Beginning in 2008 with the \$700 salary payment, regular part-time employees have not been included. Rather, one-time payments or flat amount salary adjustments applied only to regular full-time employees (at .80 FTE or greater). In 2010, regular part-time staff voiced their frustration that part-time employees were being “overlooked.”

While the budget schedule in 2010 did not permit reconsidering this issue after preliminary Trustee approval of the University budget, in one personal email response to a staff employee, the President affirmed that regular part-time faculty and staff would be considered, as appropriate, in future salary increase discussions. Current salary increase budget estimates include regular part-time faculty and staff.

**Observations:** Regular part-time faculty and staff comprise a small, but important part of our regular workforce and should be included in all regular salary increase programs on a proportional basis.

**HR Recommendation:** I support the inclusion of regular part-time faculty and staff in all regular compensation programs, including base salary adjustments or one-time payments.

## 2. FY 2011 – 12 Salary Increase Guidelines for Staff Employees

Note: This section applies only to staff employee increases and does not apply to salary increase guidelines for Board-appointed administrators or faculty.

Generally, with the restoration of a percent of salary increase pool for FY 2011-12, the University would return to processing staff salary increases on the basis of cost-of-living (with some across-the-board component) and performance (with a merit component for very good or outstanding performance).

**Constituency Feedback:** Substantial employee concern has been voiced that the routine administration of a 3.0% salary increase pool would leave many employees with less take home salary this year, compared to last year with the \$1,200 one-time salary payment. To avoid this outcome, the Staff Senate has recommended that staff salary funds be awarded in a flat dollar amount during FY 2011-12, with a return to regular cost-of-living and merit increase funding in FY 2012-13.

**Observations:** For illustration, 3.0% of the average classified staff salary would be \$930 per year, while 3.0% of the average professional and administrative staff salary would be \$1,710. If a 3.0% salary pool is allocated on a flat dollar amount, the resulting across-the-board increase would be \$1,224.42 per full-time employee (which would then be prorated by FTE to determine individual increases for regular part-time employees).

In the past few years, staff employees have also voiced a lack of confidence in the University's performance management program, and the President has charged the VPHR with reviewing and updating our performance management program during FY 2011-12, consistent with employee and supervisory input and consistent with best practices in higher education. The implementation of a new performance evaluation program would best position the University to return to a performance standard for future staff salary increases.

**HR Recommendation:** I support the Staff Senate recommendation that staff salary increases for FY 2011-12 be processed as a flat dollar amount (based on the final salary percentage pool), with a return to regular cost-of-living and performance increases for FY 2012-13, following a review of the University's performance management program.

Note: The observations and recommendations included in this discussion document represent the professional judgments and opinions of the Vice President for Human Resources only and do not represent the collective views of the Human Resources Advisory Committee or the constituency groups referenced. Please direct questions or comments to Sam Connally, Vice President for Human Resources, at [sam.connally@louisville.edu](mailto:sam.connally@louisville.edu) or 502-852-3698.