

Annual Meeting Report to the Council of Faculties and Council of Deans
AACP Task Force on Faculty Workforce
July 2008

Charge 1: Develop models of compensation packages (salary, benefits, practice plans, research plans, and consultation revenue) to be utilized by schools and colleges of pharmacy to enhance recruitment and retention of faculty members.

Subcommittee: Lamar Pritchard (Chair), Ray Love, Mehdi Boroujerdi, Raylene Rospond

Background

Investigation into salaries provided by respective AACP members to their faculty candidates posed to be too difficult to obtain and present in the current competitive environment. The focus for this year's work was on benefits and other incentive plans. Previous work has been done to collect information on practice plans and the membership is reviewed to this previous report.

Benefits

The College and University Work Family Association
<http://www.cuwfa.org/mc/page.do?sitePageld=23390&orgld=cuwfa>)
and the COACHE data discussed later in this report were used to identify areas of importance. Topics important to Colleges/Schools of Pharmacy and Higher Education in general include:

- Tenure stop-clock policies
- Shared appointments
- Flex-time policies
- Paternity leave
- Adoption benefits and leave
- Lactation rooms on campus post-partum
- Backup/Emergency Childcare assistance
- Community Service policy
- Eldercare assistance/referral benefits
- Dependent care subsidy for required travel
- Snowday/break childcare options

The National Science Foundation's ADVANCE Program was designed to increase the participation of advancement of women in academic science and engineering careers. Institutional Transformation Awardee Websites (<http://www.nsf.gov/crssprgm/advance/itwebsites.jsp>) provide a valuable resource for policies and procedures designed to enhance the recruitment and retention of faculty.

Institutional Transformation Awardees with Pharmacy Programs include University of Arizona, University of Illinois, Chicago, University of Michigan, University of Montana, New Mexico State University, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, University of Rhode Island, University of Washington, University of Wisconsin

Example Policies and Procedures

University of Michigan. Gender in Science and Engineering. **Report of the Subcommittee on Family Friendly Policies and Faculty Tracks.** March 2004
http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance/publications_and_reports

University of Montana. **Faculty Worklife Policy**
http://www.umt.edu/Policies/academic/work_life.htm

Work & Life. Synopsis of policies from awardee institution in categories such as Active and modified duties, dual career, establish Work & Life Office, Family Care, General Resources, Issues, Resource Offices, Stop the clock.
<http://research.cs.vt.edu/advance/WorkLife.htm>

Example Incentive Plans

SOP Faculty Incentive Plan”, University of Maryland. July 2006.
<http://www2.pharmacy.umaryland.edu/administration/pdfs/facultyincentiveplan.pdf>

Eligible participants include full-time faculty with a tenure or tenured-track appointment. Others must request permission to be considered eligible for the plan. Faculty may receive incentive once they have reached 5% of their base salary. Salary support can exceed 55% of base salary, but incentive cannot exceed 35% of 55% base salary. Incentive is not a part of cost of living or merit increases. Incentives are paid bi-weekly.

“Faculty Incentive Plan.” School of Pharmacy: Operating Policy and Procedure. Texas Tech University. 2 May 2003. <http://www.ttuhscc.edu/sop>

Plan provides rewards in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Faculty who receive extramural funding that replaces state appropriated salaries may elect to use 25% of the grant savings to support their research programs or be paid a special salary augmentation. A portion may go to their research programs and the remainder to augment their salary. Various incentives are given to faculty for teacher of the year awards and effective instruction. Faculty in practice settings can be paid a salary augmentation of 10% of the contribution margin, based on a combination of team efforts and individual performance by the faculty.

“Health Sciences Compensation Plan.” School of Medicine and School of Pharmacy: Implementation Procedures. University of California, San Diego. 29 January 2002. <http://pharmacy.ucsd.edu/>

Eligible faculty includes those who spend 50% or more of their time in the School of Medicine or Pharmacy. The plan addressed additional compensation such as that from royalties, honoraria, stipends, or other outside professional activities. Awards are in addition to base salaries. Elaborate plan with many subsections.

“Statement of Policy and Rules Relating to Patents” Drake University. 2008 <http://www.drake.edu/academics/policies/policies.php>

Outlines general rule regarding ownership of patents and rights to royalty income. Provides the faculty member with full rights unless the University’s contribution is considered significant.

Recommendations

1.

Charge 2: Develop models of alternative faculty appointments to be utilized by schools and colleges of pharmacy to enhance recruitment and retention of faculty members.

Subcommittee: Jeanne Van Tyle (Co-Chair), Kathy Knapp (Co-Chair), Bobbie Bryant, Dan Brazeau, Martin Farias, Jim Kehrer

Background

The ability to gather accurate data on current models of alternative faculty appointments was hindered by barriers representing lack of sufficient knowledge or detail. Committee members were asked to obtain information from their College/School/University. In place of accurate example models, the committee identified publications or resources that are available on-line for reference. Since the success of alternative appointments are often tied to promotion and tenure policies, additional information on alternative approaches to promotion and tenure were identified.

Example Policies

Butler University Job Share Arrangement – APPENDIX I

Butler University Flextime Policy for Staff Employees 06-07 – APPENDIX II

Butler University Flextime Schedule Request – APPENDIX III

Butler University Family-Friendly Benefits; Gender Equity Commission September 2006 – APPENDIX IV

Resources

An Agenda for Excellence: Creating Flexibility in Tenure-Track Faculty Careers. American Council on Education. Office of Women in Higher Education.

http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgramsServices/CEL/SloanAwards/Creating_Options_2.htm

ACE and a panel of presidents and chancellors from across the United States outline an ambitious agenda to reform and enhance the academic career path for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Creating Options: Models for Flexible Faculty Career Pathways.

http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgramsServices/CEL/SloanAwards/Creating_Options_Mo.htm

COACHE – the collaborative on academic careers in higher education.

<http://gseacademic.harvard.edu/~coache/reports/20070801.html>

The 2007 survey report highlights indicate that junior faculty place a high degree of importance on institutional policies and practices in terms of how they affect career success. The report provides results from 80 four-year institutions on the following areas: clarity and reasonableness of tenure process, workload and support for teaching and research, importance and effectiveness of common policies and practices, climate, culture and collegiality on campus, and global satisfaction.

Bond JT, Thompson C, Galinsky E, and Protas D. Highlights of the National Study of the Changing Workforce. Work-Life Supports on the Job. Families and Work institute 2002. No. 3 <http://familiesandwork.org/site/research/summary/main.html>

Benjamin E. Reappraisal and Implications for Policy and Research. New Directions for Higher Education 2003; 123: 79-112.

Cross JG, Goldenberg EN. How Does University Decision Making Shape the Faculty? New Directions for Higher Education 2003; 123: 49-59.

Thompson K. Contingent Faculty and Student Learning: Welcome to the Strativersity. New Directions for Higher Education 2003: 41-47. Outlines contingent faculty (part-time and nontenure track) issues from the perspective of an adjunct/part-time faculty.

Clark RL, d'Ambrosio MB. Recruitment, Retention, and Retirement: Compensation and Employment Policies for Higher Education. Educational Gerontology: 2005; 31: 385-403. This paper examines existing human resource policies and considers potential modifications that will enable institutions to recruit, retain, and retire faculty in the coming years.

Charge 3: Complete a roles analysis of schools and colleges of pharmacy with and without graduate programs and how partnerships can be developed among these.

Subcommittee: Robin Zavod (Chair), Juliana Szilagyi, Robert Riggs

Background:

What roles are schools/colleges of pharmacy playing in terms of contributing to the academic pipeline? One can envision that graduate programs, combined degree programs and academic partnerships are all mechanisms by which an institution can contribute to this pipeline, whether as a formalized program or by offering a variety of opportunities for student exposure to graduate education. A subgroup of this taskforce set out to determine what role(s) each institution plays in contributing to the academic pipeline and then looked more closely at identification of barriers, motivators and benefits to participating in academic partnerships in an attempt to determine how best to develop these partnerships in the future.

Methods #1:

An initial on-line survey was developed and approved by AACP for distribution in Fall 2006. The graduate/research liaisons for each institution were the target participants. AACP provided e-mail contact information for each liaison. In November 2006 each of the liaisons was sent an e-mail message that described the goals of the survey, provided some definitions pertinent to the survey, as well as included a direct link to the survey. The survey was posted on Survey Monkey and was made available to participants for just over 2 weeks. Both qualitative and quantitative data reports were generated by Survey Monkey.

Results from Schools/Colleges of Pharmacy with a Graduate Program:

Graduate School: Of the 100+ schools/colleges of pharmacy included in the e-mail distribution list, there were a total of 39 survey respondents (30 public, 9 private). Of these 39 institutions, 36 offered one or more graduate programs (see Table 1). For those institutions that offered graduate programs, data was solicited as it relates to how many of their PharmD students have entered graduate school in the last 5 years (by discipline). In addition, the number of graduate degrees awarded to their PharmD alumni in the last 5 years was also solicited. Unfortunately 70% of the respondents skipped these questions.

Table 1: List of Graduate Degree Programs.

Discipline	Number of Schools Reporting Current Program Availability
Pharmaceutical chemistry (pharmaceutics)	28
Pharmacology	25
Medicinal chemistry	21
Social and administrative sciences	16
Clinical sciences	7
Pharmacotherapy	2

Pharmacognosy	1
Other: (examples)	12
Public policy and outcome research	
Drug development	
Cosmetic science	
Toxicology	
Pharmaceutical and chemical sciences	
Drug regulatory affairs	
Forensic sciences	

Academic Partnerships: Fifty percent of the institutions with graduate programs indicated that they participated in one more academic partnerships (see Table 2). Of the academic partnerships reported, 87.5% existed within their own institution and 31% were partnerships with another school/college of pharmacy. A description of one of these partnerships was requested from each institution and a wide variety of responses were received. When asked what incentives were offered to PharmD students to encourage them to enter graduate programs, tuition waiver and a shorted timeline were the two most popular responses. When institutions with graduate programs were asked about developing one or more academic partnerships in the future, 60% of the respondents reported definite interest, with an additional 33% reporting that they were somewhat interested.

Table 2: List of Disciplines in which an Academic Partnership is Available

Discipline in which an Academic Partnership is Available	Percentage of Institutions that offer Partnership in this Discipline (N=16)
Pharmaceutical Chemistry (Pharmaceutics)	50%
Pharmacology	50%
Medicinal Chemistry	31%
Pharmacognosy	0%
Social and Administrative Sciences	25%
Pharmacotherapy	12%
Clinical Sciences	19%
Other	31%

Combined Degree Programs: When institutions with graduate programs were asked about the availability of one or more combined professional/graduate degree programs, 65% reported availability in a variety of degree combinations (see Table 3). Most of these combined degree programs were either within the School/College of Pharmacy or within the umbrella institution. A description of one of these combined degree programs was requested from each institution and a wide variety of responses were received. When asked what incentives were offered to PharmD students to

encourage them to enter graduate programs, tuition waiver and a shorted timeline were the two most popular responses.

Table 3: List of Combined Degree Programs that are Available

Combined Degree Program	Percentage of Institutions that offer Program (N=18)
PharmD/PhD	78%
PharmD/MS	55%
PharmD/MPH	22%
PharmD/PA	5%
PharmD/MBA	39%
Other	22%

Results from Schools/Colleges of Pharmacy without a Graduate Program:

Only three institutions without a graduate program responded to the survey. Two reported that academic partnerships were not available at their institution and one did not respond to this survey question. Two of the respondents indicated that they were somewhat interested in developing academic partnerships in the future.

Results from potentially all Respondents:

All survey participants were asked to identify the benefits that the institution derived from academic partnerships. The most frequently cited responses were an increase in scholarly activity (26%), an increase in the number of collaborations (26%) and the ability to attract students into their professional (PharmD) program (26%).

All survey participants were asked to identify the existing barriers to the development of one or more academic partnerships. More than half of the respondents (60%) cited that there were an inadequate number of students interested in pursuing graduate school. Other responses frequently cited included an inability to offer significant incentive(s) to students to participate in graduate programs (33%), inadequate time to develop partnerships (30%) and that development of an academic partnership was not a productive use of time/resources (17%).

All survey participants were asked to list tangible motivators to increase the number of academic partnerships. The responses varied significantly, however a unifying theme was the need to attract more individuals into academia and/or pharmacy academia in specific. A number of institutions reported the desire to increase student exposure to graduate programs/opportunities as a means to increase the number of qualified domestic graduate students as a significant motivator.

Discussion:

Upon submission of this data to the taskforce leadership and the rest of the taskforce membership, it was determined that the private school sector was under-

represented and that additional effort should be made to capture their role in contributing to the academic pipeline.

Methods #2:

Evaluation of the methods initially used to distribute the on-line survey, as well as an assessment of the survey items was conducted in Fall 2007. There was concern that the list of liaisons provided may not have been appropriate to use, in that the survey may not have been originally sent to the most appropriate individual within the institution. Failure to complete the survey may have also been caused by potential confusion about several initial survey items, thereby leading a respondent to “opt out” of survey completion. It was decided that directed solicitation would be the most effective way to identify the correct individual within each institution to contact and then use of a personal telephone interview would be used to solicit responses to specific survey items.

Twenty six personal contacts from private schools/colleges were sent an e-mail message that asked for the name/contact information for the specific individual within his/her institution who would be the most knowledgeable about the academic partnerships, combined degree programs and graduate programs available within the institution. I received contact information from ~60% of these individuals. An e-mail message was sent to each of the named contacts and phone interviews were scheduled. In addition, a number of “cold” e-mail messages were sent to individuals at additional institutions, as well as numerous follow up phone calls placed, with a total of 26 interviews scheduled (representing ~67% of all private institutions). Similar to the on-line survey, both quantitative and qualitative data were collected via the telephone interview. In addition to capturing the current roles of each institution, the interviewer attempted to identify future plans as it relates to anticipated development of graduate programs, combined degree programs and academic partnerships.

Results from Schools/Colleges of Pharmacy at Private Institutions:

Graduate School: Of the 26 survey respondents, 11 (42%) identified that they offered one or more graduate degree programs (see Table 4). Several institutions reported that the development of one or more graduate programs was anticipated within ~5 years.

Table 4: List of Graduate Degree Programs Currently Available or Planned for the Future.

Discipline		Number of Schools Reporting Current Program Availability	Number of Schools Reporting Future Program Availability
Pharmaceutical (pharmaceutics)	chemistry	3* (MS); 6** (PhD)	1 (MS); 2 (PhD)
Pharmacology		1 (MS); 5 (PhD)	
Medicinal chemistry		1 (MS); 2 (PhD)	
Social and administrative sciences		1† (MS); 2** (PhD)	2 (MS)

Pharmacognosy	1 (MS)	
Other:		
Drug discovery/development	1 (MS)	
Regulatory affairs/sciences	2(MS); 1 (PhD)	
Toxicology	1 (MS)	
Medical Technology	1 (MS)	
Public Health	1 (MPH)	1 (MPH)
Pharmacoeconomics and Policy	1(MS); 1 (PhD)	
Health Professions Education		1 (MS)

* In 1/3 institutions: no PharmD students historically ever track into this program

** In 50% institutions: no PharmD students historically ever track into this program

† Only institution to offer program: no PharmD students historically ever track into this program

Combined Degree Programs: Of the 26 survey respondents, 12 (46%) identified that they offered one or more combined degree programs. An additional 11 (42%) institutions reported that there were plans to develop one or more combined degree programs (see Table 5) in the future (typically within ~5 years). When asked what incentives were offered to PharmD students to encourage them to apply to the combined degree program, a shorted timeline was the single most popular response (inherent to most combined degree programs). Most of the respondent institutions allowed PharmD students that matriculate into their combined degree programs to take graduate school courses to fulfill PharmD degree elective requirements, several allowed elective rotations to be used to encourage early involvement in bench research or other relevant experiential opportunities, and there were several programs where the summer months during the PharmD degree program were used to fulfill requirements (including coursework) within the graduate program. A few programs were offered at night/weekend to allow for nearly simultaneous completion of the two degree programs.

Table 5: List of Combined Degree Programs Currently Available or Planned for the Future

Type of Combined Degree Program	Percentage of Institutions that Currently offer Program (N=12)	Percentage of Institutions that are planning to offer Program (N=11)
PharmD/PhD	33%	17%
PharmD/MS	33%	25%
PharmD/MPH	50%	25%
PharmD/PA	8%	8%
PharmD/MBA	92%	54%
PharmD/JD	17%	17%

Academic Partnerships: Of the 26 survey respondents only 2 identified current availability of an academic partnership. When institutions were asked about developing one or more academic partnerships in the future, 46% of the respondents reported

definite interest, with an additional 38% reporting that they were somewhat interested. It should be noted that two of the institutions surveyed had not yet graduated their first class of students, so no graduates have been able to matriculate into graduate degree programs. In both of these institutions, students have had the opportunity to use elective rotations to obtain early exposure to laboratory research, so the potential for an informal academic partnership is possible.

All but two of the survey participants were asked to identify the *potential* benefits derived from academic partnerships. (This differs from what the original survey asked.) The most frequently cited responses were an anticipated increase in the number of collaborations (100%), an increase in the number guest lecturers/speakers (96%); an increase in scholarly activity (88%), an increase in access to equipment or other lab related resources (84%), and an increase in grant submissions/funded/non-tuition based revenue (81%). Interestingly the ability to attract students into their professional (PharmD) program was a benefit that was only identified by 38% of the respondents.

All but two of the survey participants were asked to identify the *potential* barriers to the development of one or more academic partnerships. (This differs from what the original survey asked.) More than half of the respondents (58%) cited that there were an inadequate number of students interested in pursuing graduate school. Interestingly 27% of the respondents were unable to determine if this was a barrier largely because these institutions have never asked their PharmD students about interest in graduate education. Other responses frequently cited included an inability to offer significant incentive(s) to students to participate in graduate programs (42%), not much to offer the partnership (42%), and an inadequate time to develop partnerships (38%).

All survey participants were asked to list tangible motivators to increase the number of academic partnerships. The responses varied significantly, however a unifying theme was the need to attract more individuals into academia and/or pharmacy academia in specific. Another theme that began to emerge was the positive influence that an academic partnership would likely have on faculty development. A number of institutions reported that an academic partnership may enhance the ability of the institution to increase student exposure to graduate programs/opportunities during their existing PharmD curriculum, either through elective rotations or by replacing PharmD electives with graduate coursework.

Discussion:

The two sets of data cannot not be aggregated as there were several private institutions with graduate programs that more than likely contributed to both data sets. In addition, several questions used during the telephone interviews were modified from the original survey to gain an appreciation for an institution's future plans, as well as anticipated barriers/benefits to the development of one or more academic partnerships.

It is clear from both sets of data that there is a clear interest in the development of academic partnerships at both public and private institutions. A number of real and perceived benefits were identified by both sets of survey respondents. It is evident from these surveys however that there is general concern about the very small number of

PharmD students who are interested in pursuing graduate education. What was perhaps more noteworthy was that nearly one third of the private school respondents stated that they had no idea how their PharmD students felt about graduation education, largely because they had never asked. Some of the data from the private schools indicate that even if a graduate program is available within a School/College of Pharmacy, PharmD students simply do not matriculate into them. One respondent remarked that historically graduate education represented one way to “save” a BS or PharmD graduate from having to deal with the negative aspects of community/retail pharmacy. Given the breadth of opportunities now available to the PharmD graduate there are many avenues (other than graduate education) for graduates who wish to pursue their practice of pharmacy outside the community/retail environment. Having said all of this, one wonders if we simply aren’t doing enough to market this career pathway and perhaps more importantly, make it attractive to today’s graduates.

During several of the telephone interviews respondents indicated that the lure of large salaries and the need to repay enormous student loans represent motivators that drive many of today’s PharmD students into careers that will allow them to “work to live”. At one private institution one of these student motivators is being addressed via a loan forgiveness/repayment program. This program serves to entice PharmD students into graduate education, such that on completion of their graduate degree their PharmD degree related loans are paid in full. This type of program allows students to experience “living to work” (as many academicians do) without having to worry about “working to live”.

Recommendations:

1. Marketing: AACP member institutions should develop and implement an academic awareness program for PharmD and/or graduate students within their institution. This opportunity/program should be initiated in the curriculum long before these students are due to complete their degree program so as to maximize the number of exposure opportunities. For example: development of an academic track within a PharmD program may allow students to use elective credits to experience several graduate courses prior to graduation and to select elective rotations that will permit early exposure to laboratory research.
2. Marketing: How can AACP member institutions make an academic career more enticing to today’s graduates? This may mean significantly broadening the traditional definition of an academic career.
3. Funding: While funding a loan forgiveness/repayment program can be a daunting challenge, if the academy is serious about trying to help institutions “feed” the academic pipeline for future pharmacy academicians, then we should consider developing revenue streams for this purpose.

I would like to acknowledge the contributions of other taskforce members in the preparation of the survey questions (Gary Matzke, Douglas, Boudinot, Pat Davis), in the evaluation of the survey items post on-line survey (Julianna Szilagyi, Robert Riggs) and

for discussions devoted to creation of a game plan for how to collect private school data (Julianna Szilagyi).

Respectfully submitted,

Raylene M. Rospond Pharm.D.
Chair of the Task Force

Task Force Members

Council of Deans Appointees:

Raylene Rospond (Drake), Chair

Mehdi Boroujerdi (Albany)

Bobby G. Bryant (Samford), COD Chair-elect, ex officio

James Kehrer (Washington State)

Kathy Knapp (Touro)

F. Lamar Pritchard (Louisiana)

Council of Faculty Appointees:

Dan Brazeau (SUNY-Buffalo)

Martin Farias (Texas A&M)

Ray Love (Maryland)

Robert Riggs (Samford)

Julianna Szilagyi (Houston) COF Chair-elect, ex officio

Jeanne Van Tyle (Butler)

Robin Zavod (Midwestern-Chicago)

APPENDIX I
BUTLER UNIVERSITY JOB SHARE ARRANGEMENT

APRIL 2004

Definition of Job Share: Two individuals share the responsibility of one position scheduled for 40 hours a week. This arrangement is available in departments who have determined that a job share arrangement will not compromise the job standards in terms of the quality and quantity of work.

Salary: Employees will share the salary budgeted for this job. There can be variance in the two salaries based on the employees' qualifications vis a vis the job requirements. Future increases provided by the University are based on each individual's salary and performance rating.

Benefits: The following benefits are based on each individual's salary and/or are subject to the eligibility requirements for full-time employees and terms and conditions of each plan:

- Welfare Benefits
 - Medical, Dental & Vision Coverage: The University contribution is for the employee (only) coverage for any plan selected.
 - Flex Spending Account
 - Basic Life Insurance
 - Supplemental Life Insurance
 - Income Protection
 - Short-Term Disability
 - Long-Term Disability
 - Employee Assistance Program

- Retirement Benefits
 - TIAA-CREF
Eligibility: each employee must work 1,000 hours in a 12-month consecutive period

- Time-Off / Leave of Absence Benefits
 - Holidays: Holidays are paid if the holiday falls on the employee's scheduled work day or work hours.
 - Vacation: Each employee receives 50% of the vacation time awarded based on years of service.
 - Personal days: Each employee receives 50% of the personal days awarded each year.

- Sick days: Each employee receives 50% of the sick time awarded prorated accordingly, if applicable. Unused sick days can be converted to personal days in accordance with the policy.

Butler University
Job Share Arrangement
Page 2 of 2

- Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA): Employees who work less than 1,250 hours per year (as is the case in a job share arrangement) are not eligible for family medical leave.
- Tuition Remission
 - 50% tuition remission for the employee, spouse and/or dependents
- Other Benefits
 - Free or discounted athletic tickets
 - Discount tickets to selected Clowes Hall Events
 - Bookstore discount
 - Library privileges
 - Selected services of Health and Counseling Center
 - Use of exercise facilities
 - Computer Loan Program

Process/Procedure:

1. A routine work schedule for each employee is established with the supervisor.
2. Each employee understands that should he/she not be able to work on a pre-scheduled day, he/she is to contact initially the other employee to request a trade of days after which the supervisor should be notified. Every effort should be made for full position coverage; however, the University understands that, as is the case with a traditional full-time schedule, 100% coverage cannot be guaranteed.
3. Each employee is expected to complete an Absence & Overtime Report (ABOT) each month recording the days and/or hours actually worked (as opposed to scheduled). Holidays that fall on non-scheduled work days are unpaid and should be reported as such on the ABOT.
4. The job expectations for each employee are based upon a work schedule of 20 hours per week.
 - Exempt-level positions - Due to the nature of the work, some weeks may require greater than 20 hours per week; some weeks may require fewer than 20 hours per week with a general average of 20 hours per week.
 - Non-exempt positions - hours worked each week in excess of the 20 hours must be paid at the straight hourly rate. Hours worked in excess of

40 hours per week must be paid at $1 \frac{1}{2}$ x the hourly rate. This situation should be rare in a job share arrangement.

5. Every effort should be made by each employee to develop a communication plan that ensures the flow of work is maintained for a full time position. Each employee is expected to attend regularly scheduled department meetings.
6. The effectiveness of the job share arrangement will be evaluated by the supervisor and the employees after six months of operation and again at one year.

**APPENDIX II
BUTLER UNIVERSITY
POLICY & PROCEDURES**

POLICY NAME: Flextime	POLICY NUMBER:
SCOPE: Regular Full-time Staff	DEPARTMENT: Human Resources Management & Development
EFFECTIVE DATE: July 1, 2007 APPROVED BY: Dr. Bobby Fong, President	REV. DATE:

In order to recognize the varied and changing needs of Butler University staff and the varied work styles present in the academic community, Butler University promotes alternative work schedules (Flextime) for employees for whom the University's regular work hours are not ideal to meet personal and/or family needs. Butler University believes the concept and use of Flextime:

- Increases employee morale
- Maximizes employee productivity
- Provides opportunities for employees to conduct personal business without taking paid or unpaid time off
- Minimizes tardiness and short term absences
- Allows for greater employee participation in family and community activities

Although it is not possible to accommodate all requests for alternative schedules, an employee's flextime request may be approved provided the job is appropriate for flextime and the responsibilities of the department and the University are met and uncompromised. The Flextime Policy establishes procedures for implementing flextime schedules within departments.

POLICY:

A work schedule which is different than regular work hours established by the University for an employee or group of employees may be approved as long as the schedule meets the needs of the department and the University and is not designed to evade the overtime requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The employee must have successfully completed his/her 90-day probationary period before a flextime schedule can be requested.

A Flextime Schedule Request must be approved by the supervisor, department head and vice president. An employee working an alternative work schedule must have the approved schedule documented and maintained in his/her departmental file as well as

with the Human Resources Management & Development Department (HRM&D). If the request is not approved as requested, the supervisor should discuss workable alternative schedules with the employee or provide an explanation as to why the request cannot be approved.

DEFINITIONS:

Work hours – The regular work day for office staff is 7.5 hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday with one hour for lunch; a total of 37.5 hours each week. Departments on a 40 hour/week work schedule and multiple work shifts such as Construction, Maintenance, Building Services Departments and the Butler University Police Department (BUPD) have different work hours and time periods for lunch. Flextime schedules, if operationally feasible, are determined by each department.

Flexitime – The term used for alternative work schedules other than the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. for office staff and hours other than the regular work hours/shifts for employees on a 40 hour/week schedule that permit flexibility in starting and ending times within limits set by management. A flexitime work schedule is any alternative work schedule for employees who work regularly 37.5 or 40 hours a week.

Work days do not need to be consecutive within the work week in a flexitime schedule. An employee's regular work day may be adjusted temporarily or on an ongoing basis if the employee is given notice from the supervisor or a flexitime schedule requested by the employee is approved by the supervisor, department head and vice president.

Definitions of Flexitime Schedules –

- *Fixed Flexitime Schedule*
The employee's weekly pattern remains consistent, but is other than the department's standard schedule.
- *Compressed Flexitime Schedule*
The employee's weekly pattern remains consistent, but is compressed into fewer than five full days (e.g. four or four-and-one-half days).

Holidays on Flexitime – When a University holiday occurs, all regularly scheduled full-time employees receive the benefit whether scheduled to work that day or not. Each University holiday will count for 20% of the employee workweek. The schedule for the balance of the week should be adjusted so that 80% (or 60% in the case of two-day holiday weeks) of the employee's regular workweek is actually worked in that week.

Example: The University is closed on Thanksgiving and the day after Thanksgiving; thus, a three day workweek in which employees work 22.5 hours (on a 37.5 hour workweek) or 24 hours (on a 40 hour workweek). An employee on Flexitime must work 22.5 hours or 24 hours the week of Thanksgiving.

- The employee is responsible for submitting to his/her supervisor for approval a written schedule of work for the holiday week. The schedule must show the work days and hours for the holiday week. Total hours scheduled and worked must coincide with total hours worked by employees in their department on the regular (standard) work schedule less the holiday hours. At no time should the combination of regularly scheduled hours and holiday hours exceed 37.5 or 40 hours per week.

Unscheduled University Closings on Flexitime – Should an unscheduled closing of the University fall on a flexible work schedule day, pay for that day will be for the number of hours scheduled. If no hours are scheduled, the employee is not due pay for that day. If the employee has a scheduled day off (i.e. vacation, personal day), the day will be charged against scheduled time off. Examples of unscheduled closings are severe weather, power outages, and early closings prior to a holiday.

Staff on Flextime who are absent on a day when the University closes early (whether on vacation, personal, sick time or not scheduled to work) do not receive time off at a later date or any other benefit as a result of an early closing.

PROCEDURES:

University offices must be appropriately staffed and open for business during regular work hours (see definition of work hours above) before flextime can be considered an option.

1. A formal written request using the ***Flextime Schedule Request*** must be submitted by a regular full-time employee to his/her immediate supervisor at least two work weeks prior to the desired start of a flextime schedule.
2. The supervisor, department head and vice president must approve or disapprove the request form in writing and return it to the employee within two work weeks of the date the request was received. If the request is not approved as requested, the supervisor should discuss workable alternative schedules with the employee or provide an explanation as to why the request cannot be approved.
3. Supervisors should consider the impact of proposed flextime schedules on other department employees and ancillary departments. Supervisors are responsible for coordinating the schedules of all flextime participants to ensure appropriate departmental coverage.
4. If the request is approved, one copy of the request form is given to the employee, one copy remains in the employee's departmental file, and one copy is forwarded to HRM&D for the employee's personnel file.
5. "Flexing" the lunch hour is not to be considered when developing a flextime schedule (e.g. an employee is not on a flextime schedule if he/she occasionally requests to reduce the lunch hour by thirty minutes in order to leave thirty minutes early). This is solely by agreement between the supervisor and the employee on an exception basis only.
6. Employees on a flextime schedule are required to adjust their flextime schedule if departmental needs so require.
7. A supervisor or employee has the right to terminate a flextime schedule agreement at any time if it appears the flextime schedule is no longer in the best interest of the department or University or if it no longer fits the need of the employee. Appropriate notice of at least two work weeks should be given to the employee or supervisor, unless unusual circumstances prevent giving notice. A copy of the original Flextime Schedule Request should be forwarded to HRM&D for the personnel file noting that the flextime agreement has ended.

RECORDKEEPING FOR FLEXTIME SCHEDULES:

Supervisors/department heads are responsible for maintaining accurate written records reflecting flextime schedules approved for each employee.

Flextime schedules are to be forwarded to HRM&D when initiated and also when terminated.

EDUCATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF POLICY:

A copy of this policy is provided to all staff new hires during orientation. A copy of this policy is available in print in Human Resources and online at the HR website www.butler.edu/hr. A summary of this policy shall be provided in University staff handbooks and may appear in other publications prepared by Human Resources. If you have a question about this policy, please contact your immediate supervisor, department chair, college dean, University vice president, or a representative of Human Resources.

**APPENDIX III
Butler University
Flextime Schedule Request**

Employee Name *(please print)*: _____ Department: _____

Type of Flextime Schedule Requested (check one): Fixed Compressed

Original Schedule: Hours: Monday _____ Comments:
 Tuesday _____
 Wednesday _____
 Thursday _____
 Friday _____
 Saturday _____
 Sunday _____
Total Weekly Hours: _____

Flextime Schedule: Hours: Monday _____ Comments:
 Tuesday _____
 Wednesday _____
 Thursday _____
 Friday _____
 Saturday _____
 Sunday _____
Total Weekly Hours: _____

I request approval of the above flextime schedule effective _____ and ending on _____.
(Note: state "indefinite" if there is no ending date at this time.)

Employee Signature: _____ Date: _____

Approval:

I approve the above flextime schedule effective _____ and ending on _____.
 Supervisor Signature: _____ Date: _____

Department Head Signature: _____ Date: _____

Vice President/Dean Signature: _____ Date: _____

The supervisor or employee has the right to terminate this flextime schedule agreement at any time if the flextime schedule is no longer in the best interest of the department or University, or if it no longer fits the needs of the employee. Notice of at least two work weeks should be given to the employee or supervisor, unless unusual circumstances prevent giving notice.

Place one copy of this agreement in the employee's departmental file, and provide another copy for the employee. Send the original agreement to Human Resources Management and Development (JH 144) for inclusion in the employee's personnel file.

If the flextime schedule agreement ends, please complete the section below and send a copy of this form to Human Resources Management & Development (JH 144). A new Flextime Schedule Request is to be completed if a different flextime schedule is approved.

Termination of flextime schedule agreement:

The above flextime schedule agreement is terminated on _____.

Employee Signature: _____ Date: _____

Supervisor Signature: _____ Date: _____

Department Head Signature: _____ Date: _____

Vice President/Dean Signature: _____ Date: _____

