

**Faculty Benefits Meeting  
February 3, 2016  
SU 108 3:15 PM**

**Members in Attendance:** Abdullah Al-Bahrani, Patricia Sunderhaus, Debbie Patten, Kimberly Allen-Kattus, Chris Curran, John Farrar, Marius Truta, Gabe Sanders, Kimberly Clayton-Code, Andrea Gazzaniga, Kajsa Larson, Jackie Wroughton, Stephanie Hughes, Ausbra McFarland, David Dunevant, Matthew Zacate, Melissa Moon, Joan Ferrante, Perry Bratcher, Justin Yates

**Call to Order  
Adoption of the Agenda**

**Approval of Minutes of December 2 Meeting**

**Announcement:** An RFP for Medical Insurance (including prescription, vision and HAS components is about to be or already has been posted. Review of Bids will begin in March and continue in April.

**Business:**

Discussion of Medical Insurance bidding ensued.

Matthew pointed out that a committee is still forming to decide on Bids.

Matthew Zacate has agreed to serve as one faculty representative in the committee to review bids unless another Benefits committee member wished to serve. He pointed out that there will be at least two, possibly three faculty representatives on this committee. An invitation was issued for another faculty representative. Melissa Moon volunteered to serve on this committee if another faculty was needed.

Faculty were invited to offer input on criteria to be used when reviewing Medical Insurance Bid Proposals.

Discussion ensued:

The suggestion was made to produce a short survey to circulate among faculty to this end.

Discussion

It was pointed out that a Qualtrics survey would be relatively easy to produce.

The next question was what questions should be addressed to faculty.

Discussion

Questions arose concerning current plans and the overall level of satisfaction as well as clarification of the role of insurance providers at Northern Kentucky University

It was pointed out that NKU was self-insured and pooled monies covered cost of service to enrollees. It was established that the insurance providers delivered administrative services and networking with providers as well as consultant and actuarial services.

After establishing this fact discussion continued concerning what questions would be most valuable:

Suggestions were questions that might address what faculty valued most about their health insurance

- Customer service
- Cost
- Pharmacy and Prescription coverage
- Other issues

It was noted that we only have a 1 month window to create and record the survey.

Matthew suggested that if we chose this route he and Grace could produce the survey.

It was resolved that we should form two basic questions for the survey:

- 1) What we like or don't like about the current provider
- 2) Which prescription plan was favored

The committee was reminded that this issue was time sensitive and asked who wanted to draft the questions. It was agreed that all committee members would participate in choosing questions. Matthew will send out some suggestions for the committee to look over and give feedback on those found favored by all.

This was so moved and seconded; a vote was taken. All were in favor of this action.

Next order of Business was addressing the Prospective Business Survey that the committee had responded to in January. It was noted that the primary concern of most faculty was exploring the possibility of expanding the tuition waiver program as a benefit for faculty and family members.

Discussion occurred concerning how to go about crafting a recommendation or a proposal

It was agreed that this process should begin with data collection. Collecting the following information:

- Who was using the tuition waiver?
- How it was being utilized?
- What were other schools doing in context with Tuition Waivers?
- How many hours did other schools allow?
- Did they offer tuition waivers for graduate and doctoral study?

Next:

- What schools should we look at, benchmarks or regional colleges and universities?

This question led to the question of whether we should consult Staff Members on this or focus at this point on faculty, because if we were focusing on faculty we should look at Benchmark universities but if we were considering staff we would look at regional universities as well. It was resolved at this point that we focus primarily on faculty but that we expand our data collection to both regional and benchmark schools.

A subcommittee had been proposed in December. Prospective subcommittee members at that time were: Melissa Moon, Jackie Wroughton, Kimberly Kattus and Abdullah Al-Bahrani. These faculty agreed to form the subcommittee. Melissa Moon agreed to chair the subcommittee and Jackie Wroughton and Abdullah Al-Bahrani offered their services as statisticians to help organize the collected data.

It was moved that this subcommittee begin collecting data only on how much the tuition waiver program is used by staff and faculty at NKU; the motion was seconded and was supported unanimously.

New Business:

Should we request an increase in Project Grant and Summer Fellowship monies from the Provost? In December Matthew reported that the Provost might be supportive of such an increase.

The question was raised if we wanted to request a specific dollar amount.

Matthew had investigated protocol and learned that the appropriate protocol, should the Benefits committee choose to recommend a request was that we send it first to Faculty Senate. If Faculty Senate supported this request they would draft the letter and send it to the provost.

One question brought up concerned the ramifications of such a request. In other words, would money be removed from another program in order to accommodate this request. It was pointed out that the Budget survey produced by the Budget Committee revealed that in general, faculty professional support was not a high priority at this time. Recognizing that this was a complicated issue and the meeting time had already expired the committee agreed to continue discussion of this issue at the next meeting.

The motion was made to adjourn the meeting. This met with unanimous support. The meeting was adjourned.