

To the Board of Curators:

The faculty and staff of the University of Missouri Libraries are writing to express our opposition to the newly proposed PTO plan. We have several concerns, which we address here.

First, the proposed system is not sufficient and is based on skewed data:

- **The use of averages ignores the most at-risk employees.** The proposed plan assumes only 4 days of sick time, a number based on average use by non-exempt employees with less than 5 years of service. Using the average ignores employees who use either all or none of their sick time. It also disregards those with severe or chronic health needs.
- **The proposed plan ignores the longest standing employees.** According to an update given to the Board of Curators in November 2021, the average number of sick days taken by non-exempt employees with over 5 years of service is 9 days, not 4.
- **The new additions are not equivalent substitutes.** The short-term disability and parental/caregiver leave do not serve the same purpose or offer the same benefits as incidental sick leave, as they reduce banked hours and offer less flexibility. It was not mentioned in the provided documents that one must use all PTO before being able to use either short-term disability or parental/caregiver benefits.
- **The comparison to peer institutions reported misleading data.** In the analysis of SEC and AAU-P Universities, any institution that separated sick and vacation time had their sick time reduced to 4 days to match the reported “average” of UM employees.

Second, there will be consequences for all employees participating in the proposed plan:

- **Disabled, older, and chronically ill employees will be hurt most.** Only healthy staff will have “extra” vacation under the new plan. Employees with chronic illnesses and disabilities will not only lose 80 hours of time, but may need to forgo vacation in order to preserve sick leave. Sick time is *not* the same as vacation time and cannot be categorized as such.
- **There is no accounting for emergencies or the continued existence of COVID-19.** If any employee has an emergency or gets sick with COVID-19, they may be forced to use all of their PTO and have no time remaining for vacation or rest.

Third, there will be consequences for the University as a whole:

- **This plan will damage employee retention.** Benefits such as PTO are integral to a salary package and PTO has been used as compensation in years when no raises have been given. This reduction in salary represents a **net loss of 80 hours of paid time** and cannot be remedied in a single payout.
- **This plan will damage employee recruitment.** The new PTO plan puts the University of Missouri at a disadvantage compared to peer institutions at a time when campuses across the nation struggle to fill open positions.

Fourth, there is still campus-wide confusion about the implications of the plan:

- There were no clear rules for giving notice for PTO and no clear explanation for how current vacation, sick, and personal balances will be compensated.
- Communication of this proposal to those most affected is minimal and the opportunity to provide input is short. Without complete information about the proposed plan, employees are not able to offer complete feedback.

While cost savings are important, they should not be made at the expense of our employees. Therefore, the faculty and staff of the University of Missouri Libraries request that you critically reconsider the proposed PTO plan and ensure a full understanding amongst both the Board and all affected employees before the vote.

Sincerely,
MU Librarians and Archivists Council (MULAC)
Library Staff Advisory Group (SAG)

8/23/2022

(Attached: Data Analysis)

Data Analysis

Missing Data

A complete analysis of the data in the presentation to the Board of Curators is impossible. The provided materials do not include any information about where or how the information was gathered, how it was verified, how it was analyzed, or how they reached their average numbers. However, the faculty and staff of the MU Libraries have done our own analysis, relying on our research into our peer institution benefits packages. All raw data is provided in the attached spreadsheet for transparency.

Current Plan vs. Proposed Plan

The current plan will reduce the time off for each affected employee at the university by 10 days, or a net total of 80 hours. Those 80 hours equate to a loss of between 21% and 27% of overall hours that employees currently rely upon.

	Vacation		Personal		Sick		Holidays		Total		Difference		
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Days	Hours	%
Nonexempt Employees													
0-5 years	12	18	4	0	12	0	9	9	37	27	-10	-80	-27%
5-15 years	17	23	4	0	12	0	9	9	42	32	-10	-80	-24%
15+ years	22	28	4	0	12	0	9	9	47	37	-10	-80	-21%
Average	17	23	4	0	12	0	9	9	42	32	-10	-80	-24%
Exempt Employees													
0-5 years	17	23	4	0	12	0	9	9	42	32	-10	-80	-24%
5+ years	22	28	4	0	12	0	9	9	47	37	-10	-80	-21%
Average	19.5	25.5	4	0	12	0	9	9	44.5	34.5	-10	-80	-22%

Comparison to Peer Institutions

Modified Data

The data provided in the Board of Curators presentation purposefully modifies the data of our peer institutions in both the SEC and the AAU-P group. For every institution that has a “traditional” plan that separates vacation from sick time, the listed sick time was reduced to 4 days to match the reported 4 days the “average” UM system employee takes. This modification of data is noted on page 118 of the report to the Board of Curators. The charts then attempt to compare our reduced plan to the modified data for our peer institutions. Considering that the largest part of the reduction in hours is taken from our sick time, this change creates misleading comparisons.

	SEC		AAU-P	
	Presented	Reality	Presented	Reality
Non-exempt				
Average holidays *	14	13	13	13
Average vacation	20 †	14.5	18 †	13.8
Average sick		11.3		12.5
Average total	34	38.8	31	39.3
Difference		14%		27%
Exempt				
Average holidays *	14	13	12	13
Average vacation	22 †	14.5	23 †	13.8
Average sick		11.3		12.5
Average total	37	38.8	36	39.3
Difference		5%		9%

* holidays includes personal & winter break

† for traditional plans, reduced to 4 sick days for PTO "average"

Raw Data Comparison

Using the data collected, the graph below represents a raw data analysis of our peer institutions. With the current plan, we are ahead of the majority of our peers, allowing us to remain competitive in the hiring market. The proposed plan significantly reduces the benefit package and will put us anywhere from **7% to 21% lower than our peers.**

	Current Plan			Proposed Plan		
	UM System	SEC	AAU-P	UM System	SEC	AAU-P
Non-exempt						
Average holidays	13	13	13	13	13	13
Average vacation	17	14.5	13.8	18	14.5	13.8
Average sick	12	11.3	12.5	0	11.3	12.5
Average total	42	38.8	39.3	31	38.8	39.3
Difference		8%	7%		-20%	-21%
Exempt						
Average holidays	13	13	13	13	13	13
Average vacation	19.5	14.5	13.8	23	14.5	13.8
Average sick	12	11.3	12.5	0	11.3	12.5
Average total	44.5	38.8	39.3	36	38.8	39.3
Difference		15%	13%		-7%	-8%

Institutional Rank

With our current time off plan, the University of Missouri System leads the field with competitive benefits.

The proposed plan, however, puts us at the very bottom of the ranks amongst both SEC and AAU-P Universities.

SEC Universities		Vacation	Sick	Total
1	Auburn University	20	12	32
2	University of Missouri Current Plan	19.5	12	31.5
3	University of Mississippi	18	12	30
4	Mississippi State University	18	12	30
5	University of South Carolina	15	15	30
6	University of Georgia	15	12	27
7	University of Florida	13	12	25
8	University of Alabama	12	12	24
9	University of Arkansas	12	12	24
10	Louisiana State University	12	12	24
11	University of Tennessee	12	12	24
12	Texas A&M University	12	12	24
13	University of Kentucky	10	12	22
14	Vanderbilt University	20	0	20
15	University of Missouri Proposed Plan	18	0	18

AAU-P Universities*		Vacation	Sick	Total
1	The University of Kansas	26	12	38
2	University of Oregon	22.5	12	35
3	University of Missouri Current Plan	19.5	12	31.5
4	The Pennsylvania State University	18	12	30
5	Stony Brook University (NY)	15	15	30
6	University at Buffalo (NY)	15	15	30
7	The University of Iowa	12	18	30
8	The University of Wisconsin - Madison	13	16	29
9	Rutgers University	17	12	29
10	University of Maryland at College Park	14	15	29
11	Michigan State University	15.5	13	29
12	Georgia Institute of Technology	15	12	27
13	University of California, Davis	15	12	27
14	University of California, Berkeley	15	12	27
15	University of California, Irvine	15	12	27
16	University of California, Los Angeles	15	12	27
17	University of California, San Diego	15	12	27
18	University of California, Santa Cruz	15	12	27
19	University of Florida	14	13	27
20	The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	15	12	27
21	University of Michigan	12	15	27
22	Indiana University	14	12	26
23	University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	13	13	26
24	The University of Utah	14	12	26
25	The Ohio State University	10	15	25
26	University of California, Santa Barbara	14	11	25
27	University of Pittsburgh	13	12	25
28	University of Washington	13	12	25
29	Texas A&M University	12	12	24
30	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	12	12	24
31	The University of Texas at Austin	12	12	24
32	The University of Arizona	11	12	23
33	University of Colorado, Boulder	13	10	23
34	Purdue University	10	10	20
35	University of Virginia	12	8	20
36	University of Missouri Proposed Plan	18	0	18

*Vacation and personal days were combined for institutions that distinguished between the two