Chair Correspondence January-June 1999, June 2000

Bowling Green State University. Administrative Staff Council

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/asc
How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Repository Citation
https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/asc/28

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Publications at ScholarWorks@BGSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Administrative Staff Council by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@BGSU.
Pre-Microfilm Inventory

Collection: Bowling Green State University
Administrative Staff Council, UA-022

Location: Bowling Green, Ohio

Title of Series: Chair Correspondence


Format: Bound X Loose

Order: Alpha X Chronological Numerical

Index: Included Separate X None

Notes
1. Colored Paper
2. Pencil
3. Photocopies
4. Post-It Notes
5. Highlighter
Memorandum

Date: January 11, 1999
To: BGSU Faculty and Staff
From: Administrative Council Scholarship Committee: Shelley Appelbaum, Suzanne Fahrer, Deb Wells, Jim Elsasser, Mike Failor, Penny Nemitz, Susan Darrow, Deb Freyman, Sally Raymont
Re: Administrative Staff Scholarship Raffle

Each year the Administrative Council Scholarship Committee recognizes exceptional BGSU students by awarding the Administrative Staff Scholarship. Recipients are undergraduate students who rank in the top 10 percent of their college, demonstrate unmet financial need, and provide leadership/service to BGSU and the community.

In addition to selecting scholarship recipients, the ASC Scholarship Committee is responsible for raising funds for the scholarship. Fund-raising efforts have included a letter campaign to all administrative staff, and for the second time a raffle.

We invite you to purchase tickets for the Administrative Staff Scholarship raffle. The Scholarship Committee also accepts donations toward the fund -- these gifts are as welcome as ticket sales. Prizes for the 1999 raffle include:

- an Epson Stylus Ink Jet Printer ($295 value)
- $25 gift certificate to a Continuing Education Class
- 2 season tickets to 1999-00 BGSU Theater productions
- 2 season tickets to the 1999-00 College of Musical Arts Festival Series
- 4 rounds of golf with golf cart at Forrest Course course ($112 value)
- 2 season tickets to 1999 Falcon home football games
- a Fall 1999 (one-semester) pass to the BGSU Recreation Center
- WBGU gift package
- Grand Prize is an expense-paid trip for 2 with the BGSU football team to Orlando, Florida on November 20, 1999 for the Central Florida game (includes airfare, hotel, ground transportation and ticket to the game)

The raffle drawing will be held at the March 4, 1999 ASC meeting, 1:30 p.m., in the Alumni Room of the University Union. You need not be present to win.

Please return the form below, along with cash, check payable to the Administrative Staff Scholarship, or indication of Bursar charge, c/o Deb Freyman, Dept. of Biological Sciences, by February 24, 1999. We hope that you will decide to support outstanding BGSU students by contributing to the Administrative Staff Scholarship.

Name: ___________________________ Campus Address & Phone: ___________________________

____ I wish to purchase tickets
____1 for $1
____6 for $5
____15 for $10
____35 for $20
____100 for $50

____ I wish to make a donation $_____

____ I wish to charge the tickets/donation to my bursar account.

BGSU ID Number: P________
January 25, 1999  BOT Report

Happy New Year! I am hopeful that the unseasonably cold and then warm temperatures are an indication that we've already passed through winter and spring, and that summer is right around the corner. There are several items I'd like to update you on today briefly with respect to the work of Administrative Staff Council on five of our goals for 1998-99.

1. Compensation

After receiving their charge from President Ribeau last month, the Administrative Staff Compensation Working Group, chaired by Bryan Benner, requested a joint meeting with ASC's Executive Committee. Our two committees met on January 7, 1999, to have a discussion with respect to the central compensation issues, data collection and analysis efforts, and the principal values our compensation plan should be based on. We are pleased that Bryan has pledged to make this an open process. ASC's standing committees are readied to assist the compensation working group in their efforts in the months ahead, as they work toward establishing a compensation benchmark for administrative staff and develop scenarios to move administrative staff salaries toward those benchmarks.

2. Revision of the Performance Evaluation Process

First, we have received positive feedback regarding the modifications ASC passed last month to streamline the performance evaluation process. Departments and units have been called upon to determine, through collaborative unit-level discussions, what constitutes meritorious performance; i.e. performance that meets agreed upon expectations (meritorious), exceeds agreed upon expectations, or does not agreed upon expectations (non-meritorious).

Second, a subcommittee of the newly formed Ad Hoc Administrative Staff Performance Evaluation Committee has met to discuss a proposal from the Institute for Psychological Research and Application, housed in BGSU's psychology department. Becca Ferguson, Assistant Provost for Human Resources has pledged financial support for the research project, which is being designed to qualitatively and quantitatively assess the
effectiveness of our current performance evaluation system, processes and tools from the standpoint of supervisors and those supervised.

3. Develop professional development opportunities

In an effort to provide continuing professional development opportunities for BGSU's administrative staff members, ASC's Professional Development Committee is planning a half-day professional development conference on campus on March 17, 1999 in Olscamp Hall from 8:30 a.m. - noon. A variety of sessions will be offered for staff members to choose from.

4. Administrative Staff Scholarship

Each year the ASC Scholarship Committee recognizes exceptional BGSU students by awarding the Administrative Staff Scholarship. This committee also works to generate funds for the scholarship corpus, which currently stands at over $53,000.

The second annual Administrative Staff Scholarship Raffle will take place in early March. The prizes include something for everyone!

• an Epson Ink Jet printer,
• season tickets to next year's Festival series,
  University theatre productions, or
  Falcon home football games.

And this year, the grand prize is an expense paid trip for two with the BGSU Falcon Football team to Orlando, Florida on November 20, 1999 for the Central Florida game.

There is plenty of time between now and then to purchase tickets, so if you're interested in making a contribution to the scholarship fund, please be sure to let me know!
Deb, Joyce, Paul, Jay and Scott:

On January 20, 1999 Dr. Middleton received an anonymous letter dated January 15, 1999 concerning an article that appeared in the BG NEWS on January 12, 1999. In this article Dr. Middleton was misquoted by the reporter. Dr. Middleton did state to the BG NEWS reporter that his concern was for the well being of the students, faculty and staff. I am sure all of us at some point in our careers have had the experience of being misquoted and experienced the repercussions of the misquote.

As one of those Administrators who spent a lot of time on this closure issue, the overwhelming concerns behind every decision Dr. Middleton made were:
- How will our decisions effect the safety of our employees and students?
- How will our decisions effect the employees who are required to come to work?

The decision to close the university is a collaborative effort based on the recommendations of the university chief of police, facilities services and other administrators. A lot of questions are asked. Are the roads passable? Have the municipal and county governments in the area declared snow emergencies? What is the wind chill? What is the short term and long term forecast? If we open, are the campus walkways reasonably safe for employees to be able to get to their work areas?

I know you all understand the decisions to close were not taken lightly. Further, I know all of you understand the consideration Dr. Middleton gave to the safety issues. My question to all of you is how do we get this message out to the employees who are not aware of these considerations? Chief Wiegand and Dr. Gromko are more than willing to address ASC and CSC regarding the process for closure of the university and how the human element impacts these decisions. I look forward to your feedback.

Thanks, Becca
Administrative Staff Salary Increases
2/1/99

Note: There are NO new concepts here with the exception of the section on eligibility (in bold) below. This document has taken what the Board passed in June 1997. Some of the language is the same. PWC has attempted only to create a clear document to operationalize salary increases to add to the Handbook. It also removes performance evaluation language. PWC feels that the performance evaluation process should be a separate section of the handbook and cross-referenced.

Bowling Green State University administrative staff are eligible for yearly salary increases based on meritorious performance. Meritorious performance promotes employee recruitment and retention, rewards performance of duties and responsibilities, and provides incentives that encourage distinguished, innovative and creative achievements to meet unusual challenges and opportunities when they arise.

Definition of Merit

Merit is a salary increment that is awarded for performance of duties that meet or exceed job/department/unit expectations.

Merit Determination

Merit will be determined based on the following:

Exceeds expectations
Meets expectations
Does not meet expectations

Merit Eligibility (PASTED IN FROM OTHER Document already before administration)
Continuing University funded full-time and part-time staff members are eligible for consideration for full merit. In addition, staff members employed for one calendar year or less will be considered as follows:

Administrative staff members employed by December 31 are eligible for consideration for a full merit increase for the next year.

Administrative staff members employed after December 31 are eligible for consideration for a merit increase on a pro-rated basis.

Approved by Administrative Staff Council Executive Committee November 24, 1995

Determination of Salary Increases

Salary increases are determined by the job performance of an employee as assessed by the administrative staff performance appraisal process. (Cross-reference when this is developed)

Performing one's job at a level that exceeds satisfactory levels and job, department/unit expectations will result in additional salary increase provided the merit pool for the year is above 2%. (See below)

Performing one's job at a satisfactory level and meeting job expectations will result in a full merit increase if the merit pool for the year is 3% or below. (See below)

Failure to perform one's job at a satisfactory level and does not meet expectations will result in no salary increase.

Establishment of Merit Criteria
Merit criteria must be established each year and made known prior to June 30 of the prior contract year.

Each department should meet prior to every new contract year to discuss what constitutes meritorious performance. Each administrative staff member should have a clear understanding of what will constitute meritorious performance for his/her own position for the new contract year as a part of the year end performance appraisal process. (Cross-reference)

Individual discussions about merit criteria between administrative staff and supervisors should be ongoing and part of the performance appraisal process.

Administrative staff and supervisors should also meet at mid-year to change or fine-tune merit criteria (Cross reference performance evaluation).

**Distribution of Salary Increase** (This section already approved by Board in merit document)

If the total merit pool for salary increments in a given year is three percent (3%) or less, all employees who qualify for merit in their annual performance reviews will receive the same percentage increase in salary.

If the total merit pool for salary increments in a given year is more than three percent (3%) but less than five percent (5%), it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

a. Three percent (3%) of the total salaries of employees shall be allocated as a three percent (3%) increase in salary to all employees who qualify for merit based on their annual performance reviews.

b. The remaining difference between the total merit pool and the three percent (3%) of the total salaries of the administrative staff shall be allocated to departments and units for recognition of those employees whose level of performance exceeds job/department/unit expectations as defined by the merit policy of the department or unit.

If the total merit pool is five percent (5%) or more, it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

a. Sixty percent (60%) shall be allocated to departments/units to be used as an equal percentage increase in salary to all employees who meet job expectations and thereby qualify for merit in their annual performance reviews.

b. Forty percent (40%) shall be allocated to departments/units for recognition and reward of those employees whose level of performance exceeds job/department/unit expectations as defined by the merit policy of the department/unit.

Any administrative staff member who is not satisfied with his/her salary increase can pursue the conciliation process. (Cross reference)

Doing the job - full merit

(Job analysis criteria)
Hi

I am going to try this again. I sent the document to last year's exec. I think I need a vacation.

Hi

I am attaching a draft document that PWC has been working on. It is our effort to make some sense out of the merit document and get it in handbook shape. There are no new concepts in it at all.

I also want to bring forward some issues that PWC has raised regarding merit that EXEC needs to discuss

1. How is salary pool going to be determined?
2. Does everyone who is meritorious get full 3%? (assuming that is the raise)
3. What happens in one person offices?
4. Bonus at caps
5. Bonus for all
6. Identifying market exceptions.

These are all pretty unclear and potentially could create problems with the raises this year.

Thanks- see you Tuesday.

Pat

---

Pat Greeu, 1/28/99 10:42 AM -0500, BIG OOPS

X-Sender: pgreen@mailbox.bgsu.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1999 10:42:17 -0500
To: dboyce@bgnet.bgsu.edu, lopez@wbgu.bgsu.edu, jblinn@bgnet.bgsu.edu, whitmire@bgnet.bgsu.edu, lhamilt@bgnet.bgsu.edu, lwaggon@bgnet.bgsu.edu, wells@opie.bgsu.edu, mzachar@bgnet.bgsu.edu
From: Pat Green <pgreen@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Subject: BIG OOPS
Status: RO

Hi

I am going to try this again. I sent the document to last year's exec. I think I need a vacation.

Hi

I am attaching a draft document that PWC has been working on. It is our effort to make some sense out of the merit document and get it in handbook shape. There are no new concepts in it at all.

I also want to bring forward some issues that PWC has raised regarding merit that EXEC needs to discuss

1. How is salary pool going to be determined?
2. Does everyone who is meritorious get full 3%? (assuming that is the raise)
3. What happens in one person offices?
4. Bonus at caps
5. Bonus for all
6. Identifying market exceptions.

These are all pretty unclear and potentially could create problems with the raises this year.

Thanks- see you Tuesday.

Pat

---

Pat Green
Administrative Director
Center for Photochemical Sciences
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
Phone: 419-372-6008

---

Printed for "Deborah S. Boyce" <dboyce@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Administrative Staff Salary Increases
Draft 1/6/99

Note: There are NO new concepts here with the exception of the section on eligibility (in bold) below. This document has taken what the Board passed in June 1997. Some of the language is the same. PWC has attempted only to create a clear document to operationalize salary increases to add to the Handbook. It also removes performance evaluation language. PWC feels that the performance evaluation process should be a separate section of the handbook and cross-referenced.

Bowling Green State University administrative staff are eligible for yearly salary increases based on meritorious performance. Meritorious performance promotes employee recruitment and retention, rewards performance of duties and responsibilities and provides incentives that encourage distinguished, innovative and creative achievements to meet unusual challenges and opportunities when they arise.

Definition of Merit

Merit is a salary increment that is awarded for performance of duties that meet or exceed unit expectations.

Merit Determination

Merit will be determined based on the following:

- Exceeds expectations
- Meets expectations
- Does not meet expectations

Merit Eligibility (PASTED IN FROM OTHER Document already before administration)
Continuing University funded full-time and part-time staff members are eligible for consideration for full merit. In addition, staff members employed for one calendar year or less will be considered as follows:

Administrative staff members employed by December 31 are eligible for consideration for a full merit increase for the next year.

Administrative staff members employed after December 31 are eligible for consideration for a merit increase on a pro-rated basis.

Approved by Administrative Staff Council Executive Committee November 24, 1998

Determination of Salary Increases

Salary increases are determined by the job performance of an employee as assessed by the administrative staff performance appraisal process. (Cross-reference when this is developed)

Performing one’s job at a level that exceeds satisfactory levels and expectations will result in additional salary increase provided the merit pool for the year is above 3%. (See below)

Performing one’s job at a satisfactory level and meeting expectations will result in a merit increase.

Failure to perform one’s job at a satisfactory level and does not meet expectations will result in no salary increase.

Establishment of Merit Criteria (This probably needs some more work and perhaps more specific timelines)

Merit criteria must be established each year and made known prior to June 30 of the of the prior contract year.
Each department should meet prior to every new contract year to discuss what constitutes meritorious performance. Each administrative staff member should have a clear understanding of what will constitute meritorious performance for the new contract year as a part of the year end performance appraisal process. (Cross-reference)

Individual discussions about merit criteria between administrative staff and supervisors should be ongoing and part of the performance appraisal process.

Administrative staff and supervisors should also meet at mid-year to change or fine-tune merit criteria. (Cross-reference performance evaluation).

Distribution of Salary Increase (This section already approved by Board in merit document)

If the total merit pool for salary increments in a given year is three percent (3%) or less, all employees who qualify for merit in their annual performance reviews will receive the same percentage increase in salary.

If the total merit pool for salary increments in a given year is more than three percent (3%) but less than five percent (5%), it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

a. Three percent (3%) of the total salaries of employees shall be allocated as a three percent (3%) increase in salary to all employees who qualify for merit based on their annual performance reviews.

b. The remaining difference between the total merit pool and the three percent (3%) of the total salaries of the administrative staff shall be allocated to departments and units for recognition of those employees whose level of performance exceeds department or unit expectations as defined by the merit policy of the department or unit.

If the total merit pool is five percent (5%) or more, it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

a. Sixty percent (60%) shall be allocated to departments/units to be used as an equal percentage increase in salary to all employees who meet or exceed department/unit expectations and thereby qualify for merit in their annual performance reviews.

b. Forty percent (40%) shall be allocated to departments/units for recognition and reward of those employees whose level of performance exceeds department/unit expectations as defined by the merit policy of the department/unit.

Any administrative staff member who is not satisfied with his/her salary increase can pursue the conciliation process. (Cross reference)
Administrative Staff Salary Increases

Draft 1/6/99

Note: There are NO new concepts here with the exception of the section on eligibility (in bold) below. This document has taken what the Board passed in June 1997. Some of the language is the same. PWC has attempted only to create a clear document to operationalize salary increases to add to the handbook. It also removes performance evaluation language. PWC feels that the performance evaluation process should be a separate section of the handbook and cross-referenced.

Bowling Green State University administrative staff are eligible for yearly salary increases based on meritorious performance. Meritorious performance promotes employee recruitment and retention, rewards performance of duties and responsibilities, and provides incentives that encourage distinguished, innovative and creative achievements to meet unusual challenges and opportunities when they arise.

Definition of Merit

Merit is a salary increment that is awarded for performance of duties that meet or exceed unit expectations.

Merit Determination

Merit will be determined based on the following:

- Does not meet expectations
- Meets expectations
- Exceeds expectations

Merit Eligibility (PASTED IN FROM OTHER Document already before administration)

Continuing University funded full-time and part-time staff members are eligible for consideration for full merit. In addition, staff members employed for one calendar year or less will be considered as follows:

Administrative staff members employed by December 31 are eligible for consideration for a full merit increase for the next year.

Administrative staff members employed after December 31 are eligible for consideration for a merit increase on a pro-rated basis.

Approved by Administrative Staff Council Executive Committee November 24, 1998

Determination of Salary Increases

Salary increases are determined by the job performance of an employee as assessed by the administrative staff performance appraisal process. (Cross-reference when this is developed)

Failure to perform one’s job at a satisfactory level and does not meet expectations will result in no salary increase.

Performing one’s job at a satisfactory level and meeting expectations will result in a merit increase.

Performing one’s job at a level that exceeds satisfactory levels and expectations will result in additional salary increase provided the merit pool for the year is above 3%. (See below)
Establishment of Merit Criteria (This probably needs some more work and perhaps more specific timelines)

Merit criteria must be established each year and made known prior to the June 30 of the prior contract year.

Each unit should meet prior to every new contract year to discuss what constitutes meritorious performance for that area as a whole.

Individual discussions about merit criteria between administrative staff and supervisors should be ongoing and part of the performance appraisal process.

Each administrative staff member should have a clear understanding of what will constitute meritorious performance for the new contract year as a part of the year end performance appraisal process. (Cross-reference)

Administrative staff and supervisors should also meet at mid-year to change or fine-tune merit criteria. (Cross reference performance evaluation).

Distribution of Salary Increase (This section already approved by Board in merit document)

If the total merit pool for salary increments in a given year is three percent (3%) or less, all employees who qualify for merit in their annual performance reviews will receive the same percentage increase in salary.

If the total merit pool for salary increments in a given year is more than three percent (3%) but less than five percent (5%), it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

a. Three percent (3%) of the total salaries of employees shall be allocated as a three percent (3%) increase in salary to all employees who qualify for merit based on their annual performance reviews.

b. The remaining difference between the total merit pool and the three percent (3%) of the total salaries of the administrative staff shall be allocated to departments and units for recognition of those employees whose level of performance exceeds department or unit expectations as defined by the merit policy of the department or unit.

If the total merit pool is five percent (5%) or more, it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

a. Sixty percent (60%) shall be allocated to departments/units to be used as an equal percentage increase in salary to all employees who meet or exceed department/unit expectations and thereby qualify for merit in their annual performance reviews.

b. Forty percent (40%) shall be allocated to departments/units for recognition and reward of those employees whose level of performance exceeds department/unit expectations as defined by the merit policy of the department/unit.
Jane Schimpf, 2/1/99 9:50 AM -0500, Admin. Staff advancement

X-Sender: schimpf@mailbox.bgsu.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
Date: Mon, 01 Feb 1999 09:50:02 -0500
To: dboyce@bgnet.bgsu.edu, pgreen@bgnet.bgsu.edu
From: Jane Schimpf <schimpf@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Subject: Admin. Staff advancement
Cc: KPOGAN@bgnet.bgsu.edu

I don't know the all the answers. I'm an advocate for hiring the best qualified person available whether they are here or elsewhere. My beef is that often those hired from the outside earn higher salaries than those promoted from within for comparable positions. I thought we had a statement in our handbook: about this issue, but it wasn't there when I just looked. I'm passing your concerns up the chain.

Jane

> X-Sender: k pog an@mailbox.bgsu.edu
> Date: Mon, 01 Feb 1999 09:07:32 -0500
> To: schimpf@bgnet.bgsu.edu
> From: "KEITH A. POGAN" <KPOGAN@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
> Subject: Admin. Staff advancement
>
> When was the last time Admin. Staff discussed/looked into the
> limited opportunities for advancement in Admin. Staff positions. Why does
> this University spend money doing searches all the time when qualified
> people exist here? Why not establish a policy where current Admin. staff who
> meet agreed upon criteria are hired instead of going outside?
>
> Keith A. Pogan

> >>>
> >>> Never try to baptize a cat and always wear a hat when feeding seagulls.
> >>>

Jane Schimpf
Assistant Vice President
Auxiliary Services
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403-0330

E-mail: schimpf@bgnet.bgsu.edu
Phone: (419)372-2238
Fax: (372)372-0311
We have a number of items for discussion! Any other items, please email me. Thanks! See you tomorrow.

Deb

ASC Executive Committee Meeting
Founders Club 57
February 2, 1999
11:45 a.m. - 1:15 p.m.

1. Merit document and clarifying questions/concerns
   (Pat already sent documents electronically)

2. Alternative Retirement Plan -- Constituent Resources

3. Social Security Modifications -- threat to STRS/PERS

4. Promotion from within -- handbook policy?

5. Handbook changes to BOT -- by mid-February

4. ASC Replacements for:
   a. Shelley Applebaum on ASC and ASC Exec
   b. Craig Bedra on ASC

5. Communication of University Closing Criteria

6. Agenda for 2/4 ASC mtg. -- 2 guests:
   Donna Wittwer on Alternative Retirement Plan
   Sue Sopa/Marcia Latta on the "Family Campaign"

"Life is like riding a bicycle. You don't fall off unless you stop pedaling." Claude Pepper
Greetings,

Because we didn't meet this month, I feel the need to schedule a meeting and update you regarding new information.

Amendments and Bylaws Meeting

October 2, 1997

* Discussed the timeline for amending the Bylaws and estimated that we should target the February ASC meeting date for presenting amendment proposals to ASC. Proposals would be discussed and amended or voted on at the February meeting. (Approved amendments are effective immediately.

* Brainstormed goals and decided to:
  1. Identify and ensure that previously approved amendments to Bylaws and Charter are included in the next revision.
  2. Work with other ASC committees toward developing amendments that affect the Bylaws and Charter;
  3. Propose to amend/add a section to the Bylaws and procedures to follow for getting amendments into the Board's approval by ASC and/or the Board of Trustees.

**UPDATE**

Since our October 3 meeting, Mary Beth has researched relative to goal #3, and learned that there is no requirement ensuring that amendments get into the Handbook. She used her research to have proposals to change the Handbook in the next revision. The obvious problem with this deadline was that the Board did not agree on the process for forwarding proposals. Sometimes haphazard.

There are two basic types of changes to the Handbook: those that require Board of Trustees approval and those that don't (e.g., non-substantive changes including typographical or grammatical changes, automatic changes). Changes can be initiated by ASC, Human Resources, or the Administration (as in the case of federal mandates such as FMLA).

According to H.R., for changes requiring Board approval, H.R. would need the proposal in time to allow for the following process to take place:

1. H.R. prepares the documents in the style preferred by the Board
2. H.R. sends the formatted document to the Provost's Office for approval
3. The Provost's Office would forward the document to the Secretary to the Board for distribution to Board members well in advance of the meeting at which they will vote on the proposal

Non-substantive changes follow the same route except the process ends at the Provost/President level. Any federally mandated changes (facilitated by H.R.) are incorporated at the time the Board passes them. "Automatic" changes such as the administrative staff compensation table would not require a formal review process.

Do you think we should rethink our estimated date for submitting proposals?
Greetings,

Because we didn't meet this month, I feel the need to recap our last meeting and to update you regarding new information.

Amendments and Bylaws Meeting
October 2, 1997

* Discussed the timeline for amending the Bylaws and Charter, and we estimated that we should target the February ASC meeting as the latest date for presenting amendment proposals to ASC. Proposals presented in February would be discussed and amended or voted on at the March ASC meeting. (Approved amendments are effective immediately.)

* Brainstormed goals and decided to:
  1. Identify and ensure that previously approved amendments to the Bylaws and Charter are included in the next revision of the Handbook;
  2. Work with other ASC committees toward developing amendments that affect the Bylaws and Charter; and
  3. Propose to amend/add a section to the Bylaws and Charter on procedures to follow for getting amendments into the Handbook following their approval by ASC and/or the Board of Trustees.

UPDATE
Since our October 3 meeting, Mary Beth has researched the existing process relative to goal #3, and learned that there is no "real" system for ensuring that amendments get into the Handbook. Human Resources used to expect to have proposals to change the Handbook by October/November. The obvious problem with this deadline was the timeframe for ASC. Furthermore the "process" for forwarding proposals from that point was sometimes haphazard.

There are two basic types of changes to the Handbook:
1. Those that require approval by the Board of Trustees and those that don't (e.g., nonsubstantive changes including typographical or grammatical changes, automatic changes). Changes can be initiated by ASC, Human Resources, or the Administration (as in the case of federal mandates such as FMLA).

According to H.R., for changes requiring Board approval, H.R. would need the proposal in time to allow for the following process to take place:
1. H.R. formats the documents in the style preferred by the Board
2. H.R. sends the formatted document to the Provost's Office for approval
3. The Provost's Office would forward the document to the Secretary to the Board for distribution to Board members well in advance of the meeting at which they will vote on the proposal

Nonsubstantive changes follow the same route except the process ends at the Provost/President level. Any federally mandated changes (facilitated by H.R.) are incorporated at the time the Board passes them. "Automatic" changes such as the administrative staff compensation table would not require a formal review process.

Do you think we should rethink our estimated date for submitting proposals
to ASC?

John and Matt, I recall that one or both of you began to review the Handbook to identify which amendments passed by ASC in recent years are not included in the Handbook. Would you agree to do a thorough review - and report your findings at our next meeting (Dec. 4)? I can think of two missing amendments off the top of my head: the Internal Affairs and the External Affairs Committees are now standing committees by amendment.

Mary Beth and I will work on the amendment follow-up process with the goal of proposing an amendment to the Handbook in this regard.

I will be attending a meeting of the Internal Affairs Committee at noon in the Pheasant Room tomorrow, November 19 to explore apportionment options for ASC elections. If you are interested, please feel welcome to join the group.

That's it for now. Next Amendments/Bylaws meeting is noon, Pheasant Room, December 4.

Thanks,
Beverly

Beverly J. Stearns, Director
Human Resources and Outreach Services for Libraries and Learning Resources
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
Phone: (419) 372-2856
Fax: (419) 372-7996
Internet: bstearn@bgnet.bgsu.edu
Agenda for ASC meeting
Thursday, February 4, 1999
1:30-3:00
Alumni Room- University Union

Call to Order
Introduction of Substitutes
Introduction of New Member

Guest Speakers: Donna Wittwer- Alternative Retirement Plan
Marcia Latta and Sue Sopa- Family Campaign

Approval of Minutes
Chair's Report
Chair-Elect's Report
Secretary's Report
Committee Reports
- Amendments
- External Affairs
- Awards and Special Recognition
- Internal Affairs - Linda Hamilton
- Personnel Welfare - Pat Griffin
- Professional Development
- Scholarship
- Promotion of Administrative Staff Teaching Compensation Policies
- Ad Hoc Committee on Administrative Staff Teaching Compensation Policies

Discussion Items
1. unit-level discussions of mid year performance evaluation process and merit criteria - are they taking place? development, merit reviews, exceed expectations?
2. bonuses - not tied to base tied to base super merit
don't job - get full merit

Old Business
New Business
Good of the Order
Adjourn

Final page

Printed for "Deborah S. Boyce" <dboyce@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
May 5, 1998

Tony Bocanegra

This is an

issue that could

really hurt us. We

need to do all we
can to make the case to

Sidney: can do all we
can to make the case to

May 12, 1998

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

MAY 12 1998

Dr. Sidney A. Pibeau
President
Bowling Green State University
220 McFall Center
Bowling Green, OH 43403-0001

Dear Dr. Pibeau:

I am writing to make you aware of a potential federal mandate that could impact all public employees. Congress and the Clinton Administration may consider the recommendation of the Social Security Advisory Council that all state and local employees be covered by Social Security as a means to lessen the financial crisis of the Social Security system.

Recently, General Accounting Office (GAO) investigators visited Ohio to examine the state's five public employee retirement systems. It is my understanding that GAO is visiting every state whose state and local employees primarily do not participate in the Social Security system, as part of a study requested by Congressman Jim Bunning, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security. This study is examining the effect of implementing the Social Security Advisory Council's recommendation that all state and local employees be covered by Social Security and if systems, state plans, like Ohio's, are funded better than Social Security.

Ohio's public retirement systems cover teachers, school employees, police and firemen, the highway patrol, and state and local government employees. The largest system, the Public Employee Retirement System (PEPS), has over 600,000 members and benefit recipients. As you know, PEPS is pre-funded, with benefits financed over a working career. The largest source of income of the system is investment return. The system provides a tremendous amount of capital in the economy while providing higher benefits than Social Security.

If required to pay Social Security, adding full cost of the FICA tax to the PEPS tax would create an enormous unfunded mandate on states and localities. If no new costs are to be created, PEPS benefits would need to be lowered, such as abandoning health care coverage for retirees. In addition, the stability of the system for current recipients could...
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be undermined as fewer dollars are available for investment. If the current levels of
benefits were to be maintained by integrating PERS and Social Security benefits,
additional costs likely would be in range of 6% to 7% of covered payroll.

Mandatory inclusion of state and local employees will not solve the Social Security
system's financial difficulties. Universal state and local participation would provide an
immediate infusion of funds, but the long-term liabilities associated with new
beneficiaries under Social Security's pay-as-you-go system only would exacerbate the
long-run funding crisis. Public employees would be forced to participate in a poorly
funded system with future benefits at risk.

Preliminary meetings with representatives from Ohio's five public employee retirement systems
to discuss the impact of mandatory participation in Social Security. We agreed it is
important to act now, before this proposal receives widespread support. Toward that end,
I have corresponded on this issue with the members of Ohio's congressional delegation as
well as Speaker Gingrich and Senator Lott. Enclosed are copies of my letters for your
information.

I respectfully urge your opposition to any attempt to require state and local employees to
participate in Social Security, and I encourage you to contact Congress and the
Administration to express concern. Thank you for your consideration of this issue.

Sincerely,

George V. Voinovich
Governor
Dear Faculty Member,

As many of you know, the State Teachers Retirement System is threatened by a proposal from a bipartisan National Commission on Retirement Policy which calls for mandatory Social Security coverage for all new public employees. The rationale for the proposal is to preserve the current Social Security System. Since this proposed measure would have a VERY SERIOUS AND PROFOUNDLY NEGATIVE IMPACT ON BENEFITS to both retired and practicing public employees provided through the State Teachers Retirement System, I urge you to use the following prototype letter and send it to as many of the legislators listed below to express your displeasure for the inclusion of all future state employees into the Social Security System. Since this is a very important issue to most of us, a hard copy of the following prototype letter and the addresses of those government officials involved in this decision will be distributed through the campus mail in the very near future.

Sincerely,

Veronica Gold, Faculty Senate Chair

Dear (Insert Name of Public Official Here),

My name is _______ and I am a member of the Ohio State Teachers Retirement System and a faculty member at Bowling Green State University. My purpose in writing you is to express my concern about the possibility of mandatory Social Security coverage.

While the Social Security System does function as a safety net for millions...

Printed for lweiss@bignet.bgsu.edu
Chris Dalton, 9/6/98 4:20 PM - O600 Social Security Letter

> Of our senior citizens, it does require some restructuring if it is to
> continue to meet the future needs of retired U.S. citizens. However, I
> believe that mandatory coverage of public employees through Social Security
> is a very good remedy for the ills of the current Social Security System
> for these reasons:
>
> Mandated Social Security coverage for all newly hired state and local
> government workers threatens the financial well-being of the very sound,
> secure and long-standing retirement plans in Ohio and other states like
> California, Texas, Illinois and Massachusetts.
>
> The addition of non-covered employees would not fix the basic problems
> with Social Security because the additional income they would provide in
> the short term would produce a long-term liability when these individuals
> reach retirement and begin receiving Social Security benefits. This has
> been proven in the past and the solvency of Social Security has not
> improved even with the addition of new employees to its rolls.
>
> The investment income generated by both the employees and employer
> contributions to Ohio's State Teachers Retirement System would be severely
> cut by the transfer of their contributions to Social Security. It is not
> logical that the transfer of one retirement program should result directly in
> the weakening of another EFFECTIVE retirement program.
>
> The cost of funding pensions for Ohio's teachers would increase, resulting
> in the possible reduction of benefits to Ohio's current and future
> retirees.
>
> The investment of state retirement funds support Ohio's economy and the
> nation. The reduction of state pension investment leads to a reduction of
> Ohio capital investment.
>
> Ohio would not receive any tax revenue from Social Security payments. The
> potential loss of tax revenue from mandatory Social Security coverage could
> lead to increased state taxes.
>
> Ohio's State Teachers Retirement System (STRS) existed before the advent
> of Social Security and was actually prevented from joining when Social
> Security was established. Obviously, the STRS has achieved more success in
> meeting the needs of its clients so its policies and investment practices
> should be utilized by Social Security reformers.
>
> Ohio's retirement programs offer extensive portability options to its
> members and this element of portability does lead to improved retirement
> benefits to former members. The Social Security System does not have the
> corner on portability.
>
> Thank you very much for your prompt and immediate advocacy for the
> preservation of Ohio's State Teachers Retirement System. I sincerely
> express my gratitude for your support of Ohio's faculty through your
> efforts to strengthen the Social Security System without sacrificing Ohio's
> retirement program in the process. Please keep me informed of your
> position and the progress of any proposed legislation regarding revisions
> into the Social Security System.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Addresses of Federal Officials Developing Social Security Policy
>
> Executive Branch
This new questionnaire was developed by the Office of Institutional Research in consultation with the President’s Cabinet, Human Resources, and Administrative and Classified Staff Councils. It was sent to all staff (full- and part-time, Bowling Green and Firelands campuses) employed as of October 1, 1998. Of the 1,515 administrative (536) and classified (969) staff who received the questionnaire, 1,003 or 65% responded.

The 27 questionnaire items group into 6 categories:

- satisfaction with one’s current job
- satisfaction with the climate for supervision and empowerment
- satisfaction with department and coworkers
- satisfaction with the University and University policies
- satisfaction with workload and salary
- satisfaction with work conditions

Questionnaire items associated with the greatest degree of satisfaction ranged across categories including the University and University policies, department and coworkers, current job, and supervision/empowerment, and included:

- BGSU as an employer (83% very satisfied or satisfied)
- how my department treats or interacts with students (81%)
- my current job at BGSU (77%)
- my ability to influence the way work is done (76%)

The items associated with the lowest degree of satisfaction all fell into the category called the University and University policies. They were:

- BGSU’s awards for employee excellence and service (32% very satisfied or satisfied)
- my chances for a job promotion (36%)
- how I hear about policies, decisions, and changes that affect my job (38%)
- the job being done by BGSU’s top management (38%)
- how well performance evaluations have helped me to do my job better (40%)

Of the 63 significant group differences found among the 27 questionnaire items:

- seventeen (27%) were between administrative and classified staff, with administrative staff almost always being more satisfied.
- sixteen (25%) were across years of experience at BGSU, with those with fewer years at the University consistently being more satisfied.
- eleven (17%) were across years of experience in one’s current job, with fewer years on the job being consistently associated with greater satisfaction.
- ten (16%) were across divisions, with staff in the President’s division being more satisfied than staff in other divisions for seven of the questionnaire items, staff in the Provost’s area more satisfied once, and staff in University Advancement less satisfied for four of the items.
- three (5%) were by age, with younger staff being more satisfied.
- three (5%) were by gender, with males more satisfied on two items and females on one.
- two (3%) were by employment status; full-time staff were more satisfied with benefits while part-time and temporary staff were more satisfied with their salaries.
- one (2%) was by ethnicity, with persons of color being less satisfied with the help that they have received from other employees in their department (not their supervisors) to do a good job.
1. Performance Evaluation Process -- Mid-Year Reviews

- the baseline for meritorious performance is performing one's job satisfactorily as defined by job description/job responsibilities
- unit merit criteria for performance that exceeds expectations needs to be understood by staff members in the unit
- there needs to be some "objectified" quantifiable standards for measuring merit unit by unit that are understood by unit members
- merit distribution as stated in merit document passed by the BOT is different from the old system whereby supervisors could award a .5% increase for one person, 1.5% to another and 5.5% to another
- the salary pool not awarded in areas is to be spent on professional development for those deemed non-meritorious
- how will we reward those who perform beyond expectations if salary pool is under 3 percent? bonus pool outside of salary pool?
- pro-rated merit proposal -- ASC passed on 12/3

2. Merit -- how to communicate to supervisors that:
- unit merit criteria for performance that exceeds expectations needs to be understood by staff members in the unit
- there needs to be some "objectified" quantifiable standards for measuring merit unit by unit that are understood by unit members
- merit distribution as stated in merit document passed by the BOT is different from the old system whereby supervisors could award a .5% increase for one person, 1.5% to another and 5.5% to another
- the salary pool not awarded in areas is to be spent on professional development for those deemed non-meritorious
- how will we reward those who perform beyond expectations if salary pool is under 3 percent? bonus pool outside of salary pool?
- pro-rated merit proposal -- ASC passed on 12/3

3. Administrative Staff Position Reevaluation Review Team

- update on team's status -- training completed?
- number of positions currently being re-evaluated?
Superspeedydriven + continues to-notch- this job up.
Can say yes - there is a ceiling

Christian arguments - Megan and but

Minimum-satisfactory-performance - exceeds expectation

Some units are looking at other one raising the ball

#2: Merit document + change basics under
Try this for a year - since most - pub will sell what units care up for - satisfactorily
Only limited problem - exceed expectations
To: dboyce@bgnet.bgsu.edu, lopez@wbgu.bgsu.edu, jblim@bgnet.bgsu.edu, white@bgnet.bgsu.edu, pgreen@bgnet.bgsu.edu, lhamill@bgnet.bgsu.edu, lwaggon@bgnet.bgsu.edu, wells@opie.bgsu.edu, nzachar@bgnet.bgsu.edu, jskoas@bgnet.bgsu.edu

Subject: 2/16 ASC Exec Agenda

We have a number of items for discussion! Any other items, please email me. Thanks! See you tomorrow.

Deb

ASC Executive Committee Meeting
Founders Club 57
February 16, 1999
11:45 a.m. - 1:15 p.m.

1. Update on 2/12 mtg. with Chuck and Becca (see attached agenda)

2. Social Security Modifications -- threat to STRS/PERS (document distributed at last ASC Exec mtg.)

3. Agenda for ASC Leadership Team mtg. with SAR

Deborah S. Boyce, APR
Asst. to the Vice President for University Advancement
Doctoral Student, School of Communication Studies
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403-0050
dboyce@bgnet.bgsu.edu
voice: 419.372.7681
fax: 419.372.7697

"Life is like riding a bicycle. You don't fall off unless you stop pedaling." Claude Pepper
Administrative Staff Compensation Plan

Draft worked on with Pat Green, Pat Patton, Rebecca Ferguson and Donna Wittwer February 26, 1998 – Red is input from HR, blue underlined is where there may be problems, blue non-underlined is collaborative writing or can be numbers of weeks versus writing out the number

In order for Bowling Green State University (BGSU) to attract and retain qualified administrative employees, it is BGSU's policy to maintain fair and competitive salary levels and pay ranges without regard to race, color, religion, gender, national origin, age, veteran status or disability status.

The purpose of the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan is to establish a system in place that reflects:

- Relationships between positions and their worth
- The principles of equal pay for equal work
- Competition with the external employment market

SCOPE

The policies and procedures contained here and apply to all administrative staff positions except for President, provost, vice presidents, Deans and all faculty contract positions with administrative duties and postdoctoral employees. The policies and procedures define the operation of the compensation plan for the covered positions and take precedence over any other understandings, implied or otherwise.

1. Objectives

It is the intent of the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan to:

A. Administer the Plan in accordance to the general policies of the University.

B. Provide a compensation plan that is internally equitable and externally competitive with the market and with other universities of similar size and mission in the State of Ohio.

C. Ensure equal pay for positions requiring similar educational levels, experience levels, skills, effort, working conditions and levels of responsibilities.

D. Ensure the administration of the position evaluations and salary level assignments are consistent and uniform throughout the University.

E. Provide for a process that will identify inequities and allow for the maintenance of competitive salary levels.

F. Provide policies and procedures which ensure the Plan will be equitably and efficiently administered.

2. Glossary

The following terms are used in the Administrative Compensation Plan:

A. Administrative Staff Review Team Members

The administrative staff review team is comprised of 12 administrative staff members selected by the ASC executive committee. They will collaborate with Human Resources in the re-evaluation of position analyses questionnaires. These staff members will be trained by Human Resources and past ASC members of the appeals committee to analyze, evaluate and assign a salary level (numeric ranking) to a position within the Compensation Plan. Each time an administrative staff position is re-evaluated two
members of this team will work with Human Resources. These two members will be selected by Human Resources from two different vice-presidential areas. Members of this team will also participate in the appeals process. (Team members involved in the initial evaluation of a position will not be eligible to participate in the appeals process for that position.)

B. Human Resource/Administrative Staff Review Team
Two members of the Human Resources staff and two members of the Administrative Staff Review Team comprise the HR/ASC Review Team. This team is responsible for analyzing, evaluating and assigning a salary level.

C. Pay Range
The pay range is the span of dollars in a particular salary level. Each pay range will have a designated minimum, midpoint and maximum.

D. Position Analysis Questionnaire
The position analysis questionnaire is the instrument used to describe the position responsibilities. This questionnaire is used by the Review Team and/or Human Resources to determine the salary level of an administrative staff position based upon the level of knowledge and experience, creativity and complexity, impact on the institutional Mission internal and external contacts and leadership. It must be completed in order for any administrative staff position to be created and/or changed.

E. Salary Level
The salary level is the numeric ranking of administrative staff positions within the administrative staff compensation plan.

3. Policies and Procedures
The following policies and procedures have been established for the maintenance and management of the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan.

A. New Administrative Staff Hire:
New administrative staff will generally be hired between the minimum and midpoint of a salary level. A salary assigned above the midpoint will require prior approval by the area vice-president, after consultation with the Offices of Human Resources and Affirmative Action. (Approved by Board)

B. Upgrade
Definition:
An upgrade occurs when a position is reevaluated and assigned to a higher salary level as a result of significant expansion in the position's existing duties and responsibilities.

Policy:
An employee is guaranteed at least a 5% increase in salary or the minimum salary for the new level, whichever is greater. (Already approved by Board)

C. Promotion
Definition:
A promotion occurs when an employee moves from a position requiring a certain level of skill, effort and responsibility to a position assigned to a higher salary level requiring a significantly greater degree of skill, effort and responsibility.

Policy:
An employee is guaranteed at least a 5% increase in salary or the minimum salary for the new level, whichever is greater. (Approved by Board) The increase will be effective at the time of the promotion, and will be in addition to any general and merit increases for which the employee may be eligible.
D. Interim/Acting Positions
Definition:
Interim/acting is when an administrative staff member is assigned to a position in a higher salary level on an interim/temporary/acting basis.

Policy:
If the assignment is longer than 30 calendar days, s/he will receive a premium for the time served equal to at least a 5% increase in salary or the minimum for the new level, whichever is higher. (Approved by Board)

E. Demotion
Definition:
A demotion occurs when an incumbent administrative staff member moves from a position requiring a certain level of skill, effort and responsibility to another position assigned to a lower salary level requiring a lesser degree of skill, effort and responsibility.

Policy:
When a demotion occurs, the incumbent’s salary will be reduced to a level in the new pay range equivalent to his/her level in the original range. (Approved by Board) The President in consultation with the Vice President and Human Resources must approve any exceptions to this policy.

F. Downgrade
Definition:
A downgrade occurs when a position is reassigned to a lower salary level as a result of significant reduction in the position’s existing duties and responsibilities.

Policy:
When a position downgrade occurs, the employee’s salary will be reduced to a level in the new pay range equivalent to his/her level in the original range. The President in consultation with the Vice President and Human Resources must approve any exceptions to this policy.

G. Transfer
Definition:
A transfer is a lateral move from a position requiring a certain level of skill, effort and responsibility to another position requiring the same degree of skill, effort and responsibility and assigned to the same salary level.

Policy:
When a transfer occurs, normally the employee’s salary will not be adjusted. (Approved by Board). The President in consultation with the Vice President and Human Resources must approve any exceptions to this policy.

H. Market Exceptions
Definition:
A market exception is a special premium, which is established for particular positions when unusual market conditions exist causing excessive turnover, salary midpoints well below market average, and/or failure of current salary to attract qualified candidates.

Policy:
A special market premium may be established for these positions. (Approved by Board)

I. Pay above Maximum Policy:
Employee salaries will be capped at the maximum or above the maximum of a pay range. However, those administrative staff whose salaries are already above the maximum will be exempt for a period of three years. Effective July 2000, the salaries of any staff still above maximum will be frozen until such time as those salaries are within range. If at any time during the three years a staff member’s salary should fall within
range, the exemption ceases to apply to that staff member and the maximum will be enforced. (Approved by Board)

Staff members who are at the maximum will be entitled to an increase equivalent to the percentage adjustment of the pay range providing that increase is the same percentage as across the board.

Staff members at the maximum and above the maximum may be eligible to be considered each year for a lump sum/one time merit based bonus not to exceed the percentage of the salary pool designated for merit each year. This bonus will not be added to their base salary.

J. Progression through the Pay Range

Definition:
Progression through a pay range is the method by which administrative staff employee's moves through the pay ranges.

Policy:
Administrative staff members will progress through the pay range based on meritorious performance. Human Resources, in conjunction with Administrative Staff Council executive committee, will develop criteria and a process by which staff can reach the midpoint of any pay range within a period of time contingent on availability of University resources.

Note: While the pay ranges increase annually at 1% less than the total raise (combination of merit and across the board increase) it is recommended that administrative staff members receive an across the board increase equivalent to the increase in the pay range, i.e. if the total raise is 3% and the pay range increases by 2% the across the board raise should be 2%. This prevents staff members from moving backward in the pay level and possibly falling below the minimum. (This paragraph will be eliminated when it goes to the Board)

K. Title Revision

Policy:
In the event of a request for a title change to more accurately reflect position responsibilities, a position analysis questionnaire must be completed and forwarded to Human Resources according to the established procedures. If the evaluation does not result in a higher salary level, but the title accurately reflects the responsibilities, the HR/ASC Review Team will recommend the title be changed. No title change will occur without approval from the divisional vice president and Human Resources.

L. Salary Range Adjustments

Policy:
Beginning in 1987-88 the ranges for each salary level will be adjusted in a three-year recurring cycle. In the first two years of the cycle, the ranges of each level will move up annually by an amount that is 1% less than the average salary increment paid to administrative staff that year. (Approved by Board)

Every third year beginning with 1999-2000, the University will conduct a reevaluation of the ranges in light of current market conditions, as well as other relevant factors, and adjust the ranges in light of that reevaluation. (Approved by Board)

4. Administrative Compensation Plan Position Evaluation Process
The position evaluation process is the method by which positions are evaluated against a uniform set of criteria and assigned to established salary levels to establish equity. Positions are evaluated or re-evaluated based on changes in positions. Human Resources conduct the evaluations for new positions. Human Resources in consultation with the Administrative Staff Review Team conduct the re-evaluation of existing positions.

It is anticipated positions will be re-evaluated no more than once every two years.

Positions are evaluated when one of the following occurs:

1. A new position is created. The supervisor, area head, dean or vice-president, in consultation with Human Resources, is responsible for preparing a position analysis.

2. A position becomes vacant. The evaluation is initiated by the supervisor to ensure the position is equitably placed in the administrative staff compensation plan.

Positions are re-evaluated when one of the following occurs:

1. A significant change in responsibility in an existing position. A re-evaluation is initiated by the incumbent or the supervisor to ensure the duties and responsibilities are appropriately reflected in the position's salary level and compensation.

2. Reorganization occurs. The evaluations are initiated by the area head, dean or vice-president prior to the reorganization and in consultation with Human Resources. Reorganization could result in significant changes in position responsibilities. Re-evaluations of the positions are necessary to assign salary levels and establish equity.

Policy:
Position evaluations are to be completed in 12 weeks unless there is mutual agreement between the parties.

Process for Re-Evaluation of Administrative Staff Position:

1. Initiator of review (employee, supervisor, area head, or vice-president) notifies Human Resources in writing that a position needs to be evaluated. Human Resources will send a position analysis questionnaire either campus mail or electronic format within two business days. Human Resources logs the completed job analysis questionnaire from date of receipt and begin a tracking/timeline.

2. Initiator of the review (employee, supervisor, area head, or vice-president) completes the questionnaire. If the initiator is the employee the completed questionnaire is forwarded to the immediate supervisor and then to the next level of supervision for signature and comment. When the initiator is the supervisor, area head or vice president, the supervisor should meet with the incumbent to discuss position responsibilities and obtain signature on the questionnaire. The supervisor comments, signs and forwards the questionnaire within 10 working days to the next level of supervision. Supervisor and employee should both maintain a copy.

3. Upon receipt of the questionnaire, the second level supervisor evaluates, comments, signs and forwards within 10 working days to Human Resources.

4. Human Resources reviews all documents for completeness, gathers additional information as needed and distributes to the HR/ASC review team within 10 working days. The HR/ASC Review Team has 10
working days from receipt of information to analyze and point the position based on the established criteria. In the event the HR/ASC review team requests additional information, HP will gather the additional information and forward to the team.

5. Human Resources forward the results of the evaluation to the appropriate vice-president for consideration within 5 working days.

6. The vice-president shall review all documents and forward their written decision to Human Resources. In the event the vice-president does not agree with the results of the HR/ASC Review Team, Human Resources work in conjunction with the vice-president. A final determination will be made within 10 working days.

7. Human Resources will forward copies of the results and the factor sheet to the employee and the appropriate supervisory structure. If additional information is needed, it can be requested from Human Resources.

8. Employees or initiators of the analysis who do not agree with the final determination may follow the Appeal/Mediation process.

1. Vice-presidential Meeting/Appeals Process

Purpose:
The purpose of the vice-presidential meeting/mediation/appeals process is to ensure prompt resolution of disagreements regarding the results of a position evaluation and subsequent placement in the Administrative Compensation Plan.

There are three steps and employee can take:

1. Meet directly with the area vice-president to discuss (with the supervisor present), if appropriate*
2. Request a mediation board
3. Request an appeals board

* In some circumstances the staff member can choose to skip this step and proceed to mediation.

A. Vice-presidential Meeting

Purpose:
The purpose of the vice-presidential review is to give the staff member/initiator and the vice-president an opportunity to resolve the complaint in a collaborative and informal fashion. A representative from Human Resources and the ASC Review Team should be present if requested. The parties should complete the vice-presidential meeting within six weeks unless there is mutual agreement.

Process:

The staff member/initiator has 5 working days after receiving the results of the evaluation to inform Human Resources, the immediate supervisor and vice-president in writing the specific concerns about the position re-evaluation and the intent to schedule an appointment with the vice-president.
At the time of the request, Human Resources will forward all necessary documentation to the area vice-president within 10 working days. During this ten-day working period the staff member will schedule an appointment with the vice-president. At this time, the staff member or vice-president may request the presence of HR and an ASC review team member.

After the meeting, the vice-president submits a decision in writing to the employee and copy Human Resources within 5 working days.

After the meeting, the staff member/initiator submits an opinion in writing to the vice-president and copy to Human Resources within 5 working days.

If the meeting results in a higher salary level for the position in question, Human Resources will negotiate the effective date of the increase with the vice-president.

If the meeting results in no change in the salary level for the position, and the staff member/initiator is not satisfied with the meeting process, she/he can proceed to the mediation process.

B. Mediation

Purpose:
The purpose of the mediation process is to utilize the skills of a trained mediator to help resolve a complaint to the mutual satisfaction of all parties. The parties should complete mediation within twelve weeks unless there is mutual agreement.

Process:
The staff member/initiator has 5 working days after receiving the vice-president’s decision to inform Human Resources, in writing, of the intention to mediate.

Human Resources will facilitate the selection of a mutually agreed upon, trained mediator from a prepared list within 10 working days after being notified.

Human Resources will forward all documentation relating to the complaint to the mediator within 5 working days of the selection.

Note: Biennially, Human Resources, in collaboration with the Administrative Staff Executive Committee, will identify five trained mediators. The selected mediators will be internal and external.

Human Resources will arrange a date for the mediation within 15 working days after forwarding the documentation.

The mediator will meet with the staff member/initiator and an advisor of his/her choice and the vice-president and an advisor of his/her choice to reach resolution. The number of meetings necessary will be determined by the mediator and will take place within ten working days of the start of mediation. A tape recording will be made of all mediation meetings and shall become part of the record. A member of the Human Resources staff will also be present as an officer to keep a record of the proceedings and advise as appropriate.

The mediator will forward a report to Human Resources as soon as possible not to exceed 30 calendar days from the date of mediation.

Human Resources will forward copies of the report, including a copy of the tape resulting from the mediation to the staff member/initiator and the vice-president within 5 working days.

If agreement is reached, it will become binding. If the agreement results in a new salary level, Human Resources will negotiate the effective date of the increase with the vice-president.
If agreement is not reached, the staff member/initiator can proceed to the appeals process.

C. Appeals Board

Purpose:
The purpose of the Appeals Board is to make the final determination of the salary level of the position in question. The Appeals Board will consist of a vice-president or designee not in the employees' area, and two members of the Administrative Staff review team who have not been involved in the initial process. The staff member/initiator can also select a person on campus to assist in presenting the case. The parties should complete appeals within 10 weeks unless there is mutual agreement.

Process:

The staff member/initiator informs Human Resources in writing within 5 working days of mediation of the intention to appeal.

The vice president of the area selects a designee to serve on the appeals board within 5 working days.

Human Resources is responsible for selecting the administrative staff review team members and forwarding all the documentation to the members of the Appeals Board within five working days after being notified. Review team members involved in the original determination of the placement of the position may not serve on the Appeals Board.

The Appeals Board will hear the case from the staff member/initiator and vice president/designee within 15 working days after the formation of the Appeals Board.

The Appeals Board will act within 30 calendar days in a closed session to determine the salary level (numeric ranking) of the position. The decision of the Appeals Board (with rationale) will be forwarded with rationale in writing to Human Resources, the staff member/initiator and the vice-president. All sessions of the Appeals Board will be tape recorded and forwarded to Human Resources as part of the permanent record.

If the staff member or vice-president is dissatisfied with the decision of the Appeals Board, she may forward to the President for final determination.

If the decision results in a new salary level for the position, Human Resources will negotiate the effective date of the increase with the vice-president.

Note: Human Resources have the responsibility to monitor the progress of any and all steps and to make sure the appropriate deadlines are met. A log should be kept of the various stages of the process and the date at which each step began and ended. This log should be available to all parties so the progress of the complaint can be checked at any time.

Note: Timelines can be altered at any time in any section of the above as long as there is mutual agreement among the parties.
Joyce: I’m sending you this e-mail message because I am the ASC rep on UCC, and we had our first meeting on 3/3/99. UCC has not met during the academic year because of mass confusion. UCC was supposed to have been merged with the Telecom Advisory Comm, but was not. They two will be combined beginning this May, right after commencement. The new Information Technology committee will meet once a month during the summer, and biweekly during the academic year. In the interim, UCC and Telecom will continue to meet. The next meeting, 3/31, will be a combined meeting of the two, and Dr. Middleton has been asked to speak to our group to clear up the confusion. My question for ASC is this: I was just elected to be the ASC rep on UCC for a 3 yr. term (1999 - 2001). The new comm. will have elected reps from all the constituent groups. Am I to assume that I will continue in my current capacity, or should ASC hold new elections for this new committee? Also, how in the future would you like me to report on these meetings? Would a copy of the minutes be sufficient? Please let me know. My e-mail address is: lschum@radar.bgsu.edu.

Thank you,

Lori Schumacher,
Payroll
BGSU Staff Questionnaire

This new questionnaire was developed by the Office of Institutional Research in consultation with the President's Cabinet, Human Resources, and Administrative and Classified Staff Councils. It was sent to all staff (full- and part-time, Bowling Green and Firelands campuses) employed as of October 1, 1998. Of the 1,535 administrative (536) and classified (999) staff who received the questionnaire, 1033 or 65% responded.

The 27 questionnaire items group into 6 categories:

- satisfaction with one's current job
- satisfaction with the climate for supervision and empowerment
- satisfaction with department and coworkers
- satisfaction with the University and University policies
- satisfaction with workload and salary
- satisfaction with work conditions

Questionnaire items associated with the greatest degree of satisfaction ranged across categories including the University and University policies, department and coworkers, current job, and supervision/empowerment, and included:

- BGSU as an employer (83% very satisfied or satisfied)
- how my department treats or interacts with students (81%)
- my current job at BGSU (77%)
- my ability to influence the way work is done (76%)

The items associated with the lowest degree of satisfaction all fell into the category called the University and University policies. They were:

- BGSU's awards for employee excellence and service (32% very satisfied or satisfied)
- my chances for a job promotion (36%)
- how I hear about policies, decisions, and changes that affect my job (38%)
- the job being done by BGSU's top management (38%)
- how well performance evaluations have helped me to do my job better (40%)

Of the 63 significant group differences found among the 27 questionnaire items:

- 49 items were across years of experience at BGSU, with those with fewer years at the University consistently being more satisfied.
- 49 items were across years of experience in one's current job, with fewer years on the job being consistently associated with greater satisfaction.
- 49 items were across divisions, with staff in the President's division being more satisfied than staff in other divisions for seven of the questionnaire items, staff in the Provost's area more satisfied once, and staff in University Advancement less satisfied for four of the items.
- 49 items were by age, with younger staff being more satisfied.
- 49 items were by gender, with males more satisfied on two items and females on one.
- 49 items were by employment status; full-time staff were more satisfied with benefits while part-time and temporary staff were more satisfied with their salaries.
- 49 items were by ethnicity, with persons of color being less satisfied with the help that they have received from other employees in their department (not their supervisors) to do a good job.
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ASC Executive Committee Meeting
Founders Club 57
March 16, 1999
11:45 a.m. - 1:15 p.m.

1. Update on 3/11 mtg. with Chucl and Becca
2. Agenda items for 3/18 ASC mtg.
3. Update on Performance Evaluation Review Study -- MaryBeth

Any other agenda items, please email me. Thanks!

Deb

"Life is like riding a bicycle. You don't fall off unless you stop pedaling." Claude Pepper

Deborah S. Boyce, APR
Asst. to the Vice President for University Advancement
Doctoral Student, School of Communication Studies
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403-0050
dboyce@bgnet.bgsu.edu
voice: 419.372.7681
fax: 419.372.7697

"Life is like riding a bicycle. You don't fall off unless you stop pedaling." Claude Pepper
March 14, 1999

To: Administrative Staff Council

From: Amendments and Bylaws Committee

Re: Proposed Bylaws Change to Article 2, Section 4

It is recommended that the following change be implemented to the Administrative Staff Council (ASC) Bylaws Article 2, Section 4: Ad Hoc Committees

Section 4 currently reads in part:

“ASC ad hoc committees shall be created by the Executive Committee which will appoint members who need not be ASC representatives. The Executive Committee shall also appoint representatives of the administrative staff to University ad hoc committees. After two years....”

We suggest the following addition to the first sentence:

“ASC ad hoc committees shall be created by the Executive Committee which will appoint members, INCLUDING THE CHAIR, who need not be ASC representatives. The Executive Committee shall also appoint representatives of the administrative staff to University ad hoc committees. After two years....”
Performance Appraisal Evaluation and Recommendations

Prepared for: Rebecca Ferguson, Assistant Provost, Human Resources

Prepared by: The Institute for Psychological Research and Application

Date: March 2, 1999
In 1997, a performance appraisal system was implemented for evaluating the job performance of all administrative staff employees at the university. This comprehensive system includes twelve different performance dimensions that are used to evaluate administrative staff performance and to guide development of goals. The system has been used for one academic year. The goal of this proposal is to systematically evaluate the current performance appraisal system by using focus groups and surveys.

The primary goal of this project is to systematically evaluate the current performance appraisal system by using focus groups and surveys. The performance appraisal system consists of two components: the tool (the instrument used in the appraisal system) and the process (the prescribed set of procedures for completing the tool).

The focus group and survey questions will be used to answer research questions primarily in these four areas:

1) the tool;
2) the process;
3) the overall system;
4) communication between supervisors and employees.

Within these four research areas, evaluations (e.g., satisfaction and perceptions of effectiveness) of that particular aspect of the performance appraisal system will be assessed and differences in these evaluations will be tested among the different participant populations. Understanding of the tool and process as well as compliance with the process will also be assessed. Other questions about the knowledge of the linkage between merit and pay will also be asked.

Four separate populations of participants will be included in this research: administrative staff employees who do not supervise other administrative staff employees, administrative staff employees who supervise other administrative staff employees, faculty in administrative positions who supervise administrative staff employees, and faculty in non-administrative positions who supervise administrative staff employees.

The purpose of the focus groups will be to gather qualitative information related to the four research areas from members of each of the four populations. Surveys will be used to collect quantitative information about the four research areas as well as test the generalizability of the focus group findings. All members of the four populations will be given an opportunity to express their opinion on the performance appraisal system. Because it is impractical to include all members of the four populations in focus group sessions, the survey will provide this opportunity.

1) Detailed summaries of the focus group sessions and survey results. These summaries will include both quantitative information (e.g., means and standard deviations) and illustrative quotations from focus group participants. Information will be reported separately for each participant population. Potential differences in perceptions of supervisors and employees will be tested for statistical significance.
2) A set of recommendations based on the outcome of the focus groups and survey data. These recommendations will be based on a summary of current empirical research and "best practice" systems. These recommendations will be targeted to address specific issues that were identified in the focus group and survey data collections.

The Process Overview and Schedule

1) Develop materials for structured focus groups. Two project members will facilitate each focus group. Prearranged questions will be prepared to guide discussion of participants. Facilitators will be trained using role-playing with hostile focus group participants. Focus group scheduling will also occur at this stage. Selection of participants and scheduling will be conducted by IPRA. Sampling will be random within each of the four populations with the exception that each focus group will not have more than one participant from the same department. Each focus group will include members from only one of the four participant populations.

2) Pilot test focus group questions and procedure on 8 employees. The focus group procedure and questions will be revised based on the pilot session. Length of time and capability of questions to elicit responses will be two criteria used to evaluate preliminarily the focus group procedure. (1 month)

3) Conduct focus groups. Focus groups will be audio-taped. We anticipate that each focus group session will include approximately 8 employees or supervisors and last approximately two hours. 7 focus groups will be conducted with administrative staff employees who do not supervise administrative staff employees; 3 will be conducted with administrative staff employees who supervise administrative staff employees; 1 will be conducted with faculty in administrative positions who supervise administrative staff employees; 1 will be conducted with faculty in non-administrative positions who supervise administrative staff employees (1 month).

4) Analyze focus group data. This process will involve coding and transcribing audio-taped sessions. Codes of possible respondent answers will be developed by IPRA with assistance from the client group before conducting the focus groups. Preliminary results will be shared with the client group at this stage. (6 weeks)

5) Develop survey to test the generalizability of findings identified in the focus group sessions and obtain quantitative information relevant to the four research areas. The client group will have full review of the survey. (3 weeks)

6) Survey Administration. Surveys will be administered to all members of the four previously-identified populations. Data will be entered by project staff. Follow-up reminders will be sent to all participants. (1 month)

7) Analyze survey results and write a final report. This report will include a summary of focus group and survey results. A separate section outlining recommendations based on a review of the literature will be appended to this report. A presentation of the final report will be made to the client. (1 month)

Assumptions

1) The client will be responsible for transcribing the focus group audio tapes.

2) The client group will have full review of all research materials at each stage of the research. (while retaining anonymity)
To complete the project we will require a considerable time investment from employees. We will be flexible in scheduling focus group sessions but employee participation will need to be encouraged. Finally, an administrative liaison team should be assigned that will be available to handle questions that arise during the project.

**Resource Needs**

**Principal Team Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael J. Zickar, Ph.D.</td>
<td>mzickar@bgnet</td>
<td>372-9984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanaz Aziz</td>
<td>aziz@bgnet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramit Basi, M.A.</td>
<td>basi@bgnet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Elder</td>
<td>aelder@bgnet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Greve</td>
<td>egreve@bgnet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody R. Hoffman, M.A.</td>
<td>jodyr@bgnet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Luong</td>
<td>luong@bgnet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Mohr</td>
<td>dmoehr@bgnet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerel Slaughter, M.A.</td>
<td>jerels@bgnet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Steinbrenner, M.B.A</td>
<td>steinb@bgnet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Revised Time Line**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/18/99</td>
<td>Develop materials for structured focus groups. Prearranged questions will be prepared to guide discussion of participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19</td>
<td>Letters will be sent out pilot focus group participants for a March 4th session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mock focus group sessions with moderators and note takers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of response categories to be used for coding of focus group sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>Pilot focus group session with administrative staff employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6 - 3/13</td>
<td>Spring Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16</td>
<td>Meet with project group to discuss pilot focus group session. Discuss any revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23</td>
<td>Okay revisions with project group. Send out letters to focus group participants for sessions to begin on 4/6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generate skeletal survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/6 - 4/23</td>
<td>Conduct focus groups. Transcription begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/23 - 5/21</td>
<td>Analyze focus group data. Finalize survey to test generalizability of findings identified in focus group sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21 - 6/4</td>
<td>Meet with project group for revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7 - 7/7</td>
<td>Survey administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/7 - 8/7</td>
<td>Analyze survey results and write-up final report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
President's Panel Agenda
Wednesday, March 17, 1999
Chart Room, McFall Center
2:30 – 4:00 p.m.

Ed Whipple

1. Union Update
   • Dec. 1999/early fall 2000

Administrative Staff Council

   STRS/PERS/Social Security:
   a. staffer budget, 4000.00
   b. Merit:
      April 3rd

Classified Staff Council

   University's efforts lobbying the legislature in Columbus. Is there anything we can assist with at this time? Not right now.

   What are the added dollar amount to the University with more from Columbus (possibly 4%) and the size of the incoming Freshman class?

Faculty Senate

1. Student recruitment and retention update:
   - Close offers - mid-early May
   a. Feasibility of attaining enrollment reductions in some of our multi-section courses.

2. Update on State support for the next biennium.

Graduate Student Senate

Center for Cooperative Resolution.

Student Involvement.

Undergraduate Student Government

1. New Email System.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the President's Panel
FROM: Sidney Ribeau
SUBJ: Fall Semester President's Panel
DATE: March 9, 1999

This memo is confirmation of the Spring Semester meeting of the President's Panel for Wednesday, March 17, 1999 at 2:30 PM in the Chart Room of McFall Center (221).

In order for us to address all agenda items during the time scheduled, please submit only TWO ITEMS per constituency. Please don't forget to submit these items by calling the President's Office at 2-2211 or faxing them to me at 2-8446 no later than March 15, 1999.
12. The foregoing principles and policies/procedures of the performance-based merit system for faculty at Bowling Green State University shall be reviewed in the fall of 1999 and revised as appropriate. Thereafter, they shall be reviewed by the Faculty Senate and the appropriate Senate committees every three years.

Principles and Recommendations for a Performance-Based Merit System for Administrative Staff

Mr. Latta moved and Mr. Marsh seconded that approval be given to the following Principles and Recommendations for a Performance-Based Merit System for Administrative Staff. The motion was approved with no negative votes.

PRINCIPLES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A PERFORMANCE-BASED MERIT SYSTEM FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AT BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

The Administrative Staff Council believes that a number of important principles must form the foundation for an effective performance appraisal process and for the equitable distribution of salary increment awards. The Council endorses the concept of a performance-based merit system for awarding employee salary increases provided such a system is fair, equitable, and firmly grounded on these principles. By "merit", the Council means a salary increment that is allotted for performance of duties that meets or exceeds unit expectations. The following principles underlie an effective performance-based merit system:

1. An effective merit system should promote employee recruitment and retention, adequately reward conscientious performance of normal duties and responsibilities, and provide incentives that encourage distinguished, innovative and creative achievements to meet unusual challenges and opportunities when they arise.

2. A salary system should be designed to promote internal salary equity (based upon the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan) as well as external salary equity (based upon salary comparisons among individuals in similar positions from similar universities, colleges or departments). The institution should monitor and ensure that employee salaries continue to be commensurate with individual employee's skills, abilities, and experience.

3. A performance-based merit system may include a component of peer-review when appropriate. Appropriateness will be determined jointly by the supervisor and staff member, subject to the review and approval of the president or area vice president.

4. A performance-based merit system should engender the type, quantity, and quality of performance that contributes to the achievement of institutional and unit missions and goals. The reward system also needs to account for a variety of ways that an employee may support these missions and goals.

5. A performance-based merit system needs to establish a clear connection between employee performance and reward. Meritorious performance should be rewarded in tangible ways. A department or unit must clearly identify the normal expectations and performance standards that are expected of all staff. Through this process, indicators must be identified for performances that fall below standard expectations for merit as well for those types of achievements that surpass the unit's standard expectations.

6. The performance appraisal process should provide employees with constructive comments that enable them to develop professionally and to make improvements in performance.

7. A performance-based merit system must avoid trivializing the system by spreading merit too thinly and thus minimizing the impact of any incentive awards given.
8. Even the best annual review systems may produce salary inequities or may fail to appropriately reward contributions or performances spread over longer periods of time. Thus, an annual merit review system needs to be supplemented by periodic five-year comprehensive reviews on a rotating schedule.

9. A performance-based merit or salary reward system should foster cooperation among staff, should reward individuals for collaborative efforts, and should generate wide support and general satisfaction on the University campus.

10. Both the performance-based merit system and the performance appraisal process will be reviewed annually by ASC, which will make recommendations for modification as appropriate.

Provided these ten principles are followed, the Administrative Staff Council recommends that Bowling Green State University adopt a performance-based merit reward system. The Council believes it is better to improve the existing system than to abandon it completely. What follows are the specific recommendations for an employee performance-based merit system which is specific to administrative staff members.

Recommendations

1. Each year, the University should identify, review, and address employee salaries which may be inequitable. Funds should be made available on a regular, ongoing basis to correct salary inequities, make market adjustments and salary adjustments deemed appropriate following comprehensive reviews of employee performance and salary, and to support raises for promotions. These funds should not be considered part of the annual merit pool.

2. To establish a clear connection between employee performance and reward, meritorious performance should be rewarded in tangible ways. Each employee will have a performance appraisal form which specifies performance indicators to be rewarded.

3. A performance-based merit system must be administered openly and reliably. Thus, changes in evaluation and merit pay criteria must be completed before the new contract year, i.e. before June 30 of the prior contract year. To ensure that employees can contest unfair merit assessments, timely disclosures of merit performance evaluations are necessary. Continual dialogue between the supervisor and the employee about progress towards goals is essential.

TIME DEADLINES

a. Performance appraisal forms must be completed by May 31 of the prior contract year.

b. Merit evaluations must be completed and results shared with the staff member by May 31.

c. Merit criteria must be known prior to start of the next contract year.

d. A supervisor will meet with employees between November 15 and January 15 for a dialogue on progress toward their annual goals. The supervisor will document at that time an employee's performance appraisal form which is falling below a satisfactory level. The supervisor will be expected to continue to engage in on-going dialogue with the employee to improve employee performance.

4. A supervisor's merit evaluation will include an assessment of the completion of performance evaluations and merit pay recommendations for their staff on time. Failure to do so will be deemed performance below expectations.
5. The Department of Human Resources will review all annual performance evaluations and merit pay recommendations to ensure consistency and integrity. Issues concerning the process will be communicated to ASC-PWC on an annual basis.

6. The annual merit allocation should be based upon the meritorious accomplishments over the most recent three-year period on a rolling basis, i.e., each year new information is added to the file for the most recent year and information for the oldest year is eliminated from the file. This will help to reduce inequities that can result from differences in the merit funds available each year and from fluctuations in performance that may occur from year to year.

7. All employees will be evaluated in their annual performance reviews to determine their eligibility for merit. Merit eligibility is determined by the job performance of an employee, as assessed by the Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal Form. Performing one’s job at a satisfactory level and in a competent manner is the basis for merit pay. Given that an employee will qualify for a merit increase by meeting, as well as exceeding, unit standards, it is expected that very few employees will fail to qualify for merit.

8. Any employee who does not qualify for merit in their annual performance review should not receive a salary increase. A professional development fund equal to the uniform percentage raise that would have been allocated to the individual, should be made available to the department or academic unit for employee development, with priority given to assisting employees who have failed to qualify for a merit increment.

9. If the total merit pool for salary increments in a given year is three percent (3%) or less, all employees who qualify for merit in their annual performance reviews will receive the same percentage increase in salary.

10. If the total merit pool for salary increments in a given year is more than three percent (3%) but less than five percent (5%), it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

   a. Three percent (3%) of the total salaries of employees shall be allocated as a three percent (3%) increase in salary to all employees who qualify for merit based on their annual performance reviews.

   b. The remaining difference between the total merit pool and the three percent (3%) of the total salaries of the administrative staff shall be allocated to departments and units for recognition of those employees whose level of performance exceeds department or unit expectations as defined by the merit policy of the department or unit.

11. If the total merit pool is five percent (5%) or more, it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

   a. Sixty percent (60%) shall be allocated to departments/units to be used as an equal percentage increase in salary to all employees who meet or exceed department/unit expectations and thereby qualify for merit in their annual performance reviews.

   b. Forty percent (40%) shall be allocated to departments/units for recognition and reward of those employees whose level of performance exceeds department/unit expectations as defined by the merit policy of the department/unit.
PRINCIPLES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A PERFORMANCE-BASED MERIT SYSTEM FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AT BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

The Administrative Staff Council believes that a number of important principles must form the foundation for an effective performance appraisal process and for the equitable distribution of salary increment awards. The Council endorses the concept of a performance-based merit system for awarding employee salary increases provided such a system is fair, equitable, and firmly grounded on these principles. By "merit", the Council means a salary increment that is allotted for performance of duties that meets or exceeds unit expectations. The following principles underlie an effective performance-based merit system:

1. An effective merit system should promote employee recruitment and retention, adequately reward consistent performance of normal duties and responsibilities, and provide incentives that encourage distinguished, innovative and creative achievements to meet unusual challenges and opportunities when they arise.

2. A salary system should be designed to promote internal salary equity (based upon the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan) as well as external salary equity (based upon salary comparisons among individuals in similar positions from similar universities, colleges or departments). The institution should monitor and ensure that employee salaries continue to be commensurate with individual employee's skills, abilities, and experience.

3. A performance-based merit system may include a component of peer-review when appropriate. Appropriateness will be determined jointly by the supervisor and staff member, subject to the review and approval of the president or area vice president.

4. A performance-based merit system should engender the type, quantity, and quality of performance that contributes to the achievement of institutional and unit missions and goals. The reward system also needs to account for a variety of ways that an employee may support these missions and goals.

5. A performance-based merit system needs to establish a clear connection between employee performance and reward. Meritorious performance should be rewarded in tangible ways. A department or unit must clearly identify the normal expectations and performance standards that are expected of all staff. Through this process, indicators must be identified for performances that fall below standard expectations for merit as well for those types of achievements that surpass the unit's standard expectations.

6. The performance appraisal process should provide employees with constructive comments that enable them to develop professionally and to make improvements in performance.

7. A performance-based merit system must avoid trivializing the system by spreading merit too thinly and thus minimizing the impact of any incentive awards given.
8. Even the best annual review systems may produce salary inequities or may fail to appropriately reward contributions or performances spread over longer periods of time. Thus, an annual merit review system needs to be supplemented by periodic five-year comprehensive reviews on a rotating schedule.

9. A performance-based merit or salary reward system should foster cooperation among staff, should reward individuals for collaborative efforts, and should generate wide support and general satisfaction on the University campus.

10. Both the performance-based merit system and the performance appraisal process will be reviewed annually by ASC, which will make recommendations for modification as appropriate.

Provided these ten principles are followed, the Administrative Staff Council recommends that Bowling Green State University adopt a performance-based merit reward system. The Council believes it is better to improve the existing system than to abandon it completely. What follows are the specific recommendations for an employee performance-based merit system which is specific to administrative staff members.

Recommendations

1. Each year, the University should identify, review, and address employee salaries which may be inequitable. Funds should be made available on a regular, ongoing basis to correct salary inequities, make market adjustments and salary adjustments deemed appropriate following comprehensive reviews of employee performance and salary, and to support raises for promotions. These funds should not be considered part of the annual merit pool.

2. To establish a clear connection between employee performance and reward, meritorious performance should be rewarded in tangible ways. Each employee will have a performance appraisal form which specifies performance indicators to be rewarded.

3. A performance-based merit system must be administered openly and reliably. Thus, changes in evaluation and merit pay criteria must be completed before the new contract year, i.e. before June 30 of the prior contract year. To ensure that employees can contest unfair merit assessments, timely disclosures of merit performance evaluations are necessary. Continuous dialogue between the supervisor and the employee about progress towards goals is essential.

TIME DEADLINES

a. Performance appraisal forms must be completed by May 31 of the prior contract year.

b. Merit evaluations must be completed and results shared with the staff member by May 31.

c. Merit criteria must be known prior to start of the next contract year.

d. A supervisor will meet with employees between November 15 and January 15 for a dialogue on progress toward their annual goals. The supervisor will document at that time an employee's performance appraisal form which is falling below a satisfactory level. The supervisor will be expected to continue to engage in ongoing dialogue with the employee to improve employee performance.

4. A supervisor's merit evaluation will include an assessment of the completion of performance evaluations and merit pay recommendations for their staff on time. Failure to do so will be deemed performance below expectations.
5. The Department of Human Resources will review all annual performance evaluations and merit pay recommendations to ensure consistency and integrity. Issues concerning the process will be communicated to ASC-PWC on an annual basis.

6. The annual merit allocation should be based upon the meritorious accomplishments over the most recent three-year period on a rolling basis, i.e., each year new information is added to the file for the most recent year and information for the oldest year is eliminated from the file. This will help to reduce inequities that can result from differences in the merit funds available each year and from fluctuations in performance that may occur from year to year.

7. All employees will be evaluated in their annual performance reviews to determine their eligibility for merit. Merit eligibility is determined by the job performance of an employee, as assessed by the Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal Form. Performing one's job at a satisfactory level and in a competent manner is the basis for merit pay. Given that an employee will qualify for a merit increase by meeting, as well as exceeding, unit standards, it is expected that very few employees will fail to qualify for merit.

8. Any employee who does not qualify for merit in their annual performance review should not receive a salary increase. A professional development fund equal to the uniform percentage rates that would have been allocated to the individual, should be made available to the department or academic unit for employee development, with priority given to assisting employees who have failed to qualify for a merit increment.

9. If the total merit pool for salary increments in a given year is three percent (3%) or less, all employees who qualify for merit in their annual performance reviews will receive the same percentage increase in salary.

10. If the total merit pool for salary increments in a given year is more than three percent (3%) but less than five percent (5%), it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

   a. Three percent (3%) of the total salaries of employees shall be allocated as a three percent (3%) increase in salary to all employees who qualify for merit based on their annual performance reviews.

   b. The remaining difference between the total merit pool and the three percent (3%) of the total salaries of the administrative staff shall be allocated to departments and units for recognition of those employees whose level of performance exceeds department or unit expectations as defined by the merit policy of the department or unit.

11. If the total merit pool is five percent (5%) or more, it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

   a. Sixty percent (60%) shall be allocated to departments/units to be used as an equal percentage increase in salary to all employees who meet or exceed department/unit expectations and thereby qualify for merit in their annual performance reviews.

   b. Forty percent (40%) shall be allocated to departments/units for recognition and reward of those employees whose level of performance exceeds department/unit expectations as defined by the merit policy of the department/unit.
PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS

Mandatory training will be provided by the Office of Human Resources to all administrative staff and supervisors of administrative staff. New hires will also go through a training session as part of their orientation to the University.

GETTING STARTED 1ST YEAR. After conducting the performance appraisal for the current year, supervisor and employee jointly establish goals and objectives for the coming year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The supervisor observes and documents the employee's performance, regularly sharing feedback throughout the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Employee reviews job analysis, making appropriate changes, and completes Performance Appraisal Form &quot;PAF&quot; for the previous year, using goals and objectives for year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Supervisor reviews employee's job analysis, completes &quot;PAF&quot; for the previous year, plans goals and objectives for the coming year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Supervisor and employee discuss the previous year's performance, current job analysis, and finalize goals and objectives for the coming year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Supervisor sends completed &quot;PAF&quot; and current job analysis to second level supervisor for review and signature. The second level supervisor forwards the documents to Human Resources. Copies of all documents are given to the employee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AT END OF NEXT YEAR

The Performance Appraisal Process cycle continues with Step #1
### GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this appraisal is to evaluate employee performance.

**Step 1** - **Identify preliminary goals for discussion.** Prior to meeting, employee and supervisor each should identify major goals, initiatives, and accomplishments and be prepared to discuss these.

**Step 2** - **Complete the employee information block at the top of this page.**

**Step 3** - **Record your performance observations as well as performance information.** Comments should be job-related, specific, accurate, and concrete. Consideration should be given to employee's major strengths and areas for improvement.

**Step 4** - **Conduct performance appraisal interview.** Give consideration to changes that may be needed in the employee's job analysis. Remember: goals and objectives define success in the job and must be flexible in response to changes throughout the year, but any changes should be made with the full participation of both employee and supervisor. Keep the goals SMART -- Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Timely. Clearly state how the goals will be measured. Focus on measurable performance such as “deliver, develop, produce, increase, or improve.” Goals must also have a time frame.

**Step 5** - **Provide additional relevant comments, sign, and date completed form.** Consider types of training or additional skills that would be desirable in order to fulfill the duties of this position; internal and external professional activities performed in the community; mentoring of students; BGSU committee work; personal goals, etc.

**Step 6** - **Allow employee an opportunity to provide comments and have employee sign and date form.** Comments here might include how supervisor could better aid employee in effectively performing job duties, what the employee needs in terms of feedback, and timely communication with supervisor, concerns about safety, confidentiality, objectivity, etc.

**Step 7** - **Return original completed form and current job analysis to Human Resources and provide employee with a copy of the completed form.**
### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 1 - Commitment to BGSU Mission, Goals, Policies &amp; Regulations: Promotes and works toward achievement of university-related goals within the framework of university policies and procedures (e.g., maintains regular and reliable attendance, enforces and complies with safety and health policies/procedures; promotes equity and diversity in the workplace).</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| Goals for next rating period |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 2 - Core Professional/Technical Knowledge &amp; Skills:</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understands and applies job-related knowledge and skills, policies and procedures, and technical expertise to fulfill responsibilities of the position (e.g., comprehends and applies concepts, policies and procedures and technical skills; adapts to changes in job, methods, or surroundings; originates or improves work methods).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals for next rating period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 3 - Professional Development:</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintains and updates professional knowledge and skills necessary for success in current position (e.g., participates in individual/staff training and development activities provided by unit, division, or university; attends off-campus development and educational activities contingent upon support in terms of financial resources and release time by supervisor).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals for next rating period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4 - Written &amp; Oral Communication Skills:</td>
<td>Observations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates effectively with supervisor, coworkers, and others (e.g., shares information, communicates job-related information, prepares written documentation and administrative procedures, facilitates and participates in meetings, prepares and delivers oral presentations).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals for next rating period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 5 - Resource Use &amp; Management: Uses appropriate resources to increase effectiveness of unit/area and BGSU (e.g., monitors financial status of unit/area, schedules employees, prepares and interprets statistics, develops and manages budget).</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Goals for next rating period
### Area 5 - Service & Quality Orientation

Provides effective customer service and sets and monitors quality standards for service delivery by self and unit/area (e.g., delivers quality services in friendly and professional manner, ensures that work products such as completed forms, records, and answers to questions have no errors; modifies old and develops new programs to improve customer service or program quality).

**Goals for next rating period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Area 7 - Interpersonal Relations at Work

Develops and maintains effective working relationships with supervisors, staff coworkers, and others (e.g., deals effectively with interpersonal problems at work; consults with colleagues, demonstrates loyalty, collaborates with colleagues and is able to maintain professional confidentiality).

**Goals for next rating period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 8 - Internal/External Relations &amp; Service:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents a positive impression of self and university while participating in university and non-university service activities (e.g., delivers presentations and lectures to the community, networks with off-campus community leaders, participates on university and non-university committees).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals for next rating period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory/Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 9 - Human Resources Development:</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hires, trains, instructs and evaluates staff members (e.g., aids in selection of staff members; provides release time and financial support for development; develops and monitors performance expectations for staff members; provides continuous feedback, conducts effective performance reviews).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals for next rating period
**Area 10 - Program Monitoring, Coordination & Management:**
Monitors, coordinates, and directs program activities to ensure adherence to policies and procedures given available resources, and to meet short and long-term goals (e.g., ensures quality improvement in programs, reviews customers' progress and attainment of goals, collaborates with appropriate others for program modification and development).

Goals for next rating period

**Observations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area 11 - Supervision/Team Building:** Provides direction and support to individuals and teams to improve their work effectiveness (e.g., assigns tasks and responsibilities to staff/teams; ensures and monitors adequacy of resources necessary for staff/teams to accomplish their jobs; develops an atmosphere of teamwork and cooperation).

Goals for next rating period

**Observations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 12 - Leadership &amp; Vision: Develops and implements new programs and policies in area/unit to enhance work effectiveness, customer service, and staff morale and motivation (e.g., proposes or champions new initiatives or directions to improve area/unit and university; generates employee support, enthusiasm, and trust; effectively represents area/unit on campus and in the community).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals for next rating period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Appraisal Summary

Supervisor Summary:

Supervisor Signature:

Additional comments by employee:

Employee Signature:

Signature indicates review of evaluation has taken place, not agreement or disagreement with contents.

Second Level Supervisor's Signature:
Dear Focus Group Participant,

Thank you for your participation in the focus group session. Your participation in the focus groups is essential so that we can evaluate properly the effectiveness of the current performance appraisal system for administrative staff employees. We will be coding your responses and answers to our questions so that we can get a sense of opinions. In addition, your suggestions and comments will be compiled and reported to Human Resources so that they can use this information to evaluate the performance appraisal system. A follow-up survey will be designed, based partially on results from the focus group study, to obtain quantitative data that can be used to evaluate the performance appraisal system. Human Resources has promised to make available the results of the focus group and survey results in a public forum (e.g., WWW).

If you have any questions about the nature of this research, please call me at 419.372.9984 or e-mail (mzickar@bgnet.bgsu.edu). You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board, Bowling Green State University, 419.372-2481, if any questions or problems arose during the course of this study (reference # H99P207FE7). If you have any questions about the performance appraisal system, please contact one of the administrative staff council members listed on the back of this sheet.

Thank you again for your participation. We appreciate it.

Michael Zickar, Ph.D.
Institute for Psychological Research and Application
## Administrative Staff Council Members

### Academic Support
- Judy Donald
- Marilyn Braatz
  - Deb Burris
  - Keith Hofacker
  - Matt Webb
  - Mary Beth Zachary

### Student Support
- Bonita Sanders-Bembry
- Dawn Mays
- Sidney Childs
  - Gene Palmer
  - Laura Waggoner
  - Jan Peterson
  - Joyce Blinn
  - Mary Lynne Pozniak
  - Claudia Clark

### Firelands
- John Hartung
  - Penny Nemitz

### Institutional Support
- Jan Ruffner
- Deborah Boyce
  - Sandy LaGro
  - Linda Hamilton
  - Jane Schimpf
  - Cheryl Purefoy

### Athletics/Sports Activities
- Robin Veitch
- Michael C. Giles, Jr.
  - James Elsasser
  - William Blair
  - Kurt Thomas

### Technology
- Paul Lopez
- Mike Failor
- Deb Wells
  - Duane Whitmire
  - Sharon Hanna
  - Calvin Williams
  - Diane Cherry
  - Tim Smith

### Academic Departments
- Pat Green
  - John Clark
MEMORANDUM

To: Administrative Staff Council

From: ASC Salary Committee

Re: 1999-2000 Salary Recommendation

As we remain mindful of our common vision--to become the premier learning community in Ohio and one of the best in the nation--we must prepare to offer a comprehensive salary package commensurate with peer institutions in the state of Ohio. Chart 1 is an historical perspective of the compensation ranking of administrative staff salaries for peer institutions within the state. In terms of ranking, BGSU has consistently remained in the bottom third.

On chart 2, BGSU's average salaries when compared to the average salaries at peer institutions from the period 1997-1998 to 1998-1999 is consistent with the trends of the past; we still lag behind Ohio University and Miami University with regard to administrative salaries.

Although incremental progress has been made, it is the recommendation of the Salary Committee that BGSU's administrative staff receive a 5 to 7 percent salary increase for the 1999-2000 academic year. An administrative staff increase in this range would bring us closer to salaries commensurate with our cohort institutions, allow the merit process to function as designed, and continue our progress toward becoming a premier learning community.

Summary of BGSU Salaries Compared to Other State Schools Using Common Positions Seven Years Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>90-91</th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>94-95</th>
<th>95-96</th>
<th>96-97</th>
<th>97-98</th>
<th>98-99</th>
<th>AVG Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ Cincinnati</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Univ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Univ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ Toledo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron Univ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown State</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on 1998-1999 CUPA data
1998-99
Summary of Comparison of BGSU Salaries to Other State Schools Using Common Positions

Chart 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># of Positions</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>BGSU Average Salary</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Difference from BGSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$84,658</td>
<td>$63,607</td>
<td>$21,051</td>
<td>33.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$75,547</td>
<td>$65,586</td>
<td>$9,961</td>
<td>15.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$75,492</td>
<td>$69,328</td>
<td>$6,164</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$67,610</td>
<td>$64,776</td>
<td>$2,834</td>
<td>4.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$63,614</td>
<td>$64,793</td>
<td>($1,179)</td>
<td>-1.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$65,313</td>
<td>$66,759</td>
<td>($1,446)</td>
<td>-2.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$62,618</td>
<td>$64,271</td>
<td>($1,653)</td>
<td>-2.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$62,614</td>
<td>$64,778</td>
<td>($2,164)</td>
<td>-3.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$63,771</td>
<td>$66,696</td>
<td>($2,925)</td>
<td>-4.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$56,072</td>
<td>$65,012</td>
<td>($8,940)</td>
<td>-13.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on 1998-1998 CUPA data
March 23, 1999

To: Administrative Staff Council

From: Judy Adams, Chair

Re: Responsible Computer Use Policy

As announced at the seminar yesterday, the University is in the process of developing a policy for the responsible use of technology information systems. The Committee on Academic Affairs has been asked to assume responsibility for the process of this development. Constituency groups have been invited to review the draft and submit questions/suggestions/concerns. Please distribute this information to the appropriate people in your group. A copy of the proposed draft has been included with this memo and it has been posted on the web at www.bgsu.edu/offices/it/policy/

We welcome your input! Please email your comments to Judy Adams (adamsj@bgnet.bgsu.edu) or Kevin Bailey (baileyk@bgnet.bgsu.edu) or send written comments to Judy Adams, 140 McFall Center or Kevin Bailey c/o Vice Provost's Office, McFall Center.

We request that comments be made by April 16, 1999; if you would like an extended time to comment, please contact Judy Adams.

Thank you for your cooperation.

enclosure: 1
Responsible Technology Use Policy

February, 1999
PREAMBLE

Essential to the atmosphere of a university is academic freedom, the full freedom of speech, freedom to teach, to learn, and to conduct inquiry in a spirit of openness necessary to the acceptance of criticism, the expression of differing opinions, and the pursuit of truth. The exercise of academic freedom by faculty, staff, and students carries with it responsibilities for the good of the academic community and society.

Bowling Green State University is committed to promoting the open exchange of ideas. However, an open system can be vulnerable to misuse or abuse. This misuse or abuse can undermine one of the basic principles of our institution: to provide a safe environment for individual growth and education. In support of its vision to be the premier learning community in Ohio and one of the best in the nation, Bowling Green State University provides access to computing and information resources for students, faculty, and staff, within institutional priorities and financial capabilities.

PURPOSE OF THE POLICY

Bowling Green State University's Responsible Technology Use Policy contains a governing philosophy for regulating faculty, staff, and student use of the University's technology resources. This document has two purposes: 1) to promulgate acceptable uses of Bowling Green State University's computing equipment, software, and network facilities; and 2) to educate users about their responsibilities. Through this policy, the University seeks to:

- define what is meant by the misuse of technology resources
- document community expectations regarding responsible use
- protect the University against seriously damaging or legal consequences
- ensure that use of electronic communications are consistent with federal, Ohio, and other laws and applicable University policies

This policy applies to all users of University computing resources, whether affiliated with the University or not, and to all uses of those resources, whether on campus or from remote locations. Additional policies may apply to specific computers, computer systems, or networks provided or operated by specific units of the University. The policy also recognizes the responsibility of faculty and staff to take a leadership role in implementing the policy and assuring that members of the learning community honor the policy.

DEFINITIONS

Computer account: The combination of a user number, username, or userid and a password that allows an individual access to a mainframe computer, some other shared computer, or network.

Data owner: The individual or department that can authorize access to information, data, or software and that is responsible for the integrity and accuracy of that information, data, or software. The data owner can be the author of the information, data, or software, or can be the individual or department that has negotiated a license for the University's use of the information, data, or software.

Desktop computers and advanced workstations: The different classes of smaller computers, some of which are shared and some of which are single-user systems. If owned or leased by the
are built into computer operating systems and networks. Those limitations are not the sole restrictions on what is permissible. Users must abide by all applicable restrictions, whether or not they are built into the operating system or network and whether or not they can be circumvented by technical means.

USER RESPONSIBILITIES

All members of the University community who use the University’s computing and information resources must act responsibly. Every user is responsible for the integrity of these resources. All users of University-owned or University-leased computing systems must respect the rights of other computing users, respect the integrity of the physical facilities and controls, and respect all pertinent licenses and contractual agreements. It is the policy of Bowling Green State University that all members of its community act in accordance with these responsibilities, relevant laws and contractual obligations, and the highest standards of ethics.

Access to the University’s computing facilities is a privilege granted to University faculty, staff, and students. Access to University information resources may be granted by the data owners of that information based on the data owner’s judgment of the following factors: relevant laws and contractual obligations, the requester’s need to know, the information’s sensitivity, and the risk of damage to or loss by the University.

The University reserves the right to limit, restrict, or extend computing privileges and access to its information resources. Data owners—whether departments, units, faculty, students, or staff—may allow individuals other than University faculty, staff, and students access to information for which they are responsible, so long as such access does not violate any license or contractual agreement, University policy, or any federal, state, county, or local law or ordinance.

The following list includes but is not limited to responsibilities for users of Bowling Green State University computing resources:

- Regular deletion of unneeded files from one’s accounts on shared computing resources.
- Refraining from overuse of connect time, information storage space, printing facilities, processing capacity, or network services.
- Refraining from use of sounds and visuals which might be disruptive or offensive to others.
- Refraining from unauthorized use of departmental or individual computing resources.
- Adherence to all contractual and license agreements associated with computing resources. Take reasonable and appropriate steps to see that all hardware and software license agreements are faithfully executed on any system, network, or server that you operate.
- Use only those computers and computer accounts for which you have authorization.
- Be responsible for all use of your accounts and for protecting each account’s password.
- Report unauthorized use of your accounts to the appropriate University authority.
- Back up copies of files, programs, diskettes, and tapes, particularly those created on desktop computers and those used on individually- or departmentally-operated systems.
- Promote ethical computing practices among the individuals that report to you.
harassing, threatening, or otherwise causing harm to a specific individual(s), whether by direct or indirect reference
libel or slander
destruction of or damage to equipment, software, or data belonging to the University or others
academic dishonesty
intentional or negligent distribution of computer viruses
impeding, interfering with, impairing, or otherwise causing harm to the activities of others
downloading or posting to University computers, or transporting across University networks, material that is illegal, proprietary, in violation of University contractual agreements, or otherwise is damaging to the institution
attempting to modify or remove computer equipment, software, or peripherals without proper authorization
accessing computers, computer software, computer data or information, or networks without proper authorization, regardless of whether the computer, software, data, information, or network in question is owned by the University
circumventing or attempting to circumvent normal resource limits, logon procedures, and security regulations
using computing facilities, computer accounts, or computer data for purposes other than those for which they were intended or authorized
sending fraudulent computer mail, breaking into another user’s electronic mailbox, or reading someone else’s electronic mail without his or her permission
sending any fraudulent transmission, including but not limited to fraudulent requests for confidential information, fraudulent submission of electronic purchase requisitions and fraudulent electronic authorization of purchase requisitions
violating any software license agreement or copyright, including copying or redistributing copyrighted computer software, data, or reports without proper recorded authorization
taking advantage of another user’s naiveté or negligence to gain access to any computer account, data, software, or file that is not your own and for which you have not receive explicit authorization to access
physically interfering with other users’ access to the University’s computing facilities
encroaching on other’s use of the University’s computers by engaging in activities that degrade the performance of the University’s technology resources such as spamming
posting or sending material that is obscene, sexually explicit, or child pornography

Violations of the Responsible Technology Use Policy shall subject users to the applicable processes and procedures of the University. Illegal acts involving University computing resources may also subject violators to prosecution by local, state, and/or federal authorities.

PERSONAL WEB PAGES

The purpose of personal WEB pages is to give faculty, staff, and students the ability to create a home on the World Wide Web that reflects their interests, hobbies and background. Bowling Green State University is not responsible for personal pages. The University reserves the right, however, to remove from any BGSU web server any page that is found to be in violation of the
Electronic Communications Privacy Act. Federal law which protects the privacy of wire and oral communications and establishes the circumstances and conditions under which the interception of wire and oral communications may be authorized.

Federal Copyright Law. U.S. copyright law grants authors certain exclusive rights of reproduction, adaptation, distribution, performance, display, attribution and integrity to their creations, including works of literature, photographs, music, software, film and video. Violations of copyright laws include, but are not limited to, the making of unauthorized copies of any copyrighted material (such as commercial software, text, graphic images, audio and video recordings) and distributing copyrighted materials over computer networks or through other means.

Federal Wire Fraud Law: Federal law prohibits the use of interstate communications systems (phone, wire, radio, or television transmissions) to further an illegal scheme or to defraud.

Federal Computer Fraud and Abuse Law: Federal law prohibits unauthorized access to, or modification of information in computers containing national defense, banking, or financial information.

Pyramid schemes/Chain Letters: It is a violation of the Federal Postal Lottery Statute to send chain letters which request sending money or something of value through the U.S. mail. Solicitations through electronic messaging are also illegal, if they require use of U.S. mail for sending money/something of value.

Ohio Computer Crime Law: Ohio law prohibits the unauthorized use of property of another. Property includes any property under Ohio law, including but not limited to computer data, computer software, financial instruments and other documents associated with computers, or copies of the documents, whether in machine or human readable form.

Ohio Public Records Law. E-mail messages may be considered public record and may be subject to public inspection under this law.

Defamation: Someone may seek civil remedies if they can show that they were clearly identified as the subject of defamatory messages and suffered damages as a consequence. Truth is a defense against charges of defamation.

BGSU Student Affairs Handbook: Contains the full text of the Code of Student Conduct and the Code of Academic Conduct.

BGSU Governance Documents: Contains the full text of the sexual harassment and racial and ethnic harassment policies.

BGSU BGNET Agreement: Contains the full text of rules governing the dissemination and receipt of electronic mail messages.

DISCLAIMER

As part of the services available through the Bowling Green State University campus network, the University provides on its web pages links to a large number of conferences, lists, bulletin boards, and Internet information sources. These materials are not affiliated with, endorsed by, edited by, or reviewed by the Bowling Green State University, and the University takes no responsibility for the truth or accuracy of the content found within these information sources. Moreover, some of these sources may contain material that is offensive or objectionable to some users.
Deborah S. Boyce/F&S/BGSU, 3/29/99 3:30 PM -0500, 3/30 ASC Exec Agenda

From: Deborah S. Boyce/F&S/BGSU
Date: Mon, 29 Mar 1999 15:30:14 -0500
To: dboyce@bgnet.bgsu.edu, lopez@wbgu.bgsu.bgsu.edu, jblinn@bgnet.bgsu.edu, whitmire@bgnet.bgsu.edu, pgreen@bgnet.bgsu.edu, lhamilt@bgnet.bgsu.edu, lwaggon@bgnet.bgsu.edu, wells@opie.bgsu.edu, mzachar@bgnet.bgsu.edu, jelsass@bgnet.bgsu.edu
Subject: 3/30 ASC Exec Agenda

MIME-Version: 1.0

ASC Executive Committee Meeting
Founders Club 57
March 30, 1999
11:45 a.m. - 1:15 p.m.

1. Update on Academic Enhancement

2. Staff Satisfaction Task Force Membership

3. Update on Performance Evaluation Review Study -- MaryBeth

4. Responsible Technology Use Policy -- www.bgsu.edu/offices/it/policy/

5. Taft's "Ohio Reads" Resolution FS, DSC, DSR joined

6. ASC Spring Reception -- May 13th 3-5 p.m.

7. Agenda items for 4/8 ASC mtg.

Any other agenda items, please email me. Thanks!

Deb

May 13 3-5 PM

ASC Reception

Deborah S. Boyce, APR
Asst. to the Vice President for University Advancement
Doctoral Student, School of Communication Studies
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403-0050
dboyce@bgnet.bgsu.edu
voice: 419.372.7681
fax: 419.372.7697

"Life is like riding a bicycle. You don't fall off unless you stop pedaling." Claude Pepper

Printed for "Deborah S. Boyce" <dboyce@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
March 30, 1999

To: Administrative Staff Council

From: Amendments and Bylaws Committee

Re: Proposed Bylaws Change to Article 2, Section 4

To allow for the appointment of a non-Administrative Staff Council (ASC) member to the position of chair of an Ad Hoc committee, it is recommended that the following changes be made to the (ASC) Bylaws Article 2, Section 4: Ad Hoc Committees

Section 4 currently reads in part:

"ASC ad hoc committees shall be created by the Executive Committee which will appoint members who need not be ASC representatives. The Executive Committee shall also appoint representatives of the administrative staff to University ad hoc committees. After two years...."

We suggest the following addition to the first sentence:

"ASC ad hoc committees shall be created by AND RESPONSIBLE TO the Executive Committee which will appoint members, INCLUDING THE CHAIR, who need not be ASC representatives. The Executive Committee shall also appoint representatives of the administrative staff to University ad hoc committees. After two years...."
MINUTES
President's Cabinet
Monday, April 12, 1999 - 1:30 P.M.
Chart Room

Absent: JDS

Guests: Rebecca Ferguson

DMM - Reviewed April 26 and May 7 BOT agendas and April 19 Expanded Cabinet agenda. JCD distributed revised residence and dining hall budgets scheduled for April 26 BOT meeting. SAR added "Communication of Technology Needs" to Expanded Cabinet agenda; he plans to review the new Senate technology oversight committee with them and to ask that technology needs of areas be routed through deans and vice-presidents or their designees to A. Lancaster and that they be thinking about those needs in a proactive manner.

JCD - Distributed a sample pouring rights agreement. SAR asked that P. Krebs be invited to April 19 luncheon.

EGW - Reviewed B. Beatty's request to freeze the General Service charge for FY 2000. CRM suggested that a more university-wide service charge be developed. SAR asked JCD and EGS to put together a committee and draft a committee charge for review by Cabinet at a future meeting.

CRM noted that C. McRoberts has just finished a report on scholarships. SAR asked that C. McRoberts come to next available Cabinet meeting to discuss report.

R. Ferguson - Distributed ASC merit principles approved by BOT in June 1997, and directed Cabinet to Recommendation #10. There is a need for clarification of how merit pool > 3% will be allocated and the meaning of performance that exceeds expectations. Discussion then ensued around salary pools for 1999-2000 and long-term compensation plans. Timeline developed for handling long-term compensation proposals:

- May 1 - deadline for study group reports to SAR
- May 7 - SAR will update BOT
- May 15-20 draft compensation plans completed and presented to ASC, CSC and Senate

Reviewed CSC proposed handbook changes. Cabinet endorsed 5% increase for temporary work assignment outside current classification, but prefers to hold off on any additional increases for reclassification and promotion until after long-term compensation plan completed. Cabinet endorsed retiree fee waiver request for benefits same as faculty and clarification of course/credit hour restriction on employee fee waivers as "2 courses or 6 credit hours per term, whichever is greater." SAR asked R. Ferguson to draft response for Cabinet review: will be put on June BOT agenda.

EGS - Relayed concern expressed to her about conflicting events at BGSU. EGW suggested revisiting topic once cultural events committee report completed.

JCD - Distributed models for possible distribution of state technology initiative funds.
MINUTES
Expanded Cabinet
Monday, April 19, 1999 - 2:00-3:00 P.M.
Faculty Lounge, 2nd Floor, University Union

Absent: Willis, Williams

SAR - Asked JCD to discuss status of state biennial budget process. JCD distributed Taft's budget proposal and testimony before the House Higher Ed. Subcommittee.

Distributed copy of newly created Information Technology Committee, which is the result of consolidating two existing University Standing Committees into one by the Faculty Senate. Discussed with deans and VPs structures in place in their areas to identify and communicate technology needs to A. Lancaster and the need for some type of centralized mechanism which would assist A. Lancaster in organizing the needs. L. Sternberg suggested a coordinating council consisting of chairs of the college/area committees. SAR asked A. Lancaster to establish such a council and asked deans and vice presidents to provide A. Lancaster with name of person who should serve as their college/area representative.

Stressed importance of need for regular dialogue on technology and to keep key decision makers apprised of developments and issues so they can articulate and address issues in the campus community. Asked CRM to provide him with ideas for an appropriate communication process, possibly using the coordinating council.

Asked deans and vice presidents to provide him with the name of a representative from their respective areas to serve on a team to develop an educational United Way campaign at BGSU.

Asked Expanded Cabinet to think of ideas for an enhanced communication system that would generate a broader awareness of key events and high profile speakers so SAR or appropriate representative could attend. M. Gromko will check to see if the new Resource 25 system will be able to identify and communicate events above a certain threshold and avoid events drawing similar audiences from being held at the same time.
4/15 Agenda Meeting with Chuck and Becca

1. Merit –

- How will merit be determined in units where unit-level criteria have yet to be developed?
- Who will hold these units accountable – HR
- How will "super" merit be distributed when there is no unit-level criteria?
- Pro-rated merit proposal -- ASC passed on 12/3

2. Performance Evaluation Process -- Yearend Reviews --

Information needs to be communicated to supervisors on:

- the baseline for meritorious performance -- performing one's job satisfactorily as defined by job description/job responsibilities
- unit merit criteria for performance that exceeds expectations -- needs to be understood by all staff members in the unit
- merit distribution as stated in merit document passed by the BOT
- the salary pool not awarded in areas is to be spent on professional development for those deemed non-meritorious
- how those employees who perform beyond expectations if salary pool is under 3 percent -- bonus pool outside of salary pool?
3. DOL and ASC Plan

4. Responsible Technology Use Policy Development Process

5. Performance Evaluation Review Study Update
ASC Executive Committee Meeting
Founders Club 57
April 27, 1999
11:45 a.m. - 1:15 p.m.

   with Becca

2. Responsible Technology Use Policy -- www.bgsu.edu/offices/it/policy/

3. Elections -- Joyce

4. Update on Performance Evaluation Review Study -- MaryBeth

5. Agenda items for 5/6 ASC mtg.

6. ASC Spring Reception -- May 13th 3-5 p.m.

7. June ASC mtg. to be 6/10 instead of 6/3.

Any other agenda items, please email me. Thanks!

Deb
To: All Administrative Staff  
From: Joyce Blinn  
Secretary Administrative Staff Council  
Re: Ballot of Slate of Officers, Ballots for Standing Committees, and Election Results

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF- OFFICER ELECTION BALLOT

Please make your selection for the 1999-2000 Administrative Staff Council Officers by checking your choice for Chair-Elect and Secretary below.

PLEASE RUN OFF THIS BALLOT, CROSS OFF YOUR NAME AND E-MAIL ADDRESS, AND SEND BY CAMPUS MAIL TO: Joyce Blinn 213 Moseley Hall by TUESDAY, JUNE 1.

Chair Elect (unopposed)

_____ Mary Beth Zachary, Library- Head of Access Services

Mary Beth Zachary graduated from BGSU in 1971, taught in Massachusetts, and returned to BGSU to work in the library in 1986. She is currently serving her third term on Administrative Staff Council where she has served on the Personnel Welfare Committee, Executive Committee, and Amendments & Bylaws Committee. Her current position is Head of Access Services in the Library. Mary Beth sees completing the implementation of the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan, within the President’s compensation plans, as council’s priority for the coming year.

Secretary (listed alphabetically)- Check one.

_____ Claudia Clark, Clinical Psychologist Counseling Center

Claudia has served on ASC for one year. She participated in the following committee activities: ASC Professional Development Committee- proposed and helped to develop the 1999 ASC spring mini-conference and the ASC Professional Grant program; also, as co-chair of the Student Affairs Staff Development Committee 1997-98, took on the responsibility of recording and distributing minutes of monthly meetings.

Claudia hopes disseminate information to the membership as quickly and accurately as possible, to explore methods for ensuring that all members and constituents have regular access to ASC minutes and other relevant information. Good communication is one of the keys to good group process. Disseminating information quickly and accurately makes it possible for good communication to occur. It also increases the probability that group members and their constituents will participate in decisions that affect their well-being.

_____ John Clark, Assistant Director of General Studies Writing, English Dept.

In common with other ASC members, I’m sure, I have served as an officer of many professional and non-professional groups, through which experience I have gained an appreciation for organizational order and for the necessity of coherent organizational communication. (continued on next page)
As Secretary to Administrative Staff Council, I would attempt to bring my experience in similar organizational participation, my communications training, and my motivation to serve my peers to all the duties of that position. My current professional position and my training in English Rhetoric both add, I believe, to my potential as secretary for ASC. I communicate through individual email, listservs, professional letters, and telephone a large number of hours in each working day, and record-keeping has a similarly large part in my job duties. As the old saying goes, if you want something done, give the task to someone who already has too much to do. I have too much communication in my life already, to be honest, but if I can serve ASC and all BGSU Administrative Staff well by adding still more to my list of communications and record-keeping duties, I will be more than happy to do so. My ASC experience thus far has shown me the deserved respect these professionals earn for their support of BGSU, a respect I too would like to earn by increasing my contributions to Administrative Staff Council.

---

SELF-NOMINATION FORM FOR PARTICIPATION ON UNIVERSITY STANDING COMMITTEES

Name ______________________________ Department / Area __________________

Administrative Staff members serve on a number of university committees. Listed below are the committees that need new members next year. If you would like your name included on the ballot for that committee, please write your name next to the appropriate committee. You may choose to run for more than one committee.

PLEASE RUN OFF THIS BALLOT, CROSS OFF YOUR NAME AND E-MAIL ADDRESS, AND SEND BY CAMPUS MAIL TO: Joyce Blinn 213 Moseley Hall by TUESDAY, JUNE 1.

Equal Opportunity Compliance (3 year term)_______________________________

Health, Wellness, and Insurance (3 year term)______________________________

(2 year term- to finish out the term of an ASC member who will be leaving the University)________________

---

ELECTION RESULTS:

I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who submitted self-nominations for the recent Administrative Staff Council elections. The following is a listing of the election results:

Institutional Support- Nancy Coy

Academic Departments- Pamella Phillips
Technology- Pat Booth and Tony Howard
Academic Support- Diane Smith and Nancy Vanderhuit
Student Support- Kay Gudehus, Ron Knopf, Sr., and Laura Emch
Athletics / Sports Activities- Thad Long and Gina Parks
May 7, 1999  BOT Report

We have had a busy spring! And many members of the University community are getting ready as we speak for one of the most joyous occasions on any college or university, besides the beautiful weather we are experiencing today – is Commencement! And that is why my compatriot Paul Lopez is not with us today. As WBGU-TV’s production manager, Paul is setting up the equipment so that commencement exercises in Anderson Arena can be televised in our overflow facility in Olscamp Hall.

The Administrative Staff Council continues to make progress toward its 1998-99 goals, and there are several items I’d like to update you on today.

1. Revision of the Performance Evaluation Process

In my last report to the board I indicated that a research proposal was under consideration to study the Administrative Staff’s Performance Evaluation process. I am pleased to report that the research project is underway. Graduate students in the psychology department’s Institute for Psychological Research and Application have been facilitating a number of focus groups with administrative employees and administrative staff supervisors to qualitatively assess the effectiveness of our current performance evaluation system, processes and tools. Once the qualitative data has been analyzed a survey instrument will be designed to ascertain the perceptions of all administrative staff members.

2. Develop professional development opportunities

On March 17, 1999 a half-day professional development workshop entitled, “Invest in Yourself” for members of the University community was sponsored by ASC’s Professional Development Committee, chaired by Jane Schimpf, and the hard work of Ann Betts, Director of Conferencing and Darlene Whipple, Director of BGSU’s Training Center. A variety of sessions were offered for individuals to choose from, and I am pleased to report that the sessions were attended by over 135 students, faculty, and classified and administrative staff members. We are hopeful that funding for this program will be forthcoming in the next academic fiscal year, so that this University-wide professional development effort may be continued.
3. Staff Satisfaction Task Force

Also, in March, Bill Knight shared with the President’s Legion group the results of BGSU’s administrative and classified staff satisfaction survey which was administered last fall. And subsequent to that presentation, he shared the findings with ASC members. I have already indicated to President Ribeau that administrative staff members are pleased that he has charged Becca Ferguson and Bill Knight to head up a small group of administrative and classified staff members to outline an action plan to follow-up on some of the survey’s findings.

4. Administrative Staff Scholarship

The second annual Administrative Staff Scholarship Raffle also took place in early March, to generate funds for the scholarship corpus, which currently stands at over $55,000. Each year the ASC Scholarship Committee recognizes exceptional BGSU students by awarding the Administrative Staff Scholarship. While I am sad to report that I didn’t win the season tickets for the Festival Series as I did last year, over $1400 was raised in ticket sales, which will be added to our endowed scholarship fund, and some great prizes were won by 11 lucky folks!

5. Salary Committee

At yesterday’s ASC meeting, one action item we had was the approval of ASC’s salary recommendation for 1999-2000, which will be forwarded to the University Budget Committee and the Faculty Senate Budget Committee for their consideration.

6. Administrative Staff Compensation Working Group

Paul Lopez and I met with Bryan Benner, the chair of the Administrative Staff Compensation Working Group, yesterday for an update on that group’s work. As the President indicated in the Finance Committee meeting this morning, the ASCWG has submitted their report, and we look forward to seeing the President’s forthcoming Compensation Plan.
6. **Spring ASC Reception on Thursday, May 13**

You are all invited to attend our Spring ASC reception on Thursday, May 13th if you are in town, from 3-5 p.m. at the Mileti Alumni Center. At 4 p.m. the 2nd annual "BG Best" awards ceremony. I am told by Deb Burris chair of the Awards and Special Recognition Committee, that 8 BG Best awards will be given out this year to deserving administrative staff members. Last year's event was a lot of fun, and this year's event promises to be as well, so I hope you can join us.
MEMORANDUM

To: J. Christopher Dalton
   Senior Vice President for Finance

From: Deborah S. Boyce, Chair
       Administrative Staff Council

Re: 1999-2000 Salary Recommendation

Date: May 10, 1999

As we remain mindful of our common vision--to become the premier learning community in Ohio and one of the best in the nation--we must prepare to offer a comprehensive salary package commensurate with peer institutions in the state of Ohio. The following information was prepared by ASC's Salary Committee.

Chart 1 is a historical perspective of the compensation ranking of administrative staff salaries for peer institutions within the state. In terms of ranking, BGSU has consistently remained in the bottom third.

On Chart 2, BGSU's average salaries, when compared to the average salaries at peer institutions from the period 1997-1998 to 1998-1999, are consistent with the trends of the past; we still lag behind Ohio University and Miami University with regard to administrative staff salaries.

Although incremental progress has been made, it is the recommendation of the Administrative Staff Council that BGSU's administrative staff receive a 5 to 7 percent salary increase for the 1999-2000 academic year. An administrative staff increase in this range would bring us closer to salaries commensurate with our cohort institutions, allow the merit process to function as designed, and move us closer toward our goal of becoming a premier learning community.

Summary of BGSU Salaries Compared to Other State Schools Using Common Positions Ten Year Comparisons

Chart 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>90-91</th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>94-95</th>
<th>95-96</th>
<th>96-97</th>
<th>97-98</th>
<th>98-99</th>
<th>AVG Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ Cincinnati</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Univ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Univ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ Toledo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron Univ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown State</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CUPA Data 1990-1999
1998-1999
Summary of Comparison of BGSU Salaries
to Other State Schools Using Common Positions

Chart 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># of Positions</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>BGSU Average Salary</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Difference from BGSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$84,658</td>
<td>$63,607</td>
<td>$21,051</td>
<td>33.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$75,547</td>
<td>$65,586</td>
<td>$9,961</td>
<td>15.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$75,492</td>
<td>$69,328</td>
<td>$6,164</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$67,610</td>
<td>$64,776</td>
<td>$2,834</td>
<td>4.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$63,614</td>
<td>$64,793</td>
<td>($1,179)</td>
<td>-1.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$65,313</td>
<td>$66,759</td>
<td>($1,446)</td>
<td>-2.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$62,618</td>
<td>$64,271</td>
<td>($1,653)</td>
<td>-2.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$62,614</td>
<td>$64,778</td>
<td>($2,164)</td>
<td>-3.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$63,771</td>
<td>$66,696</td>
<td>($2,925)</td>
<td>-4.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$56,072</td>
<td>$65,012</td>
<td>($8,940)</td>
<td>-13.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on 1998-1999 CUPA data
Annual Report for the ASC Professional Development Committee
1998-99

ASC Professional Development Committee
Members:  Jane Schimpf, Chair
          Amy Prigge
          Tony Howard
          Dan Parratt
          Claudia Clark

Charge:   To aid and encourage the professional growth and
development of administrative staff. It studies and recommends
action with regard to professional leaves, continuing education and
recognition of professional achievement.

This year the committee successfully completed three projects; a
mentoring program, a professional development grant program and a
conference for staff on the campus.

The mentoring program idea had been started the previous year, but
this team completed the process of implementation. Called
Professional Connections it was designed to help new staff members
acclimate to the campus and the community. Volunteers are recruited
to serve as mentors to assist new employees in adjusting to University
employment and community involvement in ways that lead to
positively-motivated staff members. Each participant is paired with
two staff members to get a broader range of perspectives and
knowledge to be successful.

The Professional Development Grant Program developed this year
awarded over $3,000 this year to seven administrative staff members
to attend programs in their field that would further their development
as BGSU professionals.

"Invest in Yourself" was the first ever conference hosted by ASC. Held
on March 17th it drew 137 participants to the six sessions that were
developed to enhance the personal value of each staff member.
Hi!

It seems hard to believe that my term as ASC chair is almost over!

I want to thank each of you for the leadership role you assumed this year, having served as a chair of one of ASC's standing and ad hoc committees. The work of you and your committee helped to advance the work of ASC and the lives of BGSU's administrative staff members. It has been a pleasure to report on the progress we've made; and although there is (and probably always will be) more work to be done, your efforts had made the difference in getting us to where we are today!

For your committee reports tomorrow, I would ask that each of you provide a brief, "annual report" to the group, summarizing your committee's work over the year. Also, please forward to me electronically, within the next week or so, a few summary paragraphs that will serve to summarize and document the work of your respective committee(s).

Amendments -- Mary Beth Zachary
External Affairs -- Marilyn Braatz
Awards and Special Recognition -- Deb Burris
Internal Affairs -- Linda Hamilton
Personnel Welfare -- Pat Green
Professional Development -- Jane Schimpf
Salary -- Calvin Williams
Scholarship -- Jim Elsasser
Ad Hoc Comm. on Administrative Staff Teaching Compensation -- Jan Peterson
Ad Hoc Comm. on Performance Evaluation Review -- Mary Beth Zachary
Ad Hoc Comm. on Handbook Revision -- Bev Stearns

Once again, on behalf of the Council and our administrative staff colleagues, I thank you for all you have done this year. Your efforts have helped move us closer to becoming a premier learning community in Ohio, and one of the best in the nation!

Sincerely,

Deb
To: Board of Trustees

From: President Ribeau

Re: Faculty and Staff Compensation Plan

Compensation 2000 and Beyond: Committed to the challenge, focused on our vision

Date: June 23, 1999

At my opening-day address last August, I announced “Faculty and Staff Compensation” as one of this year’s highest institutional priorities. This year, in both large and small group settings, I have delivered the message that “part of being a premier learning community means not only helping students to succeed, but also investing in our greatest institutional resource…our people.” Time and time again, I have said that our greatest resource at Bowling Green State University is not the buildings, technological advancements, or even the physical plant, but rather the human resources that truly make BGSU the University it is today…certainly the institution we are fast becoming.

Although I have been visiting with the Board about reinvesting in our faculty and staff by developing a competitive comprehensive compensation plan since the start of my administration in 1995, it is only recently that we have had the institutional resources to make this a reality. Through the efforts of our faculty, staff and students, we have worked to build our enrollment, one student at a time. Our collective enrollment efforts have not only resulted in bringing additional students into our learning community, but have also served as the fiscal lifeblood of the institution, providing a level of financial support that had been non-existent at BGSU for quite some time. The additional dollars from tuition, fees and subsidy brought into the institution have enabled us to support our institutional priorities with much needed supplementary revenue.

The priority of faculty and staff compensation is reflective of our institutional commitment to recruit and retain the faculty and staff who each day put forth their best efforts on behalf of the University, its vision, its values and its students. This year’s enrollment success has enabled us to recognize the efforts of our faculty and staff by putting together a comprehensive compensation plan that will allow us over the next several years to become competitive for all employee groups.

As you will recall, this past November the Board met with the leadership of the three constituent groups to discuss faculty and staff compensation. Soon after that meeting, the three compensation working groups, appointed by me and representing the faculty, classified and administrative staffs began their work. For over five months, these groups met to analyze data, define problems related to compensation within their respective employee groups, and finally, develop a number of options for my consideration. On a personal note, I applaud the efforts of the three working groups who, over the course of the past semester have grappled with the issues related to employee compensation. Their contributions to the development of this plan are both valued and appreciated. After reviewing all information collected and options proposed, and after discussion with Cabinet and others in the central administration, I am prepared to recommend this comprehensive Compensation Plan, Compensation 2000 and Beyond: Committed to the challenge, focused on our vision.
The Compensation Plan, which this year is primarily focused on equity initiatives, includes three components, one for each employee group and is designed to address the issues specific to each classification of employees bringing all groups into competitive positioning within 5-7 years, a goal to which I remain personally and passionately committed. It is a plan informed by the research and diligent efforts of the working groups representing the faculty, administrative and classified staff.

This year, through our regular salary pools, all faculty and administrative staff who meet or exceed expectations will receive 3% merit, and classified staff will receive a 3% across-the-board increase. It is important to note that the compensation plan described here represents funds that are separate from the normal annual salary pools. The additional increases for 1999-2000 through the compensation plan will be funded from dollars set aside as follows: 3.0% of the personnel base for continuing full-time faculty, 2.25% of the personnel base for continuing full-time and permanent part-time administrative staff and 0.5% of the personnel base for full-time and permanent part-time classified staff members, other than members of a collective bargaining unit. The differential allocations by employee group reflect the relative competitiveness of our current employee compensation in comparison to appropriate peer groups. Future years of implementation will require further review of figures and funds available, as well as continued examination of appropriate peer group data. And finally, it is noteworthy that this comprehensive compensation plan has been developed while the University has simultaneously announced one of the lower tuition increases in the state for public institutions of higher education.

The proposed Compensation Plan has been carefully reviewed by counsel to insure that our actions do not adversely impact women and minorities. Across the board salary increments are by their very nature race and gender neutral, however, you should know that we have looked beyond this fact to assure that in implementation the plans do not inadvertently harm members of protected classes. I am pleased to say that our plans are legally sound, and that our actions should have a positive effect on our ongoing Department of Labor compliance review. As the process continues during the coming year, counsel will also review proposed market adjustments so we can continue to be assured that our methodology is legally appropriate.

Every vital and dynamic organization thrives because it depends more on commitment and enthusiasm than on the letter of the contract. The spirit of this Compensation Plan reflects the University’s recognition of our faculty and staff members’ commitment to, and enthusiasm for Bowling Green State University, an institution well on its way to becoming the premier learning community in Ohio and one of the best in the nation.
I. FACULTY COMPONENT

Based on the work of the Faculty Compensation Working Group, along with additional advisory input, the Faculty Compensation Plan initiates the process to raise Bowling Green State University (BGSU) faculty salaries to the 70th percentile of peer institutions (defined as Public Doctoral I, Doctoral II and Research II institutions).

A. What will be implemented during the first year?

The three-part faculty compensation plan includes across-the-board increases, promotion increases, and funds to adjust salary inequities.

1. The first year. For the first year, all eligible faculty will receive a fixed increase of $1250. This amount will be the same for all ranks. In future years, we anticipate that the distribution and amount may vary by such factors as rank and campus. However, to insure equity and to insure that as many faculty as possible receive a significant increase in the first year, a flat amount was selected.

2. Compression, inversion and market adjustments. A pool will be reserved annually, as possible, to address compression, salary inversion and market adjustments. A pool, as described below has been reserved to address these issues in the coming year, based on input from the Deans of various colleges.

3. Promotion amounts will also be increased. Currently an individual who is promoted from Assistant to Associate Professor receives $2000. It is the intent of this plan to raise that amount to $2750 for 1999-2000 and to $3500 in 2000-2001. There is no plan to raise the promotion amount for Assistant to Associate Professor beyond $3500 at this time. Similarly, the amount awarded an individual who is promoted from Associate to Full Professor will be increased. Currently, an individual who is promoted from Associate Professor to Full Professor receives $3000. It is the intent of this plan to raise that amount to $4000 in 1999-2000 and to $5000 in 2000-2001. There is no plan to raise the promotion amount for Associate to Full Professor beyond $5000 at this time. Increasing promotion amounts rewards and encourages excellence. At the same time, this increase will help raise average salaries in our overall effort to reach the target goal of the 70th percentile.

B. How much funding is involved?

1. The Base. The base of the faculty compensation plan for 1999-2000 is 3% of the personnel base for all continuing full-time faculty, including lecturers and instructors. Eighty-three percent (83%) of that base is devoted to the flat compensation increase ($1250 per faculty member) portion of the plan. Seventeen percent (17%) of the base
is devoted to the pool which addresses market adjustments and salary inversions. Promotions will be separately funded.

2. The Future. Future years will probably not have the same amount of flat compensation nor the same pattern of allocation. This is a continually evolving process, which must be based on available funds and a year-by-year review of internal statistics and national data. Although equity is the driver of this year's strategy, eventually the University will be moving to a more merit driven system. At the heart of the Faculty Compensation Plan for all years is an intent to recognize that a premier institution must compensate at a nationally competitive level, must leave room to adjust individual anomalies and inequities, and must reward excellence through promotion and merit.

C. Who is included?

All full-time instructional faculty (professors, associate professors, assistant professors), full-time instructors and lecturers are part of the Faculty Compensation Plan. Chairs and directors are included as are librarians and counseling staff on continuing full-time faculty contracts. This includes faculty from both the main and Firelands campuses. Not included are faculty predominantly on administrative appointment such as Deans, Associate Deans, the President, Vice-Presidents and Vice-Provosts. Part-time faculty including faculty on the Supplemental Retirement Plan (SRP) are also not included. Consideration will be given to salary adjustments for Associate Deans and others (full-time faculty with administrative appointments) on a case-by-case basis. Eligible faculty must also have been on a faculty contract as of Spring Semester 1999 to receive additional compensation during the first year of the Faculty Compensation Plan.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COMPONENT

A. What will be implemented during the first year?

Included among the several thoughtful proposals put forward by the Administrative Staff Compensation Working Group was a recommendation that all administrative staff receive an across the board increase in base salary. The competitiveness of salaries will best be insured if we adopt this approach, modified somewhat to also include a pool of funds for individual market adjustments. With this in mind, the administrative staff component of the Compensation Plan for 1999-2000 includes setting aside 2.25% of the total personnel salary base for continuing full time and permanent part time administrative staff (on both the main and Firelands campuses) to fund these increases. Of this amount, 1.5% will be allocated across the board so that all continuing staff members receive an increase in base pay. Full time staff members will receive an increase of $662 each. Permanent part time staff also will receive an across the board adjustment which will be allocated on a pro rata basis. The remainder of the pool of funds will be used to finance market adjustments for administrative staff members whose salaries are not appropriately competitive. These market adjustments will be made during the coming fiscal year (retroactive to July 1) and will be based on benchmark data which is appropriate to the particular circumstance. The market adjustment process will be managed centrally by the Office of Human Resources.

B. What is our goal this year?

The University is at an important watershed -- we have the rare opportunity to shape administrative staff compensation for the foreseeable future. What we put in place three years ago was a market driven plan. What we want to do now is institutionalize this.
system — so that we have a market driven compensation system that rewards productivity and achievement. The plan needs to encourage hiring at aggressively competitive rates and it must eventually allocate a greater percentage of money to reward high achievers. To accomplish this goal we will make a moderate adjustment to staff members’ base pay, make necessary and important market adjustments, and, as previously promised, evaluate the pay ranges. In the coming year, Human Resources will be charged with the task of reevaluating the pay ranges.

C. **What do we hope to accomplish in future years?**

The administrative staff compensation system is meant to be dynamic and flexible. The grades and pay ranges will be analyzed on a regular basis and necessary changes — those required to reflect the market driven nature of the plan — will be made. Compensation will continue to be market focused, and when resources allow for it, outstanding achievements will be rewarded accordingly. Yes, our pay structure should guarantee that pay is competitive. And yes, exceptional performers should be rewarded. Although, what matters every bit as much as assuring competitive pay is insuring the quality of work life at BGSU. To this end, we will explore what it will take for staff to realize the all-important intrinsic rewards that are essential to true job satisfaction. Competitive pay is obviously an important component of job satisfaction. But, staff also must have the opportunity to do meaningful and varied work, learn new skills, and acquire new competencies.

### III. CLASSIFIED STAFF COMPONENT

The Classified Staff Compensation Working Group met throughout the year to study issues related to their employee group. Their work resulted in the conclusion that the compensation of classified staff overall is highly competitive. With this in mind, the committee set out to look at performance-based reward mechanisms that would be effective in reinforcing BGSU’s core values. The Classified Staff Compensation Working Group is to be commended for carrying out its charge with initiative, creativity, and adherence to the spirit of BGSU’s Core Values. The decision to adopt the concept of the group’s recommendations demonstrates the value of its work.

A. **What is the classified staff compensation plan?**

The Classified Staff Compensation Plan provides a means for all classified employees to earn reward points based on their “extra” efforts in regard to their positions at BGSU. It is devised to provide incentives or ways for employees to achieve a higher level of motivation and service for the BGSU Community. Specifically, it is designed to promote a positive, nurturing environment where employees feel rewarded for their efforts, to promote participation and recognize efforts, to instill pride, and to provide each classified staff member with the opportunity to decide how his or her unique contribution is achieved. Under this plan, classified staff can earn reward points that relate to BGSU’s Core Values as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Values</th>
<th>Performance Reward Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for One Another</td>
<td>Personal Attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Team Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual and Spiritual Growth</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Imaginings</td>
<td>Building Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in a Job Well Done</td>
<td>Positive Performance Evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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B. How will the plan be implemented?

Human Resources, representatives of the Classified Staff Council, and others as appropriate will immediately begin developing a system to determine how reward points can be earned, documented and redeemed and to begin training classified staff and supervisors in the use of this new incentive system.

Funding equal to 0.5% of the total pool of classified staff salaries (approximately $130,000) will be reserved for the plan for 1999-2000. It is expected that comparable amounts will be available in subsequent years of the plan. The classified staff component of the compensation plan will be reviewed on an annual basis.

C. Who is eligible for the classified staff compensation plan?

Employees eligible for the classified staff compensation plan are full-time and permanent part-time classified staff members (other than members of a collective bargaining unit), both at the main and Firelands campuses.
Hi all, I am out of the office, allegedly on vacation. I cannot believe it, but I just received this a moment ago. It just came in as I was sending out reception notices. Haven't even read it myself.

Deb/Joyce, has the ASC Rep listproc been updated so that we can send this out to all the new ASC reps? I would like to send out a cover note indicating how we will gather comments. Please forward me the correct address <ASC-reps@listproc.bgsu.edu>? (I do not have the address on my computer at home.

I also need new ASC Exec members Joyce. They also are not on my computer at home :-(

<this is what I get for getting on-line from home :-).>

Paul/MaryBeth, can an on-call mtg. be arranged on this short notice? Paul and I will be leaving town (with other friends and family members :-) for a weekend trip on Friday a.m. Sending comments electronically may be a possibility, but neither Paul nor I will be able to tabulate them until Monday.

I have not yet received the BOT packet for Monday, so I am unsure when the committee and full BOT mtgs. are on Monday. I've asked Deb Magrum to email the agenda to me.

I have the kids in swim lessons from 10-noon tomorrow, then a lunch meeting with the President for University Planning Council from noon - ? I have to leave for Defiance at 3 p.m.

Should we try for Thursday p.m.? Let me know how you think we should proceed.

Thanks!

Deb

**********Message from President Ribeau**********

To: Dr. Henry Garrity, Chair of Faculty Senate
    Deb Boyce, Chair of Administrative Staff Council
From: President Ribeau

Re: Compensation Plan

Please find enclosed the Employee Compensation Plan, "Compensation 2000 and Beyond: Committed to the Challenge, Focused on our Vision". As has been previously articulated, the Board will vote on the plan at their June meeting. Any comments regarding the plan can be emailed to my Interim Special Assistant, Dr. Eileen Sullivan (gannons@bgnet.bgsu.edu). As I stated in my letter to the Board, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the members of the three employee compensation working groups and especially to those who served as chairs of the compensation working groups. Your contributions to this process are noteworthy and greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Sidney A. Ribeau
President

To: Board of Trustees

From: President Ribeau

Re: Faculty and Staff Compensation Plan

Compensation 2000 and Beyond: Committed to the challenge, focused on our vision

Date: June 23, 1999

At my opening-day address last August, I announced "Faculty and Staff Compensation" as one of this year's highest institutional priorities. This year, in both large and small group settings, I have delivered the message that "part of being a premier learning community means not only helping students to succeed, but also investing in our greatest institutional resource...our people." Time and time again, I have said that our greatest resource at Bowling Green State University is not the buildings, technological advancements, or even the physical plant, but rather the human resources that truly make BGSU the University it is today...certainly
the institution we are fast becoming.

Although I have been visiting with the Board about reinvesting in our faculty and staff by developing a competitive comprehensive compensation plan since the start of my administration in 1995, it is only recently that we have had the institutional resources to make this a reality. Through the efforts of our faculty, staff and students, we have worked to build our enrollment, one student at a time. Our collective enrollment efforts have not only resulted in bringing additional students into our learning community, but have also served as the fiscal lifeblood of the institution, providing a level of financial support that had been non-existent at BGSU for quite some time. The additional dollars from tuition, fees and subsidy brought into the institution have enabled us to support our institutional priorities with much needed supplementary revenue.

The priority of faculty and staff compensation is reflective of our institutional commitment to recruit and retain the faculty and staff who each day put forth their best efforts on behalf of the University, its vision, its values and its students. This year’s enrollment success has enabled us to recognize the efforts of our faculty and staff by putting together a comprehensive compensation plan that will allow us over the next several years to become competitive for all employee groups.

As you will recall, this past November the Board met with the leadership of the three constituent groups to discuss faculty and staff compensation. Soon after that meeting, the three compensation working groups, appointed by me and representing the faculty, classified and administrative staffs began their work. For over five months, these groups met to analyze data, define problems related to compensation within their respective employee groups, and finally, develop a number of options for my consideration. On a personal note, I applaud the efforts of the three working groups who, over the course of the past semester have grappled with the issues related to employee compensation. Their contributions to the development of this plan are both valued and appreciated. After reviewing all information collected and options proposed, and after discussion with Cabinet and others in the central administration, I am prepared to recommend this comprehensive Compensation Plan, Compensation 2000 and Beyond: Committed to the challenge, focused on our vision.

The Compensation Plan, which this year is primarily focused on equity initiatives, includes three components, one for each employee group and is designed to address the issues specific to each classification of employees bringing all groups into competitive positioning within 5-7 years, a goal to which I remain personally and passionately committed. It is a plan informed by the research and diligent efforts of the working groups representing the faculty, administrative and classified staff.
This year, through our regular salary pools, all faculty and administrative staff who meet or exceed expectations will receive 3% merit, and classified staff will receive a 3% across-the-board increase. It is important to note that the compensation plan described here represents funds that are separate from the normal annual salary pools. The additional increases for 1999-2000 through the compensation plan will be funded from dollars set aside as follows: 3.0% of the personnel base for continuing full-time faculty, 2.25% of the personnel base for continuing full-time and permanent part-time administrative staff and 0.5% of the personnel base for full-time and permanent part-time classified staff members, other than members of a collective bargaining unit. The differential allocations by employee group reflect the relative competitiveness of our current employee compensation in comparison to appropriate peer groups. Future years of implementation will require further review of figures and funds available, as well as continued examination of appropriate peer group data. And finally, it is noteworthy that this comprehensive compensation plan has been developed while the University has simultaneously announced one of the lower tuition increases in the state for public institutions of higher education.

The proposed Compensation Plan has been carefully reviewed by counsel to insure that our actions do not adversely impact women and minorities. Across the board salary increments are by their very nature race and gender neutral; however, you should know that we have looked beyond this fact to assure that in implementation the plans do not inadvertently harm members of protected classes. I am pleased to say that our plans are legally sound, and that our actions should have a positive effect on our ongoing Department of Labor compliance review. As the process continues during the coming year, counsel will also review proposed market adjustments so we can continue to be assured that our methodology is legally appropriate.

Every vital and dynamic organization thrives because it depends more on commitment and enthusiasm than on the letter of the contract. The spirit of this Compensation Plan reflects the University's recognition of our faculty and staff members' commitment to, and enthusiasm for Bowling Green State University, an institution well on its way to becoming the premier learning community in Ohio and one of the best in the nation.

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION PLAN
June 23, 1999

COMPENSATION 2000 AND BEYOND:
COMMITTED TO THE CHALLENGE, FOCUSED ON OUR VISION

Bowling Green State University aspires to be
the premier learning community in Ohio and one of the best in the nation.
I. FACULTY COMPONENT

Based on the work of the Faculty Compensation Working Group, along with additional advisory input, the Faculty Compensation Plan initiates the process to raise Bowling Green State University (BGSU) faculty salaries to the 70th percentile of peer institutions (defined as Public Doctoral I, Doctoral II and Research II institutions).

A. What will be implemented during the first year?

The three-part faculty compensation plan includes across-the-board increases, promotion increases, and funds to adjust salary inequities.

1. The first year. For the first year, all eligible faculty will receive a fixed increase of $1250. This amount will be the same for all ranks. In future years, we anticipate that the distribution and amount may vary by such factors as rank and campus. However, to insure equity and to insure that as many faculty as possible receive a significant increase in the first year, a flat amount was selected.

2. Compression, inversion and market adjustments. A pool will be reserved annually, as possible, to address compression, salary inversion and market adjustments. A pool, as described below has been reserved to address these issues in the coming year, based on input from the Deans of various colleges.

3. Promotion amounts will also be increased. Currently an individual who is promoted from Assistant to Associate Professor receives $2000. It is the intent of this plan to raise that amount to $2750 for 1999-2000 and to $3500 in 2000-2001. There is no plan to raise the promotion amount for Assistant to Associate Professor beyond $3500 at this time. Similarly, the amount awarded an individual who is promoted from Associate to Full Professor will be increased. Currently, an individual who is promoted from Associate Professor to Full Professor receives $3000. It is the intent of this plan to raise that amount to $4000 in 1999-2000 and to $5000 in 2000-2001. There is no plan to raise the promotion amount for Associate to Full Professor beyond $5000 at this time. Increasing promotion amounts rewards and encourages excellence. At the same time, this increase will help raise average salaries in our overall effort to reach the target goal of the 70th percentile.

B. How much funding is involved?

1. The Base. The base of the faculty compensation plan for 1999-2000 is 3% of the personnel base for all continuing full-time faculty, including lecturers and instructors. Eighty-three percent (83%) of that base is devoted to the flat compensation increase ($1250 per faculty member) portion of the plan. Seventeen percent (17%) of the base is devoted to the pool which addresses market adjustments and salary inversions. Promotions
will be separately funded.

2. The Future. Future years will probably not have the same amount of flat compensation nor the same pattern of allocation. This is a continually evolving process, which must be based on available funds and a year-by-year review of internal statistics and national data. Although equity is the driver of this year's strategy, eventually the University will be moving to a more merit driven system. At the heart of the Faculty Compensation Plan for all years is an intent to recognize that a premier institution must compensate at a nationally competitive level, must leave room to adjust individual anomalies and inequities, and must reward excellence through promotion and merit.

C. Who is included?

All full-time instructional faculty (professors, associate professors, assistant professors), full-time instructors and lecturers are part of the Faculty Compensation Plan. Chairs and directors are included as are librarians and counseling staff on continuing full-time faculty contracts. This includes faculty from both the main and Firelands campuses. Not included are faculty predominantly on administrative appointment such as Deans, Associate Deans, the President, Vice-Presidents and Vice-Provosts. Part-time faculty including faculty on the Supplemental Retirement Plan (SRP) are also not included. Consideration will be given to salary adjustments for Associate Deans and others (full-time faculty with administrative appointments) on a case-by-case basis. Eligible faculty must also have been on a faculty contract as of Spring Semester 1999 to receive additional compensation during the first year of the Faculty Compensation Plan.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COMPONENT

A. What will be implemented during the first year?

Included among the several thoughtful proposals put forward by the Administrative Staff Compensation Working Group was a recommendation that all administrative staff receive an across the board increase in base salary. The competitiveness of salaries will best be insured if we adopt this approach, modified somewhat to also include a pool of funds for individual market adjustments. With this in mind, the administrative staff component of the Compensation Plan for 1999-2000 includes setting aside 2.25% of the total personnel salary base for continuing full time and permanent part time administrative staff (on both the main and Firelands campuses) to fund these increases. Of this amount, 1.5% will be allocated across the board so that all continuing staff members receive an increase in base pay. Full time staff members will receive an increase of $662 each. Permanent part time staff also will receive an across the board adjustment which will be allocated on a pro rata basis. The remainder of the pool of funds will be used to finance market adjustments for
concept of the group's recommendations demonstrates the value of its work.

A. What is the classified staff compensation plan?

The Classified Staff Compensation Plan provides a means for all classified employees to earn reward points based on their "extra" efforts in regard to their positions at BGSU. It is devised to provide incentives or ways for employees to achieve a higher level of motivation and service for the BGSU Community. Specifically, it is designed to promote a positive, nurturing environment where employees feel rewarded for their efforts, to promote participation and recognize efforts, to instill pride, and to provide each classified staff member with the opportunity to decide how his or her unique contribution is achieved. Under this plan, classified staff can earn reward points that relate to BGSU's Core Values as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Values Categories</th>
<th>Performance Reward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for One Another</td>
<td>Personal Attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Team Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual and Spiritual Growth</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Imaginings</td>
<td>Building Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride in a Job Well Done</td>
<td>Positive Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. How will the plan be implemented?

Human Resources, representatives of the Classified Staff Council, and others as appropriate will immediately begin developing a system to determine how reward points can be earned, documented and redeemed and to begin training classified staff and supervisors in the use of this new incentive system.

Funding equal to 0.5% of the total pool of classified staff salaries (approximately $130,000) will be reserved for the plan for 1999-2000. It is expected that comparable amounts will be available in subsequent years of the plan. The classified staff component of the compensation plan will be reviewed on an annual basis.

C. Who is eligible for the classified staff compensation plan?

Employees eligible for the classified staff compensation plan are full-time and permanent part-time classified staff members (other than members of a collective bargaining unit), both at the main and Firelands campuses.
Eileen G. Sullivan, Ph.D.
Interim Special Assistant to the President
Bowling Green State University
220 McFall Center
Bowling Green, OH 43403
Phone: (419) 372-0467
FAX: (419) 372-8446
E-mail: gannons@bgnet.bgsu.edu

Deborah S. Boyce, APR
Asst. to the V.P. for University Advancement
Doctoral Student, School of Communication Studies
Bowling Green State University
dboyce@bgnet.bgsu.edu
voice: 419.372.7681
fax: 419.372.7697

"Just the knowledge that a good book is waiting one
at the end of a long day makes that day happier."

--Kathleen Norris
Hi Eileen,

As you know, Paul and I are heading out of town this a.m. I received the plan from you late Wednesday, and have asked for feedback. Feedback during the past 24 hours follows.

Administrative staff would ask that Section C of the administrative portion of the plan be edited. The language is ambiguous enough to be perceived as patronizing and condescending by readers. Specifically, we would recommend striking the two "yes" references in sentences 3 and 4. And strike entirely sentence 5: *To this end, we will explore what it will take for staff to realize all important intrinsic rewards that are essential to true job satisfaction.* More on this below.

Here are some of the comments we've received to date regarding the Compensation Plan:

1. **[Benchmarks]** are set to determine the competitive nature of faculty salaries, but no benchmarks have been articulated for administrative staff salaries. What is the benchmark our portion of the plan is based on? How was it/will it be determined? i.e., how will we know are salaries are "competitive"? What is the standard we are aiming for?

2. The administrative compensation plan is to be "market driven". Who defines the market parameters? What are they? And with whom are BGSU administrative staff members to be compared with? CUPA data nationally, or with like public institutions in the Midwest?

3. The plan does not address inequities that result from improper placement in the salary ranges. If everyone gets virtually the same raise, the situation remains the same. Incoming staff members are being hired in between the 1st quartile or midpoint or in many instances, higher, while many 5 year+ employees are sitting at the minimum/first quartile.

3. Placement will be dealt with through a case-by-case [market adjustment process] through HR. How will this process be operationalized? Who determines who is eligible for review? Individuals under the midpoint? How will we know that competitive salary levels have been reached if benchmarks have not been determined (70% on the faculty side of the house). fwiw, market adjustments were reportedly eliminated; the original Mercer Plan was supposed to eliminate the need for them.

4. The issue of progression is dealt with on the faculty side, but not on the administrative staff side.

5. The $662 across-the-board increase will push more administrative staff members to their salary range cap. How will these individuals be compensated in the future?

5. Why is it that intrinsic rewards are elevated in the discussion of administrative staff, but not
in the faculty section. The assumption inferred by readers is that while faculty members may find their work intrinsically rewarding, we need to be reminded that we should also. And that this somehow will bring us more job satisfaction than a salary increase would. Numerous administrative staff indicated that Section C is off-putting given that the across-the-board increase for faculty is 2x as large as ours.

An institutional commitment to succession planning and advancement opportunities for administrative staff would be a more tangible way of rewarding administrative staff members than "exploring what it takes for staff to realize all-important intrinsic rewards that are essential to true job satisfaction." Why are not the faculty reminded that they should look for more intrinsic rewards in their work?

Administrative staff members find their work to be meaningful and have relied on their own personal sense of intrinsic rewards to sustain them over the years they have remained at BGSU.

A sample of direct quotations follow:

*If I wasn't already doing meaningful work - I wouldn't be here!! I have that and have often had to create that on my own!! Now pay me!! I do not need anyone to explain to me how great it is to work here and I am a little insulted that I am not given credit for that. Many of us have worked here through some pretty lean years and have shown a great amount of dedication to the University and to the students.*

*I'm disappointed. I've been holding my breath since the Mercer study waiting to make more than an entry-level salary and the current plan does not address my concerns more than vaguely.

*This plan takes no account of years of service. Why should a person who has only been here a year (who evidently negotiated and accepted a particular salary) now receive a raise?*

*I am happy, however, that part of the plan is for a dollar amount raise rather than percentage. Because I am so close to the low end of my pay range, % raises add insult to injury.*

*$662????? For someone who may be placed in the CORRECT range at the INCORRECT point? $13/month before taxes after all of this hoopla????? I can't express my true thoughts via email - I think it might constitute some sort of federal offense.*

"Need I comment that more time to review this would have been helpful?"

I will forward you any new comments when we get back to town.

Deb
Report to the BOT  June 28, 1999

President’s Compensation Plan

On behalf of administrative staff, I would like to first extend our thanks and appreciation to the BOT for your support of the President’s very important initiative with respect to Faculty and Staff Compensation.

We applaud the President’s desire to enhance faculty and staff compensation at BGSU and applaud the earmarking of significant funds with which to do so. We are extremely pleased that the President has made this an institutional priority over the next 5 - 7 years.

Moreover, administrative staff are pleased to see that:
• regular review of pay grades and ranges will be forthcoming;
• that permanent part-time employees are included in the compensation plan;
• that market adjustments will be made for some employees;
• that some institutional accountability has been built into the compensation plan as outlined;
• and there is the promise to reward performance, which is still yet undefined for administrative staff.

We are also pleased to see that some of the issues in the original administrative staff compensation plan first discussed in the fall of 1995 are referenced in the President’s Compensation plan. The compensation issues that we felt still need to be addressed were presented to the BOT in November of 1998, and subsequently forwarded to the presidential appointed Administrative Staff Compensation Working Group. ASC looks forward to working with HR in the resolution of these issues.

We recognize that the President’s initiative will help BGSU to become more competitive on a regional and national level, and we look forward to participating in operationalizing the compensation plan’s implementation over the next few years.
Administrative Staff Compensation Issues include:

- correcting the improper placement of individuals hired prior to the implementation of the administrative compensation plan (in January of 1990). PWC, in conjunction with HR, has been compiling data identifying the persons affected and monies involved. A recommendation, passed by ASC, would be a first step in addressing administrative staff compensation issues.

- developing and implementing plans for placement and progression (progression/penetration) within administrative staff salary grades; possible criteria may include longevity, experience/skill sets/career-based merit, and market value of positions.

- developing merit criteria for exceptional merit at the unit level, and if tied to performance evaluation, methods of measuring such performance need to be developed and implemented.

- developing merit criteria for bonuses (not linked to base pay and independent of the administrative staff compensation plan).

- developing and implementing creative ways of recognizing and rewarding individuals at or beyond the maximum of their salary grade.

- developing and implementing equitable policies and mechanisms for compensating administrative staff members who teach at BGSU.

To achieve these ends, we would suggest that the Administrative Staff Compensation Working Group:

- determine which institutions and skill markets should be used to benchmark BGSU's administrative staff compensation plan. For quite some time, ASC's salary committee has recommended that BGSU's administrative staff salaries be in parity with Ohio University, Miami University, and Kent State University.

- develop and field-test a systematic process to conduct "market reviews" of administrative staff positions and salary ranges.

- undertake systematic research to: (1) study the features of designated institutions' compensation plans and (2) benchmark their administrative staff salary ranges and positions vis-a-vis BGSU's administrative staff salary ranges and positions at all levels, especially those salary ranges and positions that are not included in the CUPA data.

- the information gleaned from this initiative should be shared with BGSU's administrative staff members.
1998-99 ASC Annual Report

Communication, collaboration, and collegiality have been the focus of the Administrative Staff Council over the past year. Through the hard work and dedicated efforts of administrative staff, progress has been made on many of the goals and priorities ASC identified for the 1998-99 academic year.

*Develop Training and Professional Development Opportunities -- Accomplished

Jane Schimpf and the Professional Development Committee successfully completed three projects: implementation of the Professional Connections mentoring program, designed to help new administrative staff members acclimate to the campus and the community. Each participant is paired with two staff members to get a broader range of perspectives and knowledge to be successful.

The Professional Development Grant Program developed this year awarded over $3,000 to help fund seven administrative staff members attending professional development programs in their field.

The first ever conference "Invest in Yourself" was hosted by ASC, which drew over 140 faculty, staff and student participants to the six sessions that were developed to enhance the personal value of each individual.

*Continue Raising Funds for the Administrative Staff Scholarship Fund -- Accomplished

Jim Elsasser and the Scholarship Committee held the second annual raffle to generate funds for the administrative staff scholarship fund. Through collaborative efforts, the committee received generous prize donations from campus departments and community businesses culminating with a grand prize trip for two to Orlando. The raffle generated over $1,400, which leaves the scholarship fund endowment corpus at over $60,000.

The scholarship committee has awarded three student scholarships for the 1999-2000 academic year. After narrowing the applicant
field from 56 to 6, the committee awarded Wendy Hoying a $1,000 scholarship, Greg Stoner a $500 scholarship, and Rebecca Pappert a $500 scholarship. These students will be honored at the Administrative Staff Council’s Reception in September.

**Implement a Performance-Based Merit System -- Some Progress**

Over the course of the past year, working with the Provost and Human Resources, ASC leadership diligently sought to facilitate the implementation of the 100 percent merit-based system for administrative staff. In December of 1998, administrative units were called upon to hold unit-level discussions to develop criteria for assessing meritorious performance. This effort will carry-over into the next academic year, since it appears a number of areas have yet to develop criteria for assessing meritorious performance.

**Fine-Tune the Performance Appraisal Process -- Significant Progress**

Mary Beth Zachary, Inge Klopping, and Karen Woods formed the core of administrative staff members working with faculty and students from BGSU’s Institute for Psychological Research & Application, this spring. To date, focus groups have been completed and a questionnaire has been completed to survey perceptions regarding the existing performance appraisal process. When this study is completed, an ad hoc committee will analyze the report and its recommendations in an effort to fine-tune the administrative staff performance appraisal process.

**Develop a Placement and Progression Compensation Plan for Administrative Staff -- Significant Progress**

Placement and progression are two carry-over items from the implementation of the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan. Pat Green and the Personnel Welfare Committee spent considerable time developing a placement plan for administrative staff members, which was passed by ASC in the fall and forwarded to the Provost and the Administrative Staff Compensation Working Group, appointed by the President.
The work of Calvin Williams and the Salary Committee also helped to frame where a sample of BGSU's administrative staff salaries fall with respect to those at other public institutions in Ohio.

Correct placement of administrative staff members within their salary grades and a progression plan are needed, along with criteria for measuring both performance that meets and exceeds expectations, before the 100-based merit based system can truly operate as intended.

**Develop Policies on Administrative Staff Teaching Compensation -- Some Progress**

Jan Peterson chaired an ad hoc committee charged with working on this issue. The group had difficulty reaching consensus with respect to definition of terms, let alone policy recommendations because of the variety of teaching scenarios administrative staff currently operate under.

**Review and Revision of the Administrative Staff Handbook -- Some Progress**

Also, although our plans initially postponed the revision and review of the Administrative Staff Handbook to the 1999-2000 academic year, that effort was begun in January of 1999 under the leadership of Beverly Stearns.

Other priorities ASC identified for the 1998-99 academic year are truly on-going institutional efforts, and they include:

**Working to keep constituents informed and supportive of legislative issues**

**Continuing and Enhancing Collaborative Enrollment and Retention Initiatives**
Working to Improve Institutional Culture --

The work of Marilyn Braatz and the External Affairs Committee and Linda Hamilton and the Internal Affairs committee, served to aid this effort, as did the work of Deb Burris and the Awards and Special Recognition Committee, which administered the B. G. Best Award program for the second year. This BG Best program recognizes administrative staff members who have:

- Implemented a new idea or program to benefit the BGSU community;
- Improved the quality of BGSU's programs and/or services;
- Showed an outstanding commitment to BGSU by their voluntary involvement in campus/community activities.
- Provided excellent customer service to the BGSU community.
- Demonstrated exemplary commitment to the core values of BGSU.

Eight staff members received the hand-painted ceramic “Falcon” replica named B.G. Best at the annual Spring ASC Reception on May 13. Administrative staff members receiving awards this year were:

- Patricia Booth (WBGU-TV)
- Nancy Footer (General Counsel)
- Vicki Kah-nower-hazza (Family & Consumer Sciences)
- Naomi Lee (College of Technology)
- Phyllis Short (Information Technology Services)
- Lois Sonnenberg (Continuing Education)
- Suzanne Sopa (Development) and
- Andy Wickhiser (Psychology)

The Michael R. Ferrari Award process is underway with plans to announce the 1999 winner at the Fall ASC Reception.

Also, the results of Bill Knight's staff satisfaction survey findings, administered in the fall, 1998, will serve as the basis for the President's Staff Satisfaction Task Force's work in the near future. This effort, to be led by Becca Ferguson, working with Bill Knight, will involve representatives from administrative and classified staff working together to develop an action plan to enhance staff satisfaction at BGSU.
*Improve Communication among Administrative staff members - final On-Going priority* for Administrative staff during the past year

ASC leadership made a concerted effort to serve as communication conduits and as liaisons between the central administration and administrative staff members. Information and discussions held with
- the president, the provost, and vice provosts and in meetings with
- the BOT, the President's Panel and Legions group, and
- the Constituent Group Caucus, were regularly shared with the ASC.

I am appreciative of the opportunity I have had in serving this institution as a member of ASC over the years, most recently as vice chair and chair of the council. What made serving in these leadership roles so rewarding is the commitment and dedication of countless numbers of individuals who continue to volunteer to serve, or when called upon, agree to serve, in an effort to improve the inner-workings of Bowling Green State University.

I would have liked to have had all of the administrative staff members who served in the work of ASC this past year in the gallery with us today, so that you could recognize their efforts, but there wouldn't have been room to hold them all.

I would, at this time, however, like two people to stand and be recognized. It is my pleasure to introduce to you the ASC Leadership team that will take us into the new millennium:

- **Mary Beth Zachary**, Library and Learning Resources, Vice Chair of ASC,
- **Paul Lopez**, Tucker Communications Center, as the chair of ASC.

I have enjoyed getting to know many of you over the course of the past two years. On behalf of Administrative Staff members, I want to thank each of you for your efforts in support of Bowling Green State University's faculty, staff and most important, students.
Administrative Staff Council

1999-2000

**Academic Support**

Marilyn Braatz (2001)
Keith Hofacker (2001)
Mary Beth Zachary (2001)-Chair Elect**
Diane Smith (2002)
Linda Baklum (2002)

**Firelands**

Penny Nemitz (2001)

**Institutional Support**

Deb Boyce (1998)-Past Chair**
Sandy LaGro (2000)
Jane Schimpf (2000)
Cheryl Purefoy (2001)
Nancy Coy (2002)

**Athletics/Sports Activities**

Michael C. Giles, Jr. (2000)
William Blair (2001)**
Gina Parks (2002)
Thad Long (2002)
Jane B. Myers (2002)

**Student Support**

Mary Lynne Pozniak (2001)
Jan Peterson (2001)
Sidney Childs (2001)
Claudia Clark (2001)-Secretary**
Ron Knopf, Sr. (2002)
Laura Emch (2002)
Kay Gudehus (2002)

**Technology**

**Paul Lopez (1998)-Chair**
Pat Booth (2002)
Tony Howard (2002)

**Academic Departments**

John Clark (2001)**
Lynne Blum (2000)

**Executive Committee**
Administrative Staff Council Standing Committees
1999-2000

Amendments
Mary Bahl (chair)
John Hartung

Awards & Special Recognition
Deb Burris (chair)
Lynne Blum
Tony Howard
Laura Waggoner

External Affairs
Marilyn Braatz (chair)
Robin Veitch

Internal Affairs
Linda Hamilton (chair)
Linda Bakkum

Personnel Welfare (no chair)
Nancy Coy
Mike Giles, Jr.

Professional Development
Jane Schimpf (chair)
Marilyn Braatz
Claudia Clark
Laura Emch
Kay Gudehus

Salary (no chair)
John Clark
Thad Long

Scholarship
Jim Alsasser (chair)
Gina Parks
Cheryl Purefoy
Diane Smith
Matt Webb
ASC Standing Committees 1999-2000

Executive
Act for the ASC between meetings. Act as or designate a liaison between the ASC and other governance groups, individuals and agencies. Set the agendas for ASC meetings and shall set priorities and goals yearly.

- Matt Webb
- Linda Hamilton
- Claudia Clark
- Paul G. Lopez
- Mary Beth Zachary
- William Blair
- Deb Wells
- Deb Boyce
- Laura Waggoner
- John Clark

Amendments
Initiate and receive proposed amendments to the charter or by-laws and shall report to the ASC on all proposed amendments.

- John Hartung

Awards & Special Recognitions
Ferrari and BG Best Awards: Handle all responsibilities associated with the advertisement, selection and presentation of these Awards. One member from each functional area is the preferred make-up of this committee.

- Lynne Blum
- Tony Howard
- Laura Waggoner

External Affairs

- Robin Veitch

Internal Affairs

- Linda Balkum
- Mike Giles Jr.

Personal Welfare
Annually review the Administrative Staff Handbook. Review, study and recommend Council action on matters involving general salary policies, benefits, performance evaluation and policies and procedures which affect the functioning of administrative staff in their positions. The chair of PWC shall be on the Executive Committee. One member from each functional area is the preferred make-up of this committee.

- Nancy Coy
- Mike Giles Jr.
**Professional Development**
Aiding and encouraging the professional growth and development of administrative staff. Study and recommend action with regard to professional leaves, continuing education and recognition of professional achievement.
-Marilyn Braatz
-Laura Emch
-Kay Gudehus

**Salary**
Compile comparative data and make a salary proposal each year on behalf of the administrative staff.
-John Clark
-Thad Long

**Scholarship**
Administer all aspects of the administrative staff scholarship program.
-Gina Parks
-Cheryl Purefoy
-Diane Smith
-Matt Webb

**Elections**
Composed of ASC secretary, who shall be its chair, the Chair-Elect and other council members as needed. Initiate, conduct, tabulate and announce the results of nominations and elections for both ASC and appropriate University standing committees and maintaining eligibility and voting records.
-Claudia Clark (Chair)
-Mary Beth Zachary
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF MERIT AND EVALUATION

HR Presentation to Cabinet – 06/21/00
Presentation to Dean’s Council – 08/23/00

History

- June 26, 1997 – Board of Trustees passes policy that all Administrative Staff increases will be 100% Merit.
- 1997 – Administrative Staff Evaluation Committee creates evaluation process and form.
- 1998 – Form not working. HP, with support from ASC, directs supervisors to use any tool (form) but to adhere to the process.
- 1998 – HP, working with ASC, hires IPPA (Institute for Psychological Research and Application) to evaluate the form and process.
- 1999 – HP, required that each unit develop criteria by which each administrative staff member will be evaluated and given merit.
- 1999 – Ad Hoc ASC Committee reviewing IPPA study and charged with recommending changes to the form and process as necessary.
  - The Ad Hoc ASC committee has reviewed all documents.
  - The committee would like to create a general merit criteria document that all units could use.
  - If a unit wants additional criteria, they can develop their own document to be used WITH the general document.
  - The committee is reviewing the current merit policy and procedure
- 2000 – Unit Merit Criteria documents used for the first time

Current Merit Criteria documents

- University Advancement – One document
- Finance & Admin – One document
- Library – One document
- Grad College – One document
- Continuing Education – One document
- College of Education – One document
- College of Technology – One document
- College of Music – One document
- College of Business Administration – One document
- College of Health & Human Services – Some under College, some individual
- College of Arts & Sciences – Individual documents by College and Departments
- Firelands College – One document
- Executive Vice President – Individual documents
- Student Affairs – Individual documents by unit
PRINCIPLES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A PERFORMANCE-BASED MERIT SYSTEM FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AT BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

The Administrative Staff Council believes that a number of important principles must form the foundation for an effective performance appraisal process and for the equitable distribution of salary increment awards. The Council endorses the concept of a performance-based merit system for awarding employee salary increases provided such a system is fair, equitable, and firmly grounded on these principles. By "merit", the Council means a salary increment that is allowed for performance of duties that meets or exceeds unit expectations. The following principles underlie an effective performance-based merit system:

1. An effective merit system should promote employee recruitment and retention, adequately reward conscientious performance of normal duties and responsibilities, and provide incentives that encourage distinguished, innovative and creative achievements to meet unusual challenges and opportunities when they arise.

2. A salary system should be designed to promote internal salary equity (based upon the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan) as well as external salary equity (based upon salary comparisons among individuals in similar positions from similar universities, colleges, or departments). The institution should monitor and ensure that employee salaries continue to be commensurate with individual employee's skills, abilities, and experience.

3. A performance-based merit system may include a component of peer-review when appropriate. Appropriateness will be determined by and subject to review and approval of the President or area Vice President.

4. A performance-based merit system should engender the type, quantity, and quality of performance that contributes to the achievement of institutional and unit missions and goals. The reward system also needs to account for a variety of ways that an employee may support these missions and goals.

5. A performance-based merit system needs to establish a clear connection between employee performance and reward. Meritorious performance should be rewarded in tangible ways. A department of unit must clearly identify the normal expectations and performance standards that are expected of all staff. Through this process, indicators must be identified for performances that fall below standard expectations for merit as well for those types of achievements that surpass the unit's standard expectations.

6. The performance appraisal process should provide employees with constructive comments that enable them to develop professionally and make improvements in performance.

7. A performance-based merit system must avoid trivializing the system by spreading merit too thinly and thus minimizing the impact of any incentive awards given.

8. Even the best annual review systems may produce salary inequities or may fail to appropriately reward contributions or performances spread over longer periods of time. Thus, an annual merit review system needs to be supplemented by periodic five-year comprehensive reviews on a rotating schedule.

9. A performance-based merit or salary reward system should foster cooperation among staff, should reward individuals for collaborative efforts and should generate wide support and general satisfaction on the University campus.

10. Both the performance-based merit system and the performance appraisal process will be reviewed annually by ASC, which will make recommendations for modification as appropriate.

Provided these ten principles are followed, the Administrative Staff Council recommends that Bowling Green State University adopt a performance-based merit reward system. The Council believes it is better to improve the existing
system than to abandon it completely. What follows are the specific recommendations for an employee performance-based merit system which is specific to administrative staff members.

**Recommendations**

1. Each year, the University should identify, review and address employee salaries which may be inequitable. Funds should be made available on a regular, on-going basis to correct salary inequities, make market adjustments and salary adjustments deemed appropriate following comprehensive reviews of employee performance and salary, and to support raises for promotions. These funds should not be considered part of the annual merit pool.

2. To establish a clear connection between employee performance and reward, meritorious performance should be rewarded in tangible ways. Each employee will have a performance appraisal form plan which specified performance indicators to be rewarded.

3. A performance-based merit system must be administered openly and reliably. Thus, changes in evaluation and merit pay criteria must be completed before the new contract year, i.e., before June 30 of the prior contract year. To ensure that employees can contest unfair merit assessment, timely disclosures of merit performance evaluations are necessary. Continual dialogue between the supervisor and the employee about progress towards goals is essential.

**TIME DEADLINES**

a. Performance appraisal forms must be completed by May 31 of the prior contract year.

b. Evaluations must be completed and results shared with staff member by May 31.

c. Merit criteria must be known prior to start of next contract year.

d. A supervisor will meet with employees between November 15 and January 15 for a dialogue on progress toward their annual goals. The supervisor will document at this time an employee's performance appraisal form which is falling below the satisfactory level. The supervisor will be expected to continue to engage in on-going dialogue with the employee to improve employee performance.

4. A supervisor's merit evaluation will include an assessment of the completion of performance evaluations and merit pay recommendations for their staff on time. Failure to do so will be deemed performance below expectations.

5. The Office of Human Resources will review all annual performance evaluations and merit pay recommendations to ensure consistency and integrity. Issues concerning the process will be communicated to ASC-PWC on an annual basis.

6. The annual merit allocations should be based upon the meritorious accomplishments over the most three-year period on a rolling basis, i.e., each year new information is added to the file for the most recent year and information for the oldest year is eliminated from the file. This will help to reduce inequities that can result from differences in the merit funds available each year and from fluctuations in performance that may occur from year to year.

7. All employees will be evaluated in their annual performance reviews to determine their eligibility for merit. Merit eligibility is determined by the job performance of an employee, as assessed by the Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal Form. Performing one's job at a satisfactory level and in a competent manner is the basis for merit pay. Given that an employee will qualify for a merit increase by meeting, as well as exceeding, unit standards, it is expected that very few employees will fail to qualify for merit.

2. Any employee who does not qualify for merit in their annual performance review should not receive a salary increase. A professional development fund equal to the uniform percentage raise that would have been
allocated to the individual, should be made available to the department or academic unit for employee development, with priority given to assisting employees who have scaled to qualify for a merit increment.

9. If the total merit pool for salary increments in a given year is three percent (3%) or less, all employees who qualify for merit in their annual performance reviews will receive the same percentage increase in salary.

10. If the total merit pool for salary increments in a given year is more than three percent (3%) but less than five percent (5%), it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:
   a. Three percent (3%) of the total salaries of employees shall be allocated as a three percent (3%) increase in salary to all employees who qualify for merit based on their annual performance reviews.
   b. The remaining difference between the total merit pool and the three percent (3%) of the total salaries of the administrative staff shall be allocated to departments and units for recognition of those employees whose level of performance exceeds department or unit expectations as defined by the merit policy of the department or unit.

11. If the total merit pool is five percent (5%) or more, it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:
   a. Sixty percent (60%) shall be allocated to departments/units to be used as an equal percentage increase in salary to all employees who meet or exceed department/unit expectations and thereby qualify for merit in their annual performance reviews.
   b. Forty percent (40%) shall be allocated to departments/units for recognition and reward of those employees whose level of performance exceeds department/unit expectations as defined by the merit policy of the department/unit.

Approved by Administrative Staff Council - June 5, 1997
Amended by Central Administration - June 16 1997
TO: All Administrative Staff and Supervisors of Administrative Staff

FROM: Deborah Boyce, Chair, Administrative Staff Council. Rebecca Ferguson, Assistant Provost

DATE: December 17, 1998

RE: Mid-Year Performance Evaluation Process

In June of 1997 the Board of Trustees adopted the Principles and Recommendations for a Performance-Based Merit System for Administrative Staff at Bowling Green State University. In June of 1998 the Board of Trustees adopted a salary resolution which included the fact that salary increases for faculty and administrative staff will be determined by 100% merit-based system. This system aligns merit allocations with contributions towards achievement of University goals.

This year, as you complete your mid-year performance review, it is imperative that you have a clear understanding of what your goals are for the year and how your performance will be reviewed in relationship with these goals. Supervisors in each department or unit must work with employees to clearly identify the performance standards expected for staff to receive merit. Collaborative departmental or unit-level discussions should take place between supervisors and employees to determine what constitutes meritorious performance, i.e. performance that meets agreed upon expectations (meritorious), exceeds agreed upon expectations. or does not meet agreed upon expectations (non-meritorious).

There has been an increase in the overall number of administrative staff evaluations completed this year. We did receive, however, many comments that the performance evaluation form is cumbersome to use. In response to those concerns, we are suspending the requirement that the performance evaluation form be used this year. You and your supervisor may utilize the existing form or the enhanced narrative format (see point #5 in the attachment) as long as there is a clear understanding by you and your supervisor of the criteria on which your performance will be measured and on which merit will be awarded. (See the attached revised Performance Evaluation Process, which was passed by the Administrative Staff Council on December 3, 1998 and modified by the Administrative Compensation Working Group on December 14, 1998)

If you have not already established merit criteria by department and/or unit, this should be done as soon as possible. Unit level merit criteria must be established, mid-year performance reviews should be conducted between employees and supervisors and documentation must be submitted to the Office of Human Resources no later than January 30, 1999. If you have any questions, please contact Rebecca Ferguson at 372-2259 or ferguson@bgsu.edu.
Passed by Administrative Staff Council on 12/3/98 (as amended)
Modified by the Administrative Compensation Working Group on 12/14/98

1. Supervisors and employees should come together at mid-year to:
   a. assess job performance to date (primary and occasional duties);
   b. discuss progress to date toward meeting agreed upon goals for the year;
   c. assess and adjust goals at mid-year, if necessary; and
   d. outline criteria that will be used to determine merit, informed by unit-level discussions of what constitutes meritorious performance (at least for the 1998-99 academic year). (The merit document passed in June of 1997 indicates merit criteria should be in place prior to the beginning of the performance evaluation cycle. However, since most units do not have merit criteria in place for 1998-99, expectations with respect to how meritorious performance will be determined at year-end need to be discussed. We would hope that such unit-level criteria for at least the 1998-99 academic year would be established by January 30, 1999 at the latest. A memo directing administrative units to develop merit guidelines in a collaborative process among all unit staff will be forthcoming.)

2. Following this mid-year review, a brief narrative outlining the employee's progress toward goals, noting adjusted goals (if necessary), and indicating that satisfactory performance is being made, should be signed by both supervisor and employee and forwarded to Human Resources.

3. (From the current Administrative Staff Handbook, page 26, item 4 e) If at any time during the contract period the supervisor notes a problem in the administrative staff member's performance, a meeting should be held to discuss the problem and corrective actions. In extraordinary cases, when the supervisor determines after the initial meeting the performance is still inadequate, then the supervisor shall provide a written statement to the administrative staff member again outlining the problem and corrective actions. This statement shall be signed by the supervisor and the administrative staff member, and the second-level supervisor if performance is deemed to be unsatisfactory. A copy should be distributed to Human Resources. Progress toward improving performance shall be part of the regular annual (year-end) evaluation. These procedures are to be followed before non-renewal of contract based on performance.

4. The year-end review will take place as scheduled and should determine whether the employee's performance was satisfactory in meeting agreed upon expectations (meritorious), exceeded agreed upon expectations, or unsatisfactory in meeting agreed upon expectations (non-meritorious). Units will have the option of either using the existing performance evaluation form or an enhanced narrative format to complete the year-end review.

5. The enhanced narrative should include an assessment of the employee's job performance (primary and occasional duties) and a summary of the employee's progress toward goals. After the supervisor has signed the evaluation, the employee should have the opportunity
to add additional comments. An employee’s signature indicates a review of the evaluation has taken place, not agreement or disagreement with its contents. After the second level supervisor has signed the narrative and a copy is provided to the employee, the original narrative should be sent to Human Resources.

6. An institutional commitment to the performance evaluation process is critical and Human Resources is charged with ensuring the process takes place and deadlines are met as outlined.

7. In early 1999, an ad hoc committee should be formed by ASC Exec (which will include, but not be limited to, representatives from the original Performance Evaluation Committee, Human Resources, and PWC) to gather data with respect to the effectiveness of the performance evaluation process in an effort to: (1) ascertain what elements in the current process have been effective and (2) recommend alterations to further improve the performance evaluation process.

8. If the work of this committee is not completed prior to the start of the 1999-2000 academic year cycle, it is proposed that the revised performance evaluation process continue in effect for the 1999-2000 academic year. The only change to the process outlined above would be that merit criteria should be agreed upon when goals are set for the 1999-2000 academic year and not at the mid-year review.
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL PARKING RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the lack of convenient parking is a continuing issue on campus; and

WHEREAS, there is at present no policy regarding the issuance of reserved parking spaces on campus; and

WHEREAS, Administrative Staff Council is supportive of the fair allocation of reserved parking spaces; and

WHEREAS, the Administrative Staff Council is interested in maximizing the availability of parking spaces on campus; and

WHEREAS, the parking committee has devised a policy that addresses the assignment of reserved parking spaces; and

WHEREAS, the parking committee acts in an advisory role to the Director of Public Safety which includes Parking Services;

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Administrative Staff Council supports the Parking Committee's plan for allocating reserved parking spaces and recommends its adoption by the Director of Public Safety.

January 25, 2000
Subject: Spirit Day Notes

The following are notes from the Homecoming Spirit Day meeting a couple of weeks ago:

Homecoming Spirit Day will be Thursday, October 5

University Community will be encouraged to wear orange & brown
University spirit groups -- cheerleaders, mascots, spirit team, etc.
-- will be spreading spirit throughout campus that day

Constituent groups (Faculty Senate, ASC, CSC, USC, GSS) will host an Ice Cream Sundae Social
11:00 - 3:00 that day
"Patio/step" area of the Education Bldg. has been reserved; Memorial Hall Lobby as been reserved as rain site (thanks to Barca!)
Five stations set up with two people per stations -- will need to get five tables
Five one-hour shifts beginning at 10:30 a.m. and ending at 3:30 p.m.
Each constituent group will provide 2 volunteers per one-hour shift

Faculty Senate has served vanilla ice cream with choice of chocolate or strawberry topping
in the past and have some spoons & bowls leftover that could be used; they have
spent about $3,000 in past. Wanda is checking to see what type of reduced cost
we might get, how many people can be served by a tub of ice cream, etc.
Popcorn machine will also be set up as alternative to ice cream

Would such of you check your budgets and let me know what type of financial commitment your respective organization might be able to make towards the Ice Cream Social. Also, if you or any members of your groups have any ideas or help curb some of the costs for ice cream or toppings, please let me know.

Deb
Deb Magrum, 12:27 PM 8/28/2000, Re: Spirit Day Sundae Social

To: Deb Magrum <dmagrum@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
From: "Mary E. Zachary" <mzachar@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Subject: Re: Spirit Day Sundae Social
Cc: longtha
Bcc: Attached:

Deb,

I'll check with Thad to see if he is available to meet.

You were on my to do list today. I finally can answer your query concerning funding for the social. I'm afraid that given our expected expenditures and the very close relationship to the money allocated in our budget, that we cannot contribute funds to the social. We will, of course, contribute staff and are willing to put out a call for staff to donate toppings or sprinkles, etc. if you desire. If so, please just say the word and I, along with other staff, will happily contribute those types of items.

I'm copying Thad (our chair of external affairs) so he can let us both know of his availability in the same message.

Mary Beth Zachary

At 11:22 AM 8/28/2000 +0800, you wrote:
>Wanda Ovsrland and I would like to touch base with you again to
>finalize arrangements for the Spirit Day Ice Cream Sundae Social on
>Thursday, October 5. Would you or a representative of your
>constituent group be available to meet on either:
>  >Thursday, August 31, 3 or 3:30 p.m.
>  >Friday, September 15, anytime between 8:00 & 11:00 a.m.
>  >Once I hear from everyone, I will e-mail you back with the time &
>  >location. Thanks.
>  >Deb Magrum
>  >Deborah M. Magrum
>  >Secretary to the Board of Trustees and
>  >Admin. Assistant to the President
>  >Bowling Green State University
>  >220 McFall Center
>  >Bowling Green, OH 43403
>  >Telephone: (419) 372-2214
>  >e-mail: dmagrum@bgnet.bgsu.edu
>
Thad Long, 11/1/00 5:29 PM -0800, ASC mtg

X-Sender: longtha@popl.bgsu.edu
Date: Wed, 1 Nov 2000 17:29:13 -0800
To: gaskins@bgnet.bgsu.edu
From: Thad Long <longtha@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Subject: ASC mtg

Brady,

One other update if you don't mind sharing it at Thursday's ASC meeting (1:30 p.m., Library Pallisier Conference Room).

Not only are we in need of candy to toss at the Sat. Nov. 18, 10 a.m. BG Holiday Parade, but the group should know we're traveling in style this year as Cheryl Purdy (sounds "pure-boy", and she will likely be at the meeting) has secured us a convertible.

As for candy drop-off sites, our ASC prez, Mary Beth Zachary is receiving it right there in the library, or people can drop it off to my attention at the SPC main office, or the PFH front desk.

Thanks again for covering for me!

Thad

Thad Long, CRSS
Director, Intramurals/Sport Clubs
130 Perry Field House
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403
Ph: 419-372-7479
Fax: 419-372-3044
e-mail: longtha@bgnet.bgsu.edu

To the optimist, all doors have handles and hinges; to the pessimist, all doors have locks and latches.
Call to Order

Introduction of Substitutes

Guest Speaker: President Sidney Ribeau

Approval of October Minutes

Chair's Report

Chair-Elect's Report

Secretary's Report

Committee Reports

Amendments
External Affairs
Awards and Special Recognitions
Internal Affairs
Personnel Welfare
Professional Development
Salary
Scholarship

Old Business

Performance Evaluation revision
2000-2001 Goals
Amendment

New Business

Good of the Order

Adjourn
Spring Reception Remarks

Welcome to our Spring Reception! Welcome to the Vice President’s, Dean’s, and Directors, who have taken time to come celebrate with us today.

Today we are celebrating “Pride in a Job Well Done”! We have had an interesting year with a very challenging year to come.

No success is achieved by any individual – so it is with us. As we said in our philosophy document sent to the President’s Compensation Working Group, “successful performance by one individual is usually based on a complex interdependency of competencies of support by many others.” I firmly believe that very few individuals can attribute their success to their work only. I also want to acknowledge that many of the acts of volunteer-ism are really acts of courage that move us through our days. Many who said “Yes” were very unsure of their own possibilities!

Let me name a few of those interdependencies: My library compatriots who did my work when I was doing ours. (My staff said they’ll never let me do something like this again!)

Our Administrative Staff Council Committees – who accomplish most of the work of council.
Amendments. I’d like to thank the chairs and members. 
*Introduce the chair—ask committee members present to stand.*

**Amendments and Bylaws**
- Keith Hofacker (Chair)

**Awards & Special Recognitions**
- Tony Howard (Chair)

**External Affairs**
- Thad Long (Chair)

**Internal Affairs**
- Anne Saviers (Chair)

**Personnel Welfare**
- Laura Emch (Co-Chair)
- Inge Klopping (Co-Chair)

**Professional Development**
- Ann Betts (Chair)

**Salary**
- David Garcia (Chair)

**Scholarship**
- Sandy Miesmer (Chair)

**Elections**
- Mary Lynn Pozniak (Chair)

**Human Resources**
- Rebecca Ferguson, Donna Wittwer especially for their tireless work (actually they got tired but did it anyway)

**Members of the McFall coalition** for their support and work: Eileen Sullivan, Nancy Footer, The President’s Compensation Group, Kristina Uvagi, Steph Jesse, and Linda Dobb, and
Sidney Ribeau.

The leadership of Faculty Senate and Classified Staff Council

Most especially, I want to thank our leadership team--John Clark and Mary Lynn Pozniak. They have been extraordinary! Their work, especially, has been most effective to our collective movement forward. They have been professional, diligent, exacting, thorough, and excessively generous. Thank you very much.

I'd like to take a few moments to introduce our new leadership: John Clark, chair; Laura Emch, chair elect; Diane Smith, our new secretary. We are in such good hands!

Before introducing John Clark and Linda Dobb to say a few words, and The awards committee for the meat of the day, I'm going to use my bully pulpit one last time.

The coming year or two will be extraordinarily challenging for us all. I encourage us all to model positive and constructive behaviors, to model a healthy balance between work and personal lives, and to make choices about work based on our highest personal and institutional values.

Give your best to our students, to each other, and to yourselves. Make sure that you find balance between work life and personal
life. Thank you very much for an exceptional year.