

12-1983

Contract Staff Classification Study - Final Report December 1982

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

Bowling Green State University. Administrative Staff Council, "Contract Staff Classification Study - Final Report December 1982" (1983). *Administrative Staff Council*. 44.

<https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/asc/44>

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: Contract Staff Classification Study – Final Report

Inclusive Dates: December 1982


Format: Bound Loose

Order: Alpha Chronological Numerical

Index: Included Separate None

Notes

Bowling Green State University
Contract Staff Classification Study
Final Report



December 1982

2

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

CONTRACT STAFF CLASSIFICATION STUDY

FINAL REPORT

December 1982



Bowling Green State University

Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

December 13, 1982

Dr. Paul J. Olscamp
President
Bowling Green State University

Dear Dr. Olscamp:

This final report is the result of the Contract Staff Classification Study conducted at Bowling Green State University during the last three years. The report documents the process used, the study findings, and recommendations concerning the study and the development of an on-going personnel system for contract staff positions.

We feel that the study has developed valuable information about contract positions at EGSU. If we can be of any further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Contract Staff Classification Study Committee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.	Page 1
II. Purpose	Page 3
III. Organization.	Page 5
IV. Methodology	Page 8
V. Summary of the Results of the Study . .	Page 14
VI. Recommendations	Page 26

Appendices

I. INTRODUCTION

The final report of the Contract Staff Classification Study Committee is the culmination of three years of work involving project design, development, implementation, and analysis. The study has tried to develop a systematic means for measuring the job content of contract (administrative/professional) positions at Bowling Green State University. Two hundred seventy-three positions were studied. The focus of the study has been the objective evaluation of positions and did not address individual performance in a given position.

For the purposes of this study, organizational structure in effect in the fall of 1981 was followed. Areas were identified as follows: College of Arts & Sciences; College of Business Administration; Continuing Education, Regional, and Summer Programs; College of Education; Educational Development; Firelands; Graduate College; College of Health and Community Services; Library; College of Musical Arts; Operations; Planning and Budgeting; President's Office; Provost's Office; and Student Affairs. Appendix A identifies all contract positions assigned to each of these areas.

The data base for the study was generated through a position questionnaire completed in August, 1981, by incumbents in the identified contract positions. Because more than a year has passed since the data was collected, some of the information has, in all likelihood, become outdated. Some positions included in the study no longer exist, some have changed substantially. In addition, new positions have been created which have not been included in the study. Because changes in position responsibilities seem to occur fairly regularly and because trying to keep up with these changes would delay the completion of the study, no revisions or additions were made to the original collection of data.

Although the study is based on year-old information, the Committee feels the overall results are invaluable in helping to identify both a procedure for comparing positions quantifiably and a data base which can be revised and updated regularly. Before any decisions are made about specific positions based on the information in this study, the Committee recommends that current responsibilities be reviewed and position descriptions be revised in accordance with any changes.

The Contract Staff Classification Study Committee has included the following staff members since January 1980:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>DEPARTMENT</u>
Zola Buford	Registrar
Wayne Colvin	Residence Life
Sue Crawford	Equal Opportunity Compliance
Gregg DeCrane	Student Organizations
Kathleen Hart	English
John Hartung	Admissions/Registration Firelands
Bud Lane	Grants Accounting
Fay Paulsen	Residence Life
Jack Taylor	Student Development
Susan Caldwell	Director, Contract Staff Classification Study
Valerie Feldman	Secretary

During earlier stages of the study, several other individuals were also involved. The Committee acknowledges the assistance of Dr. Allen Kepke (initial Project Director), James Hodge III, Deborah Magrum, Ethel Mathey, Robert McGeein, and Dr. Richard Ward (consultant). In addition, Ms. Beverly Mullins served as Director of the Contract Staff Classification Study Committee from October 1980 to August 1982.

The recommendations included in this report represent consensus of the Committee. In situations where a member disagrees or has an independent recommendation, he or she may file a minority report.

II. PURPOSE

The basic objective of the Contract Staff Classification Study has been to develop a data base that defines the responsibilities of contract positions at Bowling Green State University.

II. PURPOSE

In January, 1980, a Contract Staff Classification Study was initiated by Dr. Michael Ferrari, then Provost and Executive Vice President. The purpose of the study was to gather information which would provide a reliable and objective data base for accurately defining contract staff positions at Bowling Green State University. The long-range focus of this study was on the development of a comprehensive compensation/classification program for academic administrators and those staff members throughout the institution holding professional-managerial contracts. The study was undertaken with the expectation that a thorough analysis of the data generated as a result of this project might lead to the development of a program which would accomplish the following objectives:

1. provide internal equity among all contract staff by assigning similar pay ranges to position classifications with similar levels of responsibility and skill;
2. provide a fair system of rewarding individual performance through regular salary increases within the salary range and through equitable opportunities for promotions;
3. clarify career paths within the University;
4. provide a mechanism for regular analysis of prevailing pay levels outside the University and ensure that the University is competitive in all levels of classification; and
5. ensure that equivalent salary ranges exist for comparable levels of position responsibilities, thus assisting the University's efforts in the area of affirmative action and compliance with federal wage-hour standards.

Neither these five objectives nor the methods of achieving them could be realized without the development of a data base. Information on job content, level of responsibility in numerous job related factors, and comparative rankings of positions within the University are included in this data base.

9

III. ORGANIZATION

The study was coordinated by the Director of the Contract Staff Classification Study who worked closely with a representative body of contract staff employees through the design, development, and implementation stages.

III. ORGANIZATION

The Contract Staff Classification Study was structured to provide the maximum participation possible for all areas of the University community. A representative committee was selected to work closely with the Director of the Contract Staff Classification Study to define the dimensions of the study and develop the necessary tools to conduct the project. Nominations for persons to serve on the committee were solicited from all contract staff members. Persons serving on the committee represent varied positions within the University and a wide range of backgrounds and experiences. The Committee, then, was a representative body of contract staff employees in terms of expertise and the areas on campus in which they worked.

To best accomplish its task, the Contract Staff Classification Study Committee (CSCSC) was divided into two working groups, the Drafting Committee and the Review Committee. The roles of the respective committees were as follows:

1. Drafting Committee (Director plus three CSCSC members)
 - a. to prepare materials and recommendations for consideration by the Review Committee;
 - b. to draft sections of the questionnaire and evaluation manual;
 - c. to provide input on the preparation of the final report.
2. Review Committee (all members of the CSCSC)
 - a. to provide input that would assist the Drafting Committee in its work;
 - b. to review and approve the work of the Drafting Committee;
 - c. to develop the position questionnaire;
 - d. to develop an instrument for evaluating the questionnaire (the evaluation manual);

- e. to develop a system which would mathematically weigh the questionnaire;
- f. to evaluate all questionnaires; and
- g. to prepare a report summarizing the results of the study and make recommendations relative to the development of a compensation/classification program for contract staff at Bowling Green State University.

The role of the Director of the Contract Staff Classification Study was to facilitate and coordinate all aspects of the study. This included providing the leadership and direction for the Committee in terms of determining the day-to-day processes of the study.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The study used the point-factor evaluation method. Committee work involved the following twelve stages:

- 1) determined compensable job factors;
- 2) designed a questionnaire to ascertain information about position responsibilities relative to those factors;
- 3) pilot-tested and redesigned the questionnaire;
- 4) developed an evaluation manual;
- 5) administered the questionnaire;
- 6) determined point values for all job factors based on a weighting process;
- 7) reviewed and evaluated benchmark positions;
- 3) reviewed and evaluated questionnaires for all contract positions;
- 9) established a ranking of positions;
- 10) analyzed data on numerous computer-generated reports;
- 11) developed job descriptions and position profiles;
- 12) prepared a final report and recommendations.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The point-factor evaluation method was selected for use in this study. This is a widely used type of job evaluation system in the United States. The decision to use this particular technique was based upon a review of similar work being done at other institutions (e.g., Case Western Reserve, Lehigh, Ohio State, Oklahoma State, University of Michigan, and Western Michigan) and the specific needs of Bowling Green State University.

Using the point-factor method, a set of compensable factors (job characteristics which contribute to the overall worth of a job) is chosen and each position is rated, based on these factors. In addition, an evaluation manual is developed which classifies responses into various categories and identifies levels of worth for each factor. Each level is assigned a specified number of points. The points assigned to each factor through the use of the evaluation manual are then totaled to yield the job worth score.

The Committee identified ten compensable factors believed to be common to all contract staff positions at Bowling Green State University. These factors are:

- 1. Minimum Qualifications
 - a. Education
 - b. Experience
 - c. Licensing
- 2. Environmental Conditions
 - a. Travel
 - b. Irregular Working Times
 - c. Irregular Working Conditions
- 3. Supervision Received
- 4. Responsibility for the Work of Others
 - a. Direct Responsibility
 - b. Indirect Responsibility
- 5. Personnel Decisions
- 6. Amount and Nature of Human Contacts

7. Budget Responsibility
 - a. Primary Signatory Authority
 - b. No Signatory Authority
8. Problem Solving
9. Confidentiality
10. Impact on the Institution

Seventeen questions designed to measure these factors were included in the completed questionnaire (Appendix B). When completed, the questionnaire was designed to obtain a complete written description of the duties and responsibilities of a contract staff position.

The study group included all full-time and part-time employees who were employed at Bowling Green State University under a managerial, administrative or professional contract in August, 1981. Early in the study the Committee was informed that the following contract positions were excluded from the study:

1. Coaches
2. Academic Center or Program Directors (e.g., Women's Studies, Environmental Studies, Faculty Development).
3. Research Faculty
4. Medical Doctors and Nurses
5. Hall Directors
6. Counselling Center Staff
7. Library Faculty

To ensure that the questionnaire would appropriately address the purpose of the study, a group of eleven randomly selected contract staff positions were selected to participate in a pilot test in October 1980. This involved the incumbents completing the questionnaire and sharing with the Committee their reactions. Organizational areas represented in the pilot test were: the Athletic Department, the College of Arts and Sciences, Firelands College, the Graduate College, Institutional Planning and Budgeting, Student Affairs, and Operations.

In addition to the pilot group, the questionnaire was also reviewed by members of the President's Cabinet and by an outside consultant, Mr. William Goodwin, Project Director for a similar study being undertaken at Oklahoma State University. The questionnaire was also reviewed for technical accuracy by Dr. Jerry Wicks, Assistant Professor of Sociology at Bowling Green State University. Prior to its distribution the questionnaire was reviewed and approved by Dr. Michael Ferrari, then Interim President.

The next step after completion of the questionnaire was the development of the evaluation manual (Appendix C). This is the instrument by which each questionnaire was evaluated. After the evaluation manual was developed, each questionnaire factor and response was assigned a percentage weight (Appendix D) to reflect its relative worth. This system was used to establish predetermined point values for each answer. The total points yielded the job worth score. This weighting process was reviewed and approved by Dr. Charles J. Cranny, Associate Professor, Industrial Psychology (Bowling Green State University).

The contract staff position questionnaire was distributed in late August-early September of 1981 to the nearly three hundred contract staff members. To facilitate this process, a series of six information sessions were scheduled. Each session included a video presentation designed to provide the necessary background about the goals, objectives, and methodology of the study.

Once the questionnaires were completed by the incumbents, they were reviewed by the immediate supervisor and returned to the CSCSC. From January - May 1982, the Committee evaluated twelve benchmark positions. These positions were selected from various organizational units of the University. The purpose of evaluating the benchmark positions was to supplement and clarify the intent of the questions and to establish a consistent framework within which all positions would be evaluated. More specifically, this stage of the process was designed to:

1. make the Committee comfortable with the evaluation process and establish criteria for evaluating questionnaires;
2. determine if there was a reasonable match between the evaluation manual (expected responses) and actual questionnaire responses; and

- 16
3. determine if the data provided on the questionnaires was sufficient for the development of accurate position descriptions.

After the benchmark positions were evaluated, an in-depth analysis of all positions began. To expedite this process, the Committee was divided into three subcommittees with the Director of CSCSC serving on each. The subcommittees were charged with the significant and extensive task of questionnaire evaluation. The goal of this stage of the process was to work towards developing an accurate data base for classifying contract staff positions.

The process of evaluating the positions also involved questionnaire audits. Audits were conducted on those positions for which additional clarification or information was needed in order to accurately and appropriately evaluate the questionnaire. Questionnaire audits were conducted with the incumbent or immediate supervisor by the Director of the Contract Staff Classification Study and occurred in person or by telephone, depending upon the nature and extent of the information required. Seventy-five audits were conducted. The evaluation of questionnaires was completed in mid-October, 1982. Appendix E contains the procedures developed by the Committee for evaluating the benchmark positions and all questionnaires, and the audit guidelines.

The final stages of the study included the analysis of the position data, preparation of position descriptions and submission of a final report.

The Committee requested numerous reports from University Computer Services including rankings of positions by total score on the questionnaire; rankings of position by score on each question; similar rankings within defined title and area groupings; frequency distributions showing the number of positions credited with each possible response; a report showing the titles of all positions credited with each possible response; total score rankings of positions by subcommittee doing the evaluation; and a position profile identifying for each position the actual responses accepted for each question. These reports were submitted to the Committee in mid-November.

Three graduate students enrolled in the College Student Personnel program were hired to assist in developing job descriptions for all positions. This process was completed in mid-November.

The final report was compiled by the Committee and includes job descriptions and position profiles for each contract position included in the study, committee interpretation and comments on the computer analysis, and recommendations regarding the procedures/instruments used in the study and suggestions on how the institution might proceed toward the realization of the five original objectives of the study.

V. Summary of the Results of the Study

The Contract Staff Classification Study has resulted in the development of position descriptions and position profiles, some descriptive information about contract positions at EGSU, and a rank order of all positions based on job worth.

V. Summary of the Results of the Study

In summarizing the results of the Contract Staff Classification study, the Committee has focused its attention in three areas: a) the development of position descriptions and position profiles; b) the description of the demographic make-up of contract positions; and c) the analysis of the numerical ranking of positions resulting from the point-factor evaluation of position questionnaires. Together, these provide an extensive data base concerning contract staff positions at BGSU.

A. Position Descriptions & Position Profiles

Information used in developing position descriptions was taken from the job content section of the position questionnaire. The key aspects of each job as described by the incumbent were listed on the position description. In addition to information that identifies the title, work area, and supervisor of the position, each position description also lists the minimum qualifications for the position (amount of education and work experience, and licensing, if any). The position descriptions are designed to be a summary of tasks and responsibilities.

Since each position description is based primarily on the job content section of the questionnaire, the Committee felt that additional valuable information about each position could be obtained from the remaining seventeen questions which addressed the compensable factors. Summary sheets listing the actual response to each question were developed. These summary sheets, called position profiles, show the responses the Committee determined to be appropriate in its evaluation of questionnaires, which may not have been the same responses listed by the incumbent.

The combination of the position description and the position profile provides a summary of each position. This information will be useful in addressing the long-range focus of the study - development of a comprehensive personnel system for contract staff at BGSU. The Committee feels that these materials provide a basis for comparing the relative worth of positions and for identifying career paths within the University. The position descriptions and position profiles were compiled under separate covers for review with this final report. (See Attachments A & B).

B. Demographic Make-up of Contract Positions

A review of the questionnaire items revealed some interesting facts about the 273 contract staff positions included in the study. Eighty-four percent of positions require at least a Bachelor's degree (more than 50% require a Master's or higher). A majority of positions, at the same time, require up to a maximum of three years related work experience. Licensing is required of only 18 positions (7%).

Seven percent of all contract positions require frequent (two or more times per month) overnight travel; and 24% require day trips at the same frequency.

A review of the overtime statistics revealed that 34% of contract positions (92) require incumbents to work no more than 40 hours per week. The remaining 66% regularly work from one to more than seventy hours per month in addition to the prescribed 40-hour workweek.

Only fifty-seven positions (21%) are exposed to physical hazards. Of those, only 23% are exposed to hazards of potentially disabling severity.

Fifty-one percent of all contract positions perform their duties with minimal supervision ("Direction" or "General Direction"). More than 70% perform only a recommending function in the various personnel decisions (evaluating performance, awarding salary increments, promoting/reclassifying, authorizing new positions, hiring, terminating, and disciplining personnel).


Thirty-nine percent of contract positions have primary signatory authority for budgets, while fifty-five percent of all positions perform some budgetary tasks without signatory authority.




In evaluating question #14 on decision-making, three levels of decisions were considered: a) decisions guided by defined procedure; b) those requiring selective use of established procedures with some flexibility for deviation from procedure; and c) those for which precedent is generally lacking and which result in the establishment of policy or procedure.

Nearly all positions perform the lowest level of decision-making at least several times per year. Seventy-three percent make these decisions either daily or weekly. At the highest level of decision-making, only 37% of the positions were involved, most making such decisions no more than several times per year. Figure 1 on page 17 shows the distribution of the three levels of decisions.

FIGURE 1

Distribution of Levels of Decision-Making



-  = level a decisions
-  = level b decisions
-  = level c decisions

Seventy percent of all contract positions have some involvement with confidentiality of information. Only 21%, however, are actually involved with compiling confidential information and determining procedures for its release.

Question #16 addresses numerous aspects of a position's impact on the institution. Forty-seven percent have an impact on the growth and development of students and 13% are directly involved in recruitment activities (nearly 50%, however, have an indirect involvement in recruitment).

Eighty percent of all contract positions are considered to provide a support service to faculty, staff, or students at BGSU. Support service to faculty and staff was defined as assistance which affects the ability of others to perform their work assignments whether teaching, research, administrative, or technical in nature. Assisting faculty or staff in a position's own work area was not considered in this question. Support service to students was defined as assistance with academic, non-academic, or post-graduation matters.

Positions that deal with alumni and parents of students for the purpose of enhancing the image of the University or encouraging financial support, recruitment of students and program participation number ninety-five (35%).

Providing programs and activities that affect the professional or personal growth and development of faculty is the responsibility of 17% of contract positions; similarly, 14% provide those services to other non-faculty staff members.

Less than 50% of contract positions have some impact on the financial stability of the University, while only 2% are considered to have a controlling role in overall financial matters (Treasurer, Executive Vice Provost, Vice President for Operations and the President).

Although 62% of all contract positions have some impact on the image and reputation of the institution through external relationships required of the job, most have indirect influence. Fourteen percent (37 positions) were considered to have a direct influence on the image and reputation of the University. Their external involvement has a direct bearing on the accomplishment of institution-wide goals and objectives.

Twenty-two percent have some job responsibility in relation to the safety, appearance, and condition of the buildings and grounds. Forty-two percent are responsible for the effective utilization

of equipment and/or facilities.

The final aspect considered under the category of "impact on the institution" was policy-making. Sixty percent of the contract positions studied are involved in policy-making either in their own work area, in a recommending capacity on institution-wide policy, or as the final authority for policy decisions affecting the entire University. Only seven positions (3%) have that final authority.

In addition to these statistics, the Contract Staff Classification Study Committee also has available lists of positions grouped by response on each question. With these lists it is possible to review, for example, which positions require a doctoral degree, which positions work under "general supervision," or which positions have an impact on the academic growth and development of students. Because of the length of the lists they were not included in this final report. They are available for review from the Director of Contract Staff Classification Study.

C. Analysis of Position Rankings

The point-factor method of evaluating positions is a means of assigning appropriate levels of worth to various aspects of a job. By quantifying these levels of worth, positions are assigned a total numerical score which forms a basis for analysis and comparison. The Committee's analysis of position rankings was conducted in several ways:

- 1) a review of rankings of all positions by total score on the questionnaire;
- 2) a review of rankings of all positions by score on each question in the questionnaire; and
- 3) a review of rankings of positions by the subcommittee doing the evaluation.

In addition to looking at all positions together in the first two analyses listed, the Committee also reviewed rankings within work areas and title groupings. Work areas were those established earlier in the study for purposes of grouping positions according to organizational structure in effect in August 1981 (see Appendix A). Title groupings were arbitrarily determined by similarity of titles. Fifteen title groupings were identified as follows: 1) President, Vice-Presidents, Vice Provosts; 2) Assistant/ Associate Vice Presidents/Vice Provosts; 3) Deans; 4) Associate Deans; 5) Assistant Deans; 6) Directors; 7) Associate Directors; 8) Assistant Directors; 9) Managers; 10) Coordinators;

11) Supervisors; 12) Academic Advisors; 13) Assistant to . . .
 14) Administrative Assistants; and 15) Technical/Professional
 positions.

It should be noted that the Committee decided not to include in the final report the actual points assigned to individual positions. Early in the Study, it was decided that the total possible number of points should be kept confidential. Only the Director of the Contract Staff Classification Study knows that value. Without a thorough understanding of the weighting and evaluation process, point values have little meaning. The ranking of positions created by the point values, on the other hand, forms the basis of the Committee's analysis. For the purposes of this final report, it may be helpful to know that positions ranged in total point value from 757 to 11,456.

Observations made in this section of the report are based on Committee knowledge and perception of positions and information obtained from questionnaires.

1. Review of rankings of all positions by total score on the questionnaire.

Overall, the Committee felt that the evaluation process resulted in an appropriate rank order of positions. The President and other top level administrative positions were ranked the highest, while maintenance and service positions usually occurred lowest in the ranking. Exhibit A at the end of this section is the ranking of all contract positions.


The Committee observed that the point spread between positions was greater at the extreme low and high ends of the ranking than in the middle. In most cases, the average differences between consecutive positions was 20 points. Eighty-two percent of the positions were scored in the 2,000-7,000 point range. The distribution of positions is shown in Figure 2 on page 21.

There were several observations of a supervisory position ranked lower than a subordinate position from the same area. The Committee felt there were several possible reasons for this:

- 1) the difference in how incumbents completed the questionnaire;
- 2) an accurate reflection of the situation;
- 3) the weighting process;
- 4) evaluation of questionnaires by different sub-committees.

FIGURE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS BY TOTAL POINTS



The Committee felt that the ranking of positions within work areas was also appropriate. Exhibit B at the end of this section displays that rank order. It was difficult, however, to compare position rankings in one area with those in another, because each area is organized differently.

The analysis of the ranking of positions by title grouping was considered generally inconclusive. The Committee found some inconsistency in the titles assigned to similar positions and, therefore, determined that the title groupings were inappropriate for making any valid conclusions. As an example, positions involved with advising students on academic matters have the following sample of titles: Assistant Dean, Academic Advisor, Counselor, Director of Program Advisement, Coordinator of Advisement. These positions were assigned under different title groupings based on their titles. In addition, it was observed that the "Director" and "Manager" title groupings had the broadest total point spread. Other title groupings appeared to be more homogenous. The Committee concluded the positions in these two title groupings are the most divergent in terms of duties and responsibilities.




The Committee found in its evaluation of questionnaires that questions #11 (Amount and Nature of Human Contacts) and #14 (Decision-making) were the most difficult to verify. In order to determine if these two questions made any major difference in the overall ranking of positions, two additional rank orders were generated - one with the points for question #11 omitted, and another with the points for question #14 omitted. The resulting rank orders of positions were considered to be similar to the ranking based on the total of all questions. Therefore Questions #11 and #14 did not appear to change the ranking of positions. Figure 3 on page 23 compares the three rank orders.

2. Review of rankings of all positions by score on each question in the questionnaire.

Overall, the rankings of positions by total points on individual questions was considered appropriate. The following general observations were made:

- a) Question #1 - Education requirements were generally higher for positions in the academic areas (Colleges and Student Affairs) than for positions in non-academic areas.
- b) Question #2 - Years of related experience appeared to be higher for positions in non-academic areas (Operations and President's Office) than for positions in academic areas. The experience requirement did not make a distinction between generally related experience and specific experience actually working in a similar position.

FIGURE 3 - COMPARISON OF RANKINGS



- c) Question #3 - The requirement for licensing occurred most often in technical/professional positions in Operations, Intercollegiate Athletics, and Health/Physical Recreation areas.
- d) Question #4 - Most extensive travel occurred in positions in the Admissions, Intercollegiate Athletics, and Alumni areas.
- e) Question #5 - Many positions worked additional hours each month without compensation as a requirement in order to accomplish the duties of the job. The additional work time was observed to be most frequent among positions in Operations, Intercollegiate Athletics, Television Services, and Student Affairs areas.
- f) Question #6 - Positions receiving credit for exposure to physical hazards occurred mainly in technical areas requiring the use of equipment or exposure to hazardous conditions including: Instructional Media Center, Musical Arts, Operations (Food Service and Technical Support Services), Intercollegiate Athletics, Television Services, and Student Affairs (Health Center).
- g) Question #7 - Approximately half of all positions received minimal supervision ("Direction" or "General Direction"), in performing the job.
- h) Questions #8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 - The rankings of positions on these questions were appropriate. The questions addressed supervision of employees, personnel decisions, nature of human contacts, budget responsibilities, decision-making, and confidentiality.
- i) Question #16 - Positions receiving high ranking on impact on the institution were mainly in the academic area.

In general, it was considered that position rankings by individual question were appropriate. In closely examining rank orders by area or title group, some questions were raised about appropriate ranking. However, these questions were not considered significant because of the low point differences between positions on individual questions. The Committee observed that education and experience requirements were closely linked. For example, some positions required a lower educational level, but higher experience level than other apparently comparable positions.

3. Review of rankings of positions by subcommittee doing the evaluation.

The Contract Staff Classification Study Committee was divided into three subcommittees for the evaluation of questionnaires. Although all Committee members were initially involved in the evaluation of benchmark positions for the purpose of establishing general

evaluation standards, it was felt some difference might still have occurred in the rankings based on each sub-committee's process. The Committee, therefore, compared the rankings of positions evaluated by each subcommittee. In general, there were no obvious inconsistencies in rankings by subgroups. However, since subcommittees did not evaluate the same (or even similar) positions, no conclusion could be drawn relative to subcommittee rankings.

General observations concerning Committee analysis of rankings.

The ranking of positions was considered to be accurate to the extent that incumbents in the positions (and their supervisors) completed the position questionnaires properly. The Committee attributed some differences in expected ranking of positions to the possibility that titles are inappropriate. The results of the study do not easily identify career paths because of the inconsistency in titles used.

VI. Recommendations

The Committee has made recommendations concerning the questionnaire and evaluation process, the results of the study, development of a personnel system for contract positions, and dissemination of the results of the study.

VI. Recommendations

The completion of this study marks the accomplishment of the first stage in the development of a personnel system for contract positions. A data base consisting of position descriptions, position rankings, and detailed information about the characteristics of each contract position has been developed. The Contract Staff Classification Study Committee has prepared recommendations concerning the questionnaire and evaluation process, the results of the study, the development of a personnel system for contract positions, and the dissemination of the results of this study.

A. Recommendations to Revise the Position Questionnaire, Evaluation Manual, and Evaluation Process

In general, the Committee recommends that a team of experts in questionnaire design and analysis review the instruments and procedures used in the study, determine the statistical validity of the weighting process, and conduct additional statistical analyses of the questionnaire results. The following specific recommendations concerning revisions to the questionnaire and evaluation manual are based on the Committee's evaluation of position questionnaires.

1. The questionnaire should be revised to increase the number of forced-choice questions, thus making the evaluation process more objective.
2. Criteria established during the evaluation process (and included in Appendix E) should be incorporated into the Evaluation Manual.
3. Question #1: Instructions for Question #1 should be revised to specify "normal minimum requirements" (i.e., those requirements at which the position would be advertised to draw "quality" applicants).

Normal minimum requirements should be guided by internal structure and external market situation. Academic credibility of the position at the University should not be the sole reason for assigning a higher level of education than is actually needed to perform a job.

If a college degree is required, an appropriate area of specialization should be included with the requirements.

- 4. Question #7: Type of supervision received appears to be more a function of the supervisor's administrative style rather than the type of supervision necessary for the effective performance of a job. The Committee recommends that this question be reviewed in terms of its usefulness and validity, as well as appropriate wording.
- 5. Question #10: The Committee recommends that there be an investigation to determine if there should be a distinction in points/weighting for personnel decisions depending upon employment status (full-time, part-time or temporary) and employee group (faculty, contract, classified or student).

The Questionnaire and the Evaluation Manual should be clarified for easier interpretation. For instance, the wording of level (4) should be changed because it is too narrow in meaning.

- 6. Question #11: The definitions of types of contact should be clarified. This question, in general, should be reviewed by an expert in questionnaire design and analysis to determine its significance.
- 7. Question #12: Information for this question should be obtained from the Business Office.
- 8. Question #14: The question does not provide adequate guidelines to accurately classify type and frequency of decisions. Frequencies often appear to be too high for the two highest levels of decision-making. The question should be revised into a forced-choice format specifying at least three categories of decisions: administrative, professional/technical, and creative/artistic.
- 9. Question #16: Section "d", "Relationships with Alumni and Parents of Students" of the Evaluation Manual should be clarified as follows:

"This position develops strategies, disseminates information, and communicates with alumni and parents of students . . ."

This revision stresses that the position must engage in all three activities in order to be given credit in this section.

- 10. The Questionnaire instructions and supervisor review sections should be revised to require closer supervisor review and comment on each question.

B. Recommendations Based on the
Results of the Study

1. The study has shown that numerous materials and types of information are viewed as confidential. The university should establish guidelines to describe what materials are confidential and how they should be handled.
2. The study has shown that 66% of contract positions require employees regularly to work more than 40 hours a week without compensation. In addition, the number of additional hours varies from one to more than 70 hours per month. Because of the variation of response to this question, the Committee recommends that the university investigate the situation with several objectives in mind:
 - a) determine if the "overtime" is a requirement of the job;
 - b) determine if inappropriate staffing levels are the cause;
 - c) develop policies to handle "overtime" in a fair and consistent manner.
3. There is some inconsistency in the use of titles making it difficult to understand reporting relationship within an area or to compare jobs from one area to another. For example, in some areas, "Directors" report to "Directors"; in one department positions at the same organizational level will vary from "Manager" to "Coordinator" to "Director"; one department may use titles like "Manager" and "Coordinator" while another will use "Director" or "Assistant Vice Provost." To use various titles, in itself, is not undesirable; however, there needs to be clarification on how titles compare.
4. During the evaluation process, the Committee questioned whether some positions should be classified instead of contract because of their similarity to existing classified positions. The Committee recommends that criteria be established for determining contract status for a position. In addition, the Committee also recommends that the Administrative Staff Council should be involved in establishing those criteria.
5. "Supervision received" by a position was often a function of the immediate supervisor's style rather than an indicator of the organizational level of the position. For purposes of describing positions (and not people), the Committee recommends that a decision be made whether supervisory style or organizational level should determine the response to this question.

- 6. Because changes in organizational structure appear to occur frequently, the Committee recommends that complete organizational charts should be updated on a regular basis.
- 7. Supervisors should be required to provide input on all responses on the position questionnaire for positions reporting to them.

C. Recommendations on the Development
of a Personnel System for Contract
Positions at BGSU

Developing a personnel system for contract positions is needed. The Contract Staff Classification Study has been the first step toward this goal. The Committee supports the development of such a system and makes the following specific recommendations:

- 1. A method for updating position descriptions on a periodic basis should be developed.
- 2. A compensation program should be developed including position grade levels and the establishment of competitive salary levels. Salary levels should not have upper limits.
- 3. Appropriate staffing (such as a full-time Director and an assistant) should be appointed to coordinate all activities of the personnel system.
- 4. The position questionnaire and evaluation process should be revised as previously recommended.
- 5. The weighting process should be examined to determine its validity.
- 6. Top management support of a personnel system is essential for the system's success.
- 7. All contract positions should be included in the system, with no exclusions.
- 8. Based on information generated by this study, career paths should be established to assist with upward mobility.
- 9. Position descriptions and position profiles should be used to determine staffing needs and changes, to recruit for vacant positions, and to provide a basis for monitoring salary equity.
- 10. A survey of similar positions at other universities should be conducted to learn minimum education and experience requirements and make appropriate changes to the requirements set by this study.

D. Recommendation on the Dissemination of the Results of the Contract Staff Classification Study

The Contract Staff Classification Study Committee has prepared this final report for the President of Bowling Green State University. The following recommendations are made for dissemination of information generated by the study to contract staff members:

1. The President should distribute position descriptions, position profiles and rankings of positions to the appropriate area Vice Presidents.
2. The Vice Presidents, in consultation with their appropriate area heads, should review these materials and determine if the descriptions of positions and rankings are appropriate. If there are questions, the Vice President should discuss them with the Director of the Contract Staff Classification Study. If a re-evaluation is warranted, the Director will reconvene the appropriate subcommittee. A response on the re-evaluation will be given to the Vice President. If a change is made on a position description or position profile the Director will also process the change in position ranking.
3. Next, the position descriptions and position profiles should be disseminated to current incumbents in the positions. The dissemination should occur at meetings scheduled for each work area identified in the study. At these meetings the Director of the Contract Staff Classification Study and selected Committee members will be present to explain the study and the development of the position descriptions and profiles.
4. If an employee does not agree with the position description or the position profile, he/she should file an appeal in writing specifying why he/she is appealing and what change is expected. That appeal should be made to his/her Vice President who may respond or forward it to the CSCSC for review. The Committee will review and return a response in writing to the incumbent in the position. This decision is binding.
5. When all appeals have been completed, the position descriptions and position profiles should be made open for review. Position rankings should also be released. Points received on individual questions or the entire questionnaire will not be released.
6. A summary of this final report should be prepared and distributed to all contract staff members.