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ASC Secretary: Schedule of Duties (rev 8/01)

General:
- ASC budget/org. number: 500 3031. You would use this budget number to pay for plaques, etc.

- Prepare monthly agenda by checking with Chair. Duplicate about 10 copies and bring to ASC meeting. Send a copy through e-mail to the ASC members plus any additional ones on mailing list. Most reps print a copy of the e-mail agenda they receive. Usually send handouts from the meeting to individuals absent from the meeting.

- Take minutes of ASC monthly meeting, send draft to reps through the reps listproc. The list serve for administrative staff council is asc-reps@listproc.bgsu.edu. The list serve for all administrative staff is asc@listproc.bgsu.edu. Also, send a copy to Roxanna Foster (foster@wbgu.bgsu.edu) for the administrative staff home page. I typed the minutes in Word, and pasted it to the e-mail to distribute to all administrative staff. You could send a copy to Ribeau, Dobbs, USG, GSS, Faculty Senate, the Monitor, and the BG News (check w. Chair to make sure there are no duplicate mailings). Since it was on the web site, I did not send the minutes to the other groups.

- Contact Humans Resources (2-2555), for mailing labels for administrative staff mailing labels (entire group) when needed. Right now the list is in order by functional areas. The labels are used mainly for elections, and any other special mailings. Allow at least 2 days.

- Track attendance at ASC meetings and notify members who miss two or more meetings (by about January) without sending a representative as per ASC attendance policy.

- Deb Wells, Computer services, maintains the listproc and will update it based upon e-mails from Human Resources. Joe Luthman, Computer Services, Maintains the constituent list for ASC members. Human Resources should e-mail ASC secretary and others regarding staff changes throughout the year.

- Set up notebook for next year's meeting materials/correspondence. Contact the university archival collections office (Mary Beth Zachary is picking them up this year and may want to do so next year also) to collect materials from two and three years ago. Keep last year's materials for review and resource during your year. The archival collections office will collect and maintain the secretary material for the Administrative Staff Council at the library.

August:
- Design and distribute Fall Reception invitations to all administrative staff in early-mid August (mailing based upon when the reception is scheduled).

- Notify the Monitor of the Fall Reception.

- Send September meeting reminder and agenda (check with Chair) to all ASC representatives.

September:
I ordered plaques last fall for the 99-00 chair and secretary. However, the plaques for 00-01 were given during the spring reception and the Awards Committee took care of it. You may want to keep this on the list of possible things to do for the next secretary in case they are not given in spring of 02.

- Coordinate with chairperson the ordering of plaques for outgoing ASC chair and secretary to present at fall reception. In the past these have been ordered at the Copy Shop. They have a copy of the previous orders which they can repeat with changes of names.

"With deepest appreciation for service to BGSU as Administrative Staff Council (Chair, Secretary) XXXX-XXXX (year)"

- Make room reservation for University Space Assignments for Spring Reception. Check with Chair and ASC Executive Committee regarding date and location. Food/refreshments should be arranged with University Union/Catering. The Chair-Elect orders the food.

October, November, December:
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF FUNCTIONAL GROUPINGS

I. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT
Affirmative Action
Alumni Affairs
Auxiliary Services
Business Office
Capital Planning
Design & Construction
Development/Foundation
Disability Services
Environmental Health & Safety
Facilities Services
Finance
General Counsel
Governmental Affairs
Human Resources
Ice Arena
Institutional Research
Internal Auditing
Marketing & Communications
Materials Handling
Payroll
Post Office
President’s Office/Office
Provost/VPA
Public Safety
Purchasing
Risk Management
Treasurer
Unigroups
University Advancement
Number of staff in area
X 6% representation = ___ reps

II. STUDENT SUPPORT
Academic Enhancement
Admissions
Bookstore
Campus Involvement
Career Services
College Access Program
Counseling Center
Dining Services
Education, Program Advisement
Educational Talent Search
Financial Aid
First Year Experience Program
Health Services
International Programs
Multicultural & Academic Initiatives
Registration & Records
Residence Life
Springboard
Student Affairs
Student Life
Student Publications
Student Support Services
Union Administration
Wellness Connection
Women’s Center
Number of staff in area
X 6% representation = ___ reps

III. ACADEMIC SUPPORT
Archival Collections
Arts & Sciences, College of
Business Administration, College of
Continuing Ed. & Summer Programs
Cooperative Education
Creative Arts
Education & Human Development
Environmental Programs
Executive Vice President
Graduate College
Graduate Studies in Business
Great Lakes, Historical Collections of
Health & Human Services, College of
Honors Program
Library/Regional Book Depository
Musical Arts, College of
Philosophy Documentation Center
Policy Analysis & Public Service
Popular Press
President’s Leadership Academy
Social Philosophy & Policy Center
Sponsored Programs & Research (SPR)
Tapestries Program
Technology, College of
Number of staff in area
X 6% representation = ___ reps

IV. ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS
Art, School of
Biological Sciences
Business Education
Canadian Studies
Chemistry
Communication Disorders
Computer Science
English
Family & Consumer Sciences
Gerontology
History
Human Movement, Sport & Leisure
Intervention Services, Division of
Language Laboratory
Management Department
Medical Technology
Nursing
Philosophy
Photochemical Sciences
Psychology
Romance Languages
Technology Systems
Theater & Film Studies
Number of staff in area
X 6% representation = ___ reps

V. ATHLETICS/REC. SPORTS
Athletics
Recreation Sports
Number of staff in area
X 6% representation = ___ reps

VI. TECHNOLOGY
Information Technology Services
Instructional Media
NWOET Foundation
Teaching, Learning & Technology
WBGU-TV/ Tucker Center
Number of staff in area
X 6% representation = ___ reps

VII. FIRELANDS
Firelands
Number of staff in area
X 6% representation = ___ reps
May 21, 2001

To: Dr. Sidney Ribeau

From: Administrative Staff Council

Re: Administrative Staff Salary Recommendation 2001-2002

Given the highly volatile nature of the budget situation in Ohio at this time while also acknowledging the financial constraints under which we are all working, Administrative Staff Council finds it difficult to recommend an appropriate specific percentage increase in salary for the next contract year.

ASC has charted comparatively, for more than a decade, Bowling Green State University (BGSU) administrative staff compensation against ten peer institutions in Ohio as documented in College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) reports. A thorough analysis offered in last year’s salary recommendation showed that on the average our CUPA-defined administrative positions had lost ground—in both dollars and in statewide ranking—against all ten of the peer institutions that define our competitive recruitment market. Recent data analysis suggests a continuation of that downward competitive spiral. To reach even the fifth place or mid-range of our peer institutions in Ohio, a competitive placement we enjoyed in the mid-90s, clearly would require a double-digit percentage of salary increase. In the current fiscal situation, we realize that such a request would seem selfish, even ludicrous.

Given, however, that administrative staff, classified staff, and non-instructional faculty have borne and will bear the burden of the selective hiring freeze, Administrative Staff Council recommends that whatever raise is given to the employees of BGSU for the 2001-2002 contract year, however small, is given in a fair and equitable manner—i.e., that each employee group be given the same percentage of salary increase. Differential increases among employee constituent groups, especially in a time when many staff are covering the work of unfilled colleague positions, easily could give rise to significant morale problems.

We look forward to contributing positively and constructively in facing the coming challenges.
INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE
In order for Bowling Green State University (BGSU) to attract and retain qualified administrative staff employees, it is BGSU's policy to maintain fair and competitive grade levels and pay ranges without regard to race, sex, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, color, national origin, ancestry, religion, age, marital status, disability, or status as a Special Disabled or Vietnam-era veteran.

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

- Relationships between positions and their worth
- The principles of equitable compensation
- Competition with the external employment market

SCOPE

These policies and procedures apply to all OCCUPIED administrative staff positions and supersede all previous written or unwritten practices. The ongoing responsibility for the administration of the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan (Plan) is assigned to the Assistant Vice President for Human Resources.

I. Objectives
It is the intent of the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan to

- Administer the Plan in accordance with the general policies of the University
- Provide a compensation plan that is internally equitable (AS DETERMINED BY COMPARING SIMILAR UNIVERSITY POSITIONS) and externally COMPETITNESS with the market. WHEN APPROPRIATE, THIS PLAN WILL BE DETERMINED BY
COMPARING SALARY RANGES WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY WITH SALARY RANGES FOR SIMILAR POSITIONS IN THE MARKET OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITY.

- Ensure equitable compensation for positions requiring similar educational levels, experience levels, skills, effort, working conditions, and levels of responsibilities.

- Ensure that the administration of the position evaluations and grade level assignments is consistent and uniform throughout the University.

- Provide for a review process that will address inequities.

- Allow for the maintenance of competitive grade levels.

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

II. Definition of Terms

The following terms are used in the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan:

A. Administrative Staff Advisory Team Members

The Administrative Staff (AS) Advisory Team CONSISTS of 16 (SIXTEEN) administrative staff members selected by the Administrative Staff Council (ASC) Executive Committee. Team members will serve three-year terms (SEPTEMBER 1 / AUGUST 31) WITH FIVE OR SIX NEW MEMBERS JOINING THE TEAM EACH YEAR. TEAM MEMBERS MUST BE INACTIVE FOR ONE YEAR AFTER COMPLETION OF THEIR THREE-YEAR TERM BEFORE THEY CAN BE CONSIDERED FOR RE-APPOINTMENT. IF A COMMITTEE MEMBER CANNOT COMPLETE HIS/HER TERM, ASC'S EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WILL APPOINT A MEMBER FROM THE SAME FUNCTIONAL AREA TO COMPLETE THE TERM. MEMBERSHIP TO THIS COMMITTEE SHOULD INCLUDE REPRESENTATIVES FROM ALL FUNCTIONAL AREAS.

The team's PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY IS TO collaborate with Human Resources in the re-evaluation of JOB Analysis Questionnaires. Human Resources and past members of the Administrative Staff Advisory Team TRAIN TEAM MEMBERS to analyze, evaluate, and recommend a grade level (numeric ranking) for CURRENTLY OCCUPIED ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF POSITIONS.

Each time an administrative staff position is re-evaluated, Human Resources selects FOUR members from the Team to participate in the process.
ATTEMPTING TO ROTATE PARTICIPATION EQUALLY AMONG MEMBERS. ONE TEAM MEMBER MUST BE FROM THE SAME VICE-PRESIDENTIAL AREA AS THE POSITION BEING RE-EVALUATED. THE OTHER THREE TEAM MEMBERS SHOULD BE FROM DIFFERENT VICE-PRESIDENTIAL AREAS. IF ONE MEMBER OF THE FOUR-PERSON TEAM FEELS IT IS NECESSARY TO RECUSE HIM/HERSELF THE PROCESS CAN CONTINUE WITH A THREE-MEMBER TEAM. IF MORE THAN ONE TEAM MEMBER WISHES TO BE RECUSED, A NEW TEAM MAY BE ASSIGNED. THE HUMAN RESOURCE DIRECTOR APPOINTS TWO MEMBERS OF THE HUMAN RESOURCE STAFF TO SERVE AS COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF TEAM members also participate in the Conciliation/Appeals process, BUT INDIVIDUAL team members MAY NOT participate in BOTH the re-evaluation AND THE APPEALS PROCESS FOR THE SAME POSITION.

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF ADVISORY TEAM MEMBER ROTATION

THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF ADVISORY TEAM CONSISTS OF 16 (SIXTEEN) ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF MEMBERS SELECTED BY THE ASC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR STAGGERED THREE-YEAR TERMS.

A. MEMBERS WILL BEGIN SERVICE ON SEPTEMBER 1 AND SERVE FOR THREE YEARS ENDING ON AUGUST 31.
B. EACH YEAR FIVE OR SIX NEW MEMBERS WILL BE APPOINTED TO REPLACE THE FIVE OR SIX WHO ARE COMPLETING THEIR SERVICE.
C. MEMBERSHIP TO THIS COMMITTEE SHOULD BE REPRESENTED BY THE FUNCTIONAL AREAS. IF THE UNIVERSITY STRUCTURE CHANGES, THE NEXT MEMBERS APPOINTED SHOULD ADDRESS ANY COMMITTEE INEQUITIES RESULTING FROM THE NEW STRUCTURE.
D. IF A COMMITTEE MEMBER CANNOT COMPLETE HIS/HER TERM, ASC'S EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WILL APPOINT A MEMBER FROM THE SAME FUNCTIONAL AREA TO COMPLETE THE TERM.
E. NO MEMBERS SHALL SERVE CONSECUTIVE THREE-YEAR TERMS.

B. Grade Level
The grade level is the numeric ranking of administrative staff positions from 5 to 23.

C. Human Resources/Administrative Staff Advisory Team (HR/AS ADVISORY TEAM)
Two members of the Human Resources staff and the FOUR members selected from the Administrative Staff Advisory Team comprise the HR/AS Advisory Team. This combined team is responsible for analyzing, evaluating, and recommending a grade level whenever an OCCUPIED administrative staff position is re-evaluated.

D. Position JOB Analysis Questionnaire
The JOB Analysis Questionnaire is the instrument used to describe the position responsibilities. This questionnaire is used by the HR/AS Advisory Team and/or Human Resources to determine the grade 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. The Position JOB Analysis Questionnaire must be completed in order for any administrative staff position to be created and/or changed.

E. Pay Range
The pay range is the compensation for a particular grade level. Each pay range has a designated minimum, midpoint and maximum. In 2001/2002 for example, in grade level 14 the minimum is $33,404, the midpoint is $42,590, and the maximum is $51,776.

F. Administrative PRESIDENT’S Compensation Working Group
The PRESIDENT’S Administrative Compensation Working Group is comprised of ADMINISTRATORS APPOINTED BY the President. This group routinely reviews issues regarding the Plan and decides the outcome of the appeals process.

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

A. New Administrative Staff Hire
New administrative staff generally is hired between the minimum and midpoint of a grade level. A salary assigned above the midpoint requires prior approval by the Vice-President, after consultation with the Offices of Human Resources and EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES (EDIS). (Number 2 - Approved by Board of Trustees, September 13, 1996.)

B. Upgrade
Definition:
A position is re-evaluated and assigned to a higher-grade level as a result of significant expansion in the position's existing duties and responsibilities.

Policy:
The incumbent is guaranteed at least a 5% increase in salary or the minimum salary for the new level, whichever is greater. (Number 3 - Approved by Board of Trustees, September 13, 1996).

C. Promotion
Definition:
An incumbent moves from a position requiring a certain level of skill, effort, and responsibility to a position requiring a significantly greater degree of skill, effort, and responsibility.

Policy:
When an employee is promoted, she/he is guaranteed at least a 5% increase in salary or the minimum salary for the new level, whichever is greater. (Point 4 - Approved by Board of Trustees, September 13, 1996.)

D. Interim/Acting Positions
Definition:
A staff member is assigned to a position on an interim/temporary/acting basis.

Policy:
If the assignment is longer than 30 calendar days and is in a higher grade level, the staff member receives a premium for the time served equal to at least a 5% increase in salary or the minimum for the interim grade level, whichever is greater. (Point 5 - Approved by Board of Trustees, September 13, 1996.)

E. Demotion
Definition:
An incumbent staff member moves from a position requiring a certain level of skill, effort, and responsibility to another position in a lower grade level requiring a lesser degree of skill, effort, and responsibility.

Policy:
When a demotion occurs, the incumbent's salary is reduced to a level in the lower pay range equivalent to his/her level in the original pay range. (Point 6 - Approved by Board of Trustees, September 13, 1996)
consultation with the Vice-President and Human Resources must approve any exceptions to this policy.

F. Downgrade
Definition:
A position is reassigned to a lower grade level as a result of significant reduction in the position's existing duties and responsibilities.

Policy:
When a position downgrade occurs, the incumbent's salary is reduced to the level in the lower pay range equivalent to his/her level in the original pay range. The President in consultation with the Vice-President and Human Resources must approve any exceptions to this policy.

G. Transfer
Definition:
An incumbent staff member moves from a position requiring a certain level of skill, effort and responsibility to another position requiring the same degree of skill, effort, and responsibility which is assigned to the same grade level.

Policy:
When a transfer occurs, normally the incumbent's salary will not be adjusted. (Point 7 - Approved by Board of Trustees, September 13, 1996.) 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 SALARY premium 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 salary premium may be paid for these positions. (Point 8 - Approved by Board of Trustees, September 13, 1996.)
I. Pay Above Maximum  
Policy:  
Administrative staff salaries are capped at the maximum or above the maximum of a pay range. However, staffs whose salaries are currently at or above the maximum are exempt for a period of three years. Effective July 2000, the salaries of any staff still above maximum MAY be frozen until such time as those salaries are within his/her 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 capped maximum will be enforced. (Point 10 - Approved by Board of Trustees, September 13, 1996.)

Staff who is at the maximum will be considered for a merit increase not to exceed the percentage adjustment of the pay range.

Staff above the maximum is eligible each year for a one-time, merit-based bonus not to exceed the percentage of the salary pool designated for merit each year. This will occur only when the Board of Trustees authorizes bonuses and will not be added to base salaries.

J. Progression Through the Pay Range  
Definition:  
Progression through a pay range is the method by which an incumbent moves through his/her assigned pay range.

Policy:  
Staff progress through pay ranges based on meritorious performance. Human Resources, in conjunction with the Administrative Staff Council Executive Committee, will develop by the year 2002 criteria and a process for staff to reach the midpoint of a pay range.

K. Title Revision  
Policy:  
Title changes may be requested to more accurately reflect position responsibilities. A Position JOB Analysis Questionnaire is completed and forwarded to Human Resources in accordance with established procedures. If the proposed title accurately reflects the responsibilities, the HR/AS Advisory Team may recommend that the title be changed regardless of any change in the grade level. No title change occurs without approval from the supervisor, Vice-President and Human Resources.

L. Salary Range Adjustments  
Policy:
Effective 1997-98, the ranges for each grade level will be adjusted in a three-year recurring cycle. In the first two years of the cycle, the pay range of each grade level will move up annually by an amount that is 1% less than the average salary increase paid to staff that year. (Number 9 - Approved by Board of Trustees, September 13, 1996.)

Every third year beginning with 1999-2000, the University will re-evaluate the ranges in light of current market conditions, as well as other relevant factors, and adjust the ranges in accordance with that RE-EVALUATION. (Point 9 - Approved by Board of Trustees, September 13, 1996.)

IV. Administrative Compensation Plan Position Evaluation/Re-evaluation Processes

The position evaluation process is the method by which positions are evaluated against a uniform set of criteria and assigned to established grade levels and appropriate pay ranges. Human Resources conducts the evaluations for new positions. Human Resources AND THE Administrative Staff Advisory Team JOINTLY conduct the re-evaluation of OCCUPIED positions. RE-EVALUATION OCCURS WHEN INITIATED BY THE INCUMBENT, THE SUPERVISOR(S), OR HUMAN RESOURCES. It is anticipated THAT RE-EVALUATION INITIATED BY THE INCUMBENT OR THE SUPERVISOR(S) FOR A SPECIFIC POSITION WILL OCCUR no more than once every two years. Position evaluations/re-evaluations are normally completed in twelve (12) weeks FROM THE TIME THE JAQ IS SUBMITTED TO HUMAN RESOURCES unless there is an agreement to extend the timelines AND ALL PARTIES ARE INFORMED.

A. Positions are evaluated when one of the following occurs:

- A new position is created. A supervisor, area head, dean, Vice-President, or President/Designee, in consultation with Human Resources, is responsible for submitting a completed JOB Analysis Questionnaire to Human Resources.

- A position becomes vacant. A supervisor, area head, dean, Vice-President, or President/Designee in consultation with Human Resources is responsible for submitting a completed Position Analysis Questionnaire to Human Resources.

B. Positions are re-evaluated when one of the following occurs:
• A significant change in responsibilities occurs or is proposed in existing positions. Re-evaluations are initiated by the incumbent or the supervisor submitting a completed Position JOB Analysis Questionnaire to Human Resources.

• Reorganization occurs. Re-evaluations are initiated by an area head, dean, Vice-President, or President/Designee prior to the reorganization and in consultation with Human Resources. Reorganization may result in significant changes in position responsibilities.

Re-evaluation Process for Administrative Staff Positions INITIATED BY THE INCUMBENT AND/OR SUPERVISOR:

1. The initiator completes the Job Analysis Questionnaire that is found on Human Resources web site http://www.bgsu.edu/offices/ohr/forms. The criteria used in the grading process is also on this web site. If the initiator is the employee, the completed Questionnaire is forwarded to both the immediate supervisor and the second-level supervisor for signature and comment. When an initiator is a supervisor, area head, or Vice-President, the supervisor meets with the incumbent to discuss position responsibilities and obtain signatures on the Questionnaire. The supervisor comments, signs, and forwards the Questionnaire to the second-level supervisor. Supervisor and employee retain a copy.

2. Upon receipt of the Questionnaire, the second-level supervisor evaluates, comments, signs, and forwards THE JAQ to Human Resources.

3. Upon receipt of the completed JOB Analysis Questionnaire, Human Resources logs in THE JAQ, NOTIFIES THE INITIATOR, and begins a tracking/timeline. Human Resources reviews all documents for completeness, gathers additional information as needed, and distributes the documents to the HR/AS Advisory Team. ANY CHANGES, ADDITIONS, OR DELETIONS MADE TO THE JAQ BY HUMAN RESOURCES MUST BE FORWARDED TO THE EMPLOYEE AND SUPERVISOR.

4. The HR/AS Advisory Team analyzes, evaluates, and recommends a grade level based on the established criteria. In the event the HR/AS Advisory
Team requests additional information, Human Resources gathers the additional information and forwards it to the Team.

5. Human Resources forwards the results of the re-evaluation to the IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR AND THE appropriate Vice-President for consideration. If the position reports directly to the President, it will be forwarded to the President/Designee for consideration.

6. AFTER INPUT FROM THE IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR AND/OR THE SECONDARY SUPERVISOR, the Vice-President or President/Designee reviews all documents and forwards a written decision about the position to Human Resources.

7. IMMEDIATELY following the Vice-Presidential or Presidential/ designee decision, Human Resources forwards copies of the re-evaluation results, INCLUDING DOCUMENTATION THAT SUPPORTS THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION to the employee and the appropriate supervisory structure. Additional information can be requested from Human Resources.

8. Administrative staff and/or initiators who do not agree with the determination MAY meet with Human Resources and, if appropriate, the immediate supervisor FOR FURTHER EXPLANATION. If there is STILL no agreement, the staff member and/or initiator may follow the Conciliation/Appeals process.

V. Conciliation/Appeals Process

The purpose of the Conciliation/Appeals Process is to ensure prompt resolution of disagreements regarding the results of position re-evaluations and subsequent placement in the Plan.

There are three steps in the process:
1. Conciliation Meeting
2. Appeals Board
3. Presidential Appeal

A. Conciliation Meeting

The Conciliation Meeting, facilitated by the Assistant Provost for Human Resources/designee, provides the initiator of the conciliation process and the Vice-President, with an opportunity to resolve the complaint in a
collaborative, informal fashion. If the position reports directly to the President, the President/designee will participate in the conciliation process. Participants in the meeting include:

- Employee
- Immediate Supervisor
- Vice-President or President/designee
- Assistant Provost for Human Resources/designee
- ASC Review Team member from the initial re-evaluation team

The process is normally completed within four (4) weeks unless there is AN AGREEMENT to extend the timelines AND ALL PARTIES ARE INFORMED.

**Process:**
1. Within seven (7) calendar days after RECEIVING THE VICE-PRESIDENTIAL OR PRESIDENTIAL/DESIGNEE DECISION AND REVILENT DOCUMENTATION FROM HUMAN RESOURCES, the initiator/INCUMBENT informs Human Resources IN WRITING of the intent to enter into conciliation.

2. Upon receipt of the request for conciliation, Human Resources begins a tracking timeline.

3. HUMAN RESOURCES COORDINATES A MEETING WITH THE APPROPRIATE PARTIES. A MEETING MUST BE CONVENED WITHIN THIRTY (30) CALENDAR DAYS OF THE REQUEST FOR CONCILIATION.

4. Human Resources is responsible for reporting, in writing, the outcome of the meeting to all involved PARTIES within fourteen (14) calendar days OF THE MEETING.

5. If the meeting results in a change of grade level for the position in question, Human Resources, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE INITIATOR/INCUMBENT, RECOMMENDS the effective date of the change TO the Vice-President. No action is necessary if the meeting results in no change in the position.

6. If the initiator/INCUMBENT is not satisfied with the decision, she or he can request an Appeals Board REVIEW.
B. Appeals Board

The Appeals Board provides the initiator of the appeals process an opportunity to achieve resolution through the involvement of administrative staff in reviewing the appeal and making recommendations to the PRESIDENT'S Administrative Compensation Working Group. The Appeals Board consists of five (5) members of the Administrative Staff Advisory Team who have not been involved in the re-evaluation or conciliation process. HUMAN RESOURCES IS AVAILABLE AS A RESOURCE. The process is normally completed within SIXTEEN (16) weeks unless there is AN AGREEMENT to extend the timeline AND ALL PARTIES ARE INFORMED.

Process:

1. Within seven (7) calendar days of conciliation, the initiator informs Human Resources and the Vice-President, in writing, of the intent to appeal. If the position reports directly to the President, the initiator informs Human Resources and the President/Designee, in writing, of intent to appeal.

2. Within seven (7) calendar days of notification of the intent to appeal, Human Resources forwards the appeals packet (AN APPEAL REQUEST FORM, JAQ, FACTOR SHEET, AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION) to the initiator.

3. Within fourteen (14) calendar days of receiving the appeals packet, the initiator completes the APPEAL REQUEST FORM and forwards ANY SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION to Human Resources.

4. Upon receipt of the completed documentation, Human Resources forwards a copy of the initiator's completed appeals packet and any other documentation to the Vice-President or President/Designee. Within fourteen (14) calendar days of receiving the information from Human Resources, the Vice-President or President/Designee ACKNOWLEDGES RECEIPT OF THE PACKET AND FORWARD ANY COMMENTS, in writing, to Human Resources. Human Resources forwards a copy of the response to the initiator.

5. During steps three and four, Human Resources IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE INITIATOR selects five (5) Administrative Staff Advisory Team members for the Appeals Board. Advisory Team members who participated
in the re-evaluation or conciliation process are not eligible to serve on the Appeals Board.

6. Within seven (7) calendar days of receiving the completed documentation from the Vice-President or President/Designee, Human Resources forwards THIS documentation AND THE INITIATOR'S DOCUMENTATION to the Appeals Board.

7. Within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the completed documentation, the Appeals Board meets TO REVIEW THE ORIGINAL RE-EVALUATION DECISION AND SUBSEQUENT DOCUMENTATION TRIGGERED BY THE APPEALS PROCESS.

8. Within seven (7) calendar days of the review, the Appeals Board submits its recommendation AND SUPPORTING RATIONALE in writing to Human Resources, initiator, Vice-President or President/Designee and Administrative PRESIDENT'S Compensation Working Group.

9. Within thirty (30) calendar days of receiving the recommendation of the Appeals Board, the Administrative PRESIDENT'S Compensation Working Group, without the Vice-President or President/Designee where the appeal occurs, reviews the recommendation of the Appeals Board and makes a decision.

10. Within seven (7) calendar days of making a decision, the Administrative PRESIDENT'S Compensation Working Group will submit the decision AND SUPPORTING RATIONALE in writing to the initiator, supervisor, Vice-President or President/Designee, and Human Resources.

11. If the decision results in a change of grade level, Human Resources RECOMMENDS the effective date of the change with the Vice-President or President/Designee.

12. If the initiator or Vice-President or President/Designee is not satisfied with the decision, she/he can appeal to the President.

C. Presidential Appeal

1. Within seven (7) calendar days of receiving the decision of the Administrative PRESIDENT’S Compensation Working Group, the initiator or Vice-President appeals in writing to the President or his/her designee of the University.
THE DESIGNEE CANNOT BE FROM THE INITIATOR'S VICE PRESIDENTIAL AREA, HUMAN RESOURCES, OR PRESIDENT'S COMPENSATION WORKING GROUP. If the position reports directly to the President, the President appoints a designee for this process.

2. Within thirty (30) calendar days after receiving the appeal, the President or designee responds MAKES A DECISION AND NOTIFIES in writing to the initiator, supervisor, Vice-President, Administrative President's Compensation Working Group, and Human Resources

3. The decision of the President or designee is final.
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### Awards & Recognition
- Linda Bakkum
- Deb Fleitz
- Kay Gudehus (Co-Chair)
- Tony Howard
- Jane B. Meyers
- Keith Pogan
- Ellie McCreery
- Kevin Work
- Pat Booth (Co-Chair)

### Executive Committee
- Ann Betts
- John Clark (Chair)
- Wayne Colvin
- Laura Emch (Chair-Elect)
- David Garcia
- Brady Gaskins (PWC Chair)
- Pam Phillips
- Diane Smith
- Robin Veitch
- Barbara Waddell
- Mary Beth Zachary (Past Chair)

### External Affairs
- Thad Long (Chair)
- Pam Phillips
- Phyllis Short
- Mary Lynn Pozniak
- Tom Gorman

### Internal Affairs
- Clarence Terry
- Ann Saviers
- Sandy Miesmer (Co-Chair)
- Cindy Smith
- Roxanna Foeter
- Krisztina Ujvagi
- Laura Waggoner (Co-Chair)

### Personnel Welfare
- Brady Gaskins (Co-Chair)
- Sally Johnson
- Keith Pogan
- Jack Taylor
- Kristen Lindsay
- Judy Donald (Co-Chair)
- Greg Guzman
Professional Development

Ann Betts (Chair)
Amelie Brogden
Tina Coulter
Susan Sadoff
Robert Zhang
Jeffrey Waple

Scholarship

Nora Cassidy (Chair)
Montique Cotton
Sue Lau
Sandy Miesmer
Diane Smith
Deb Freyman
Aimee Zimmer
Ramona Meraz
Susan Darrow

Salary (PWC Subcommittee)

Carl Dettmer
Mike Fitzpatrick
David Garcia (Chair)
Robin Veitch
Administrative Staff Council
Payment Request Form

Make check payable to: ____________________________

Mailing address of payee:

If payee is a University employee, please provide P00 number: ________________.

If payee is a University employee, please provide e-mail address: ________________

Reason for payment request:

***PLEASE DO NOT SPEND ASC BUDGET DOLLARS WITHOUT PRIOR APPROVAL OF THE ASC EXECUTIVE TEAM LEADERSHIP.***

To obtain an authorized signature, submit payment request with supporting original documentation to:

John Clark, Diana Smith, or Laura Emch

Authorization signature: ____________________________ Date: ___________
Bowling Green State University
Administrative Staff Council

215 East Hall
Bowling Green, OH 43403
(419) 372-7888

Dr. John M. Clark
Chair, ASC

June 19, 2001 Agenda

1. Rescheduling proposal for January 2002 ASC meeting (listed as Jan. 3rd; classes begin Jan. 14th)

2. Establish regular contacts next year with Classified Staff Council and Faculty Senate (proposals to share)

3. CUPA data analysis (how to assign)

4. ASC budget and budget control (cost overruns and surprises)

5. Scheduling dignitaries for ASC meetings (possibilities--President, Provost, Exec V.P., H.R., and a Board member)

6. Committee appointments and chairs (suggestions needed)

7. Goals for next year--first installment due for board presentation June 29

8. Our projected work with H.R.-- compensation + (merit, equity, "bonus")

June 18, 2001
Notes from Mercer Meeting: 5/23/01

On May 23, 2001, ASC representatives John Clark, Laura Emch, and Mary Beth Zachary met with Mercer Inc. consultant Scott Cook, H.R. representatives Becca Ferguson and Donna Wittwer, and Executive V.P. Linda Dobb to discuss Mercer’s follow-up recommendations on administrative staff compensation to the President’s Compensation Working Group. The following are notes from that meeting, compiled by John M. Clark—2001-2002 ASC Chair.

1. Mercer’s History with BGSU: In 1995, Mercer came to BGSU to assess the market competitiveness of our administrative/professional staff compensation. In particular, their focuses were 1) base pay, 2) pay ranges, and 3) review of IT positions.

2. In 2001, Mercer conducted a follow-up study based on 57 “benchmark” administrative positions. These positions were chosen as benchmarks by the vice presidents based on their representativeness of the entire administrative employee group.

3. In this year’s Mercer study, special emphasis again was given to IT positions.

4. Mercer compiled salary data from 24 surveys, reflective of salary medians, representative of our geographic recruiting area (for each benchmark position), and adjusted to July 1, 2001 (i.e., the data were “aged” to be representative of the market on the beginning of our next fiscal year).

5. Data matching was done based on job content, not type of position. (This reinforces Mercer’s consistent focus on skill sets rather than department or specific position.)

6. Elements of Mercer’s Competitive Assessment

- Actual salaries and pay ranges compared to [recruiting area] market
- Variance between ratios not typical
  - Actual salary ratios may vary due to differences in employee credentials
  - Midpoint ratios may vary due to valuation differences placed on the position by different institutions (a one-grade difference from “market” is OK, but not three or four grades difference in a position)
  - IT is judged separately
- Ratios calculated by comparing...
  - actual salaries to market (average of all incumbents in a position)
  - range midpoints to market
7. Actual Salary Competitiveness:

- In 1995, all administrative/professional jobs at BGSU were at 99% of market (market being the 50th percentile for each position, this means our average was the 49.5 percentile)
- In 2001, all administrative jobs at BGSU, as a group, are at 95% of market (or 47.5 percentile)
- Our IT are presently worst in relation to market—88% or 44th percentile
- Distribution in relation to pay range and market is also crucial; the above percentiles are averages, and individual positions can be higher or lower than BGSU average

8. Pay Structure Competitiveness:

- The administrative/professional ranges, as an aggregate, now are at 89% (44.5 percentile) of market—these ranges were set in 1995 exactly at 100%, or the 50th percentile, of market
- Our IT pay ranges now are at 83% of market, or the 41.5 percentile
- “Outliers” could be inappropriately graded, or the market valued the job differently than the institution (e.g., pharmacists, physicians, IT)

9. Salary Range Placement:

- Ranges set at 100% of market (50th percentile) in 1995
- In January, 1996, implementation of the BGSU Mercer Plan raised administrative employees only to minimum of range
- This implementation also created some salary compression—brought some newer employees close to the salaries of longer-term employees in the same unit and/or similar position
- Midpoint (50th percentile of pay range) is Mercer’s recommended market target for admin.
- Mercer also notes that the market “norm” for administrative/professional positions is for employees to reach midpoint of pay range within 4 to 7 years in position

10. A Mercer Model for Advancement through Pay Range:

- Mercer posits that administrative employees in the first quartile, minimum to 25th percentile, should be in the “learning and growing” stage for the position (and, conversely, that employees beyond the learning and growing stage should be higher in the pay range)
- Mercer considers administrative employees in the second pay range quartile, 26th percentile to midpoint, “seasoned and competent” for their positions
- Mercer considers administrative employees in the third pay range quartile, 51st to 75th percentiles, “outstanding and sustained performers” for their positions
- Mercer considers administrative employees in the top pay range quartile, 76th percentile to range maximum, inhabitants of “premium territory”—employees whose base salary at the beginning of the contract year puts them among the highest-paid in the market for their positions
- Mercer notes that “best practice” of institutions across the U.S. now considers it appropriate for 15-20% of the total workforce to be in the “outstanding sustained performance” and “premium” salary levels—and that these base salaries relative to market for the position be established by performance, not longevity alone
• Finally, Mercer notes that best compensation practices or plans across the country include a pay and performance-reward package to accelerate movement of good performers in years 0-7 (within position) to range midpoint

11. As consultant Scott Cool explained, the portion of “best compensation practice” least understood is that institutional expectations are much higher for the midpoint-and-up, “premium” base pay area than for the minimum-to-midpoint (0-50th percentile) area. All of an employee’s experience, knowledge, and superior performance over the years plus an excellent performance in the past equal a premium salary that might be increased for the upcoming year.

12. Range “Penetration”:

• Average of all BGSU administrative/professional employees is 57th percentile of range
• Average years in position for all BGSU administrative employees is 6 years
• Increased penetration of range by some administrative staff could be offset by decreased penetration by others

13. Mercer Recommendations:

• Adjust pay ranges to align with market median (required adjustment = 8-9%); one option, if range adjustment of this magnitude is unmanageable, would be smaller pay-range increases (smaller than 8-9%) over the next one to three years—a phasing-in approach
• Re-examine internal pay-range placements of positions in the Development area
• Establish a separate pay-range structure for IT positions
• Re-evaluate significant outliers with respect to midpoint ratios (positions significantly out of market norm relative to the position pay range)
• Review current employee salaries, after the structural or pay-range adjustment, to re-establish internal and external pay equity
Hi, Diane. I know you are planning to be out of the office sometime soon. For your sake, I hope you get vacation before O-Reg begins.

When you get a chance, could you do a couple of things for me? One is to create (if you don’t already have one) an email list for Exec Committees. The other is to make a note to see if Deb Fleitz can switch her constituency specifically to cover the people in Music that Faith Rfacker (whose Council term has expired) had. Deb has some other people, not in Music, as her constituency, and whoever replaced Faith on Council (Mary Lynn knows all) is not in Music but would have inherited Faith’s constituents.

If any of the above makes sense, Mary Lynn can help you piece together how it might go. My understanding is that we’d need to get Faith’s replacement in the loop and Joe Luthman, who produces the focus report that creates our constituent lists.

Thanks,
John

Dr. John Clark
General Studies Writing
Bowling Green University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
Laura Emch, 8/30/01 11:51 AM -0400, FYi on Ferrari award

X-Sender: lemch@mailstore.bgsu.edu
Date: Thu, 30 Aug 2001 11:51:13 -0400
To: dlsmith@bgnet.bgsu.edu, jclark2@bgnet.bgsu.edu, mzachar@bgnet.bgsu.edu
From: Laura Emch <lemch@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Subject: FYi on Ferrari award

Dear DL,

First of all, I don’t think there is anybody here who knows precisely what was "allocated" to ASC for the Ferrari Award. I suspect that it was part of the initial budget load provided but I have no records that would indicate what was for what.

There was a temporary transfer of $1,243 in 1984-85 that I could see occurring from another budget. I suspect that this might have been handled by the Operations Contingency to some extent when necessary.

Here is the history I can provide you:

1983-84 - the budget was established with $1,500
1984-85 - $1,550
1986-87 - $1,600
1989-90 - $1,648
1990-91 - $1,681
1991-92 - $1,581 - budget cut time
1992-93 - $1,391
1999-2000 - $2,041 ($650 added)
2001-02 - $3,041 ($1000 added)

There is no way anyone can reconstruct this now. ASC should have kept the records together someplace in a "treasurer’s book" and I’m sure that didn’t happen - so the history is lost. All of the people who would have been directly involved in setting up the process for this award have left the university.

I agree that based on what the Council is doing now - you have to receive additional funding or do a major revamping of the costs. You will have to present your facts and go from there.
Hi Linda,

Below is a summary from John on today's ASC Exec. meeting. I was asked to ask you (if you know, or know who to ask), about the original budget amount allocated for Ferrari award. This was 19, (yes 19!!), years ago. Whatever figure was originally provided for this award has not been increased or reviewed. Time to look at this one, heh?

Thanks for your help!
Laura

---

X-Sender: jclark2@mailstore.bgsu.edu
Date: Tue, 28 Aug 2001 15:40:13 -0400
To: ASC Executive Committee;
From: "John M. Clark" <jclark2@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Subject: Updates

Dear Executive Committee Members (especially those unable to attend today's meeting):

I have just enough time this afternoon to pass along a few notes regarding our meeting today. PWC co-chairs Brady Gaskins and Judy Donald (at large) will be working with H.R. representative Doug Kruzel this fall to revise and update the policy for non-compensation conciliation. The goal is a draft ready to present to Council in January, with a second reading in February and presentation to the Board in March 2002. This policy is not currently in our handbook, but it's the intention to place it there when revised and approved.

Professional Development Committee will be undertaking soon the task of generating applications for $6000 in individual professional development grants. These funds are being held for administrative staff by H.R.

I will be moving to a new position beginning Sept. 3rd. As of next Tuesday, my phone
Laura Waggoner spoke to Exec about the creation and budgeting of our three ASC awards: Ferrari, BG Best, and Spirit of BG. This summary will not do justice to Laura's presentation. However, she told us that the exact amount allotted in our budget (of $3047 annually) for the Ferrari Award is uncertain, that $650 is specifically allocated to BG Best, and that $1000 is specifically allocated (as of last year) to Spirit of BG. Currently, a mass mailing of 3000 pieces goes out for each of the three awards, at a cost per mailing of approximately $500 (I believe it was $511). The awards themselves (birds, plaques, etc.) also must be purchased, along with flowers for the Spirit award—and now vases (our supplier of donated vases has left). Also, Awards Committee does not coordinate, order, or budget for refreshments at our spring and fall awards receptions. This expense (of roughly $500 per reception) has been in addition to the $500 for mailing of nominations, the awards, engraving, and other costs.

Exec's discussion and conclusion was that we need, if possible, to find ways to cut down on printing/mailing costs or to get "help" on as much of our printing as possible. Additionally, we may need to trim refreshments expenditures at our awards banquets—perhaps by asking attending staff to contribute. Laura and I will set up a meeting to discuss these issues with Awards Committee, and Exec will return to discussion of budgeting for other committees at a later meeting.

Finally, we discussed some updates on the HWI (Health & Wellness Insurance) revision picture. Donna Wittwer now is trying to find time to come talk with us at our Sept. 6 council meeting. Issues of great controversy in the HWI Committee are Tier 4 (so called "lifestyle") drugs—including fertility drugs, impotence drugs, and contraceptives—and overall cost increases in employee contributions.

I shared two or three general ideas about the health care issue with our group today, as follows. One, the projected increase in overall health care cost to BGSU and its employees for the coming year is $2.9M—if we don't change a thing from last year. H.R.'s goal, however, and that of central administration is to (a) trim that additional cost to $1.3-1.4M, and (b) keep employee contributions in the aggregate no higher than last year's contributions of $1.4M. (Though it's easy to confuse these two figures, it's just coincidence that employees' contributions and the projected shortfall are the same.) The university would pay for all or nearly all of the additional $1.3 or $1.4 million in employee health care costs, but the university does not want to pay (does not want all of us to pay) a total increase of $2.9 million in health care.

Item two, the $1.4 million contribution of all employees combined (which would be distributed differently, some paying more than at present and some less), can be viewed
as a short-term expenditure with no future benefit beyond the calendar year (other than better health, one hopes). The other side of that coin, which H.R. would like us to be aware of, is that every dollar the university pays for employee health care is a dollar not available for salary increases. And increased salaries do increment from year to year (this year's 3% merit makes next year's X% a higher dollar figure), thus contributing to a long-term effect of increased retirement dollars.

Item three, a new wrinkle described today is a "two party" or "single plus one" plan as a compromise between single and family. H.R. reports that 1/3 of BGSU employees on a family plan currently list exactly two persons to be covered. However, national average size of "families" is greater than 2 persons, and a 2-party plan could be offered at a lower pay-in than the full "family" version.

Laura and I are exploring with H.R. and with administration ways to project and promise real growth in spendable income for BGSU employees. Both the short term and the long term are important; the trick is finding the most effective balance.

Have a great week! -- John

--
Dr. John M. Clark
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Laura F. Emch
Associate Director, Student Financial Aid
231 Administration Building
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403-0145
Phone: 419-372-2651
Email: lemch@bgnet.bgsu.edu

--
Linda L. Hamilton
Director of Budgeting
Office of Finance and Administration
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403-0080
Phone: (419) 372-8262
Fax: (419) 372-8446

Printed for Diane Smith <dlsmith@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Joe Luthman, 8/30/01 9:05 AM -0400, Re: ASC constituency listing

Diane,

I walk past the Education Building twice daily. I'll drop it off on my way today. What floor is your mail drop or office? On the printout, I'll write in some fictional changes, to illustrate what I believe is the easiest way to alter the reporting structure.

The process that people have used to make changes runs something like this.

1) Replace last year's 'retiring' reps with newly elected ones.

2) Assign new employees to their respective reps.

3) I make the changes as you indicated. (you should xerox off a copy of your requested changes, to ensure I've made them)

4) I deliver draft number two of the listing

5) You (or Exec team) balance out the numbers of constituents to reps. Exec team is best tool for ensuring that reps and constituents are actually in the respective reporting area. One ambiguous leftover point from the last couple of years is in what reporting area the employees in NWOETV should be.

Good luck! It's really not hard, and is mostly fun.

-joe

At 08:22 AM 8/30/2001 -0400, you wrote:

Joe-

I don't always have great luck with attachments. I could come get it from you or if you didn't mind you could drop it off here. Diane

--

Diane L. Smith, Assistant Director
Appendix G - Administrative Staff Compensation Plan
From the Administrative Staff Handbook

1. It was a charge to the PWC (Personal Welfare Committee) last year to update this document and recommend an equitable means for the compensation appeal process.

2. PWC researched and received input from various members of the BGSU community and also administrative members from other similar University communities. Discussions of Appendix G were held in Administrative Staff Council last year.

3. During the summer months, the PWC recommendations to Appendix G have been reviewed, modified, and approved by Human Resources (HR) and the ASC Executive Committee.

4. The original document is located on HR's web site:
   http://www.bgsu.edu/offices/ohr/handbooks/admin_compen_plan.pdf

5. The modifications to Appendix G are for procedures only. Policy changes need to be presented and approved by the Board of Trustees.

6. Two readings and approval are needed by Administrative Staff Council members to move this document forward. We can only submit Handbook recommended changes once a year at the March Board of Trustee meeting.
# Itemized Budget

**Spirit of BG Award**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Mailing and Yearly Distribution to Various Campus Sites - (3000 copies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application and Cover Letter</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labels</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowers ($15 x 12 Months)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vases (donated first year)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vases (2nd year and beyond)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 vases x $10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1c x 3&quot; = $20.25 x 12 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tags for Vases</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: jclark2@bgnet.bgsu.edu
date: Fri, 31 Aug 2001 08:10:37 -0500
to: dlsmith@bgnet.bgsu.edu, lemch@bgnet.bgsu.edu
cc: pbooth@bgnet.bgsu.edu, howard@wbgu.bgsu.edu, kaygude@bgnet.bgsu.edu

diane, laura, pat, tony, kay:

i would appreciate your help in following the request eileen sullivan makes below. the president will of course be speaking at our ferrari banquet and at our november council meeting. let's try to make sure that he has the background info he would like to have on those occasions. [the outline of "talking points" appears at the end of the message below.]

thanks,

john

subject: president ribeau's speaking engagements

cabinet, expanded cabinet members and constituent group leaders:

as you know, president ribeau speaks daily to a variety of university, community and corporate groups, as well as to legislative leaders and national bodies associated in some way with higher education. the opportunities to address the above audiences provide the president a forum for the articulation of a defined institutional image as well as the venue to share our many institutional strengths and accomplishments. with this in mind, it is imperative that we provide president ribeau with timely, and accurate information as he is the institutional voice and as such, must be well prepared for these speaking engagements. based on input from the president, below you will find a "talking points template".

please convey to all of your direct reports/fellow constituent group members that information from your area/organization must be sent to
my assistant, Krisztina Ujvagi-Roder, Coordinator of Special Projects, two weeks prior to your event. [Krisztina may be reached by phone at 2-7247, or via email at kujvagi@bgnet.bgsu.edu.]

This deadline should afford the necessary time for the creation of the talking points, the President's final review of said talking points, and any revisions, or additions that the President believes needs to be made to the talking points. The information submitted to Krisztina must be comprehensive, and conform to the template below.

Without question, we all share a common interest in best preparing the President for these speaking engagements and as a result, I'd like to thank you for your cooperation in meeting this request.

Should you have any questions, feel free to contact me. I wish you a fantastic Labor day weekend.

All the best,

Eileen

---------------------------------------------------------------

Talking Points for President Ribeau

Event Name
Event Location
Event Date: Day, mmmm dd, yyyy
Event Time
Time of Remarks (if different than above)

Audience: Composition (e.g. students, alumni, staff, faculty, donors, etc.)

Approximate number in attendance

Special guests or hosts who should be acknowledged

Any special characteristics of the group

Background: History of previous similar events
Appropriate statistical or demographic information
Special characteristics of the event (e.g. kickoff, 3rd Annual, etc.)

Purpose: Type of event (e.g. award ceremony, fundraiser, etc.)
Why is the event being held? What function will the event serve?
(e.g. the "why and wherefore")

Intended Outcome: What do we hope to achieve as a result of the event?
What are we trying to accomplish?

OPENING REMARKS AND SPECIAL THANKS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

BODY OF REMARKS

Specific topics and issues will be included here.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Eileen G. Sullivan, Ph.D.
Executive Assistant to the President & Policy Analyst
Bowling Green State University
306 McFall Center
Bowling Green, OH 43403
Phone: (419) 372-0467
FAX: (419) 372-7878
E-mail: gannons@bgnet.bgsu.edu

BGSU Vision Statement:

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

BGSU Core Values:
September 11, 2001

MEMORANDUM

To: ASC Executive Committee
From: Diane Smith, Secretary ASC

Administrative Staff Council Executive Committee Dates for 2001-02

September 11
September 25*
October 9, 23
November 6, 20
December 4, 18
January 15, 29
February 12, 26
March 12, 26
April 9, 23
May 7, 21
June 4, 18

All meetings are from 11:45-1:00. All meetings are in Founders Club 57 except for the September 25 meeting, which will be held in 1103 Offenhauer West

If you will not be able to attend a meeting please let me know.
Thought questions for the President to discuss with ASC

10/31/01: Meeting with John Clees, ASC Chair, and Laura Emch, ASC Chair-elect

Question 1—What is the President’s position on the Administrative Staff teaching compensation proposal? (In the pursuit of equitable treatment, we desire to “regularize” administrative teaching that occurs beyond the scope of expected job duties. The ASC proposal submitted in spring 2001 to Dean’s Council by H. R. is attached.)

Question 2, balancing staffing levels with levels of service—We have an institutional commitment to continued enrollment growth. Considering the student number increase and decreased staffing in some areas, with further decreases possible, how do we communicate to the students and clients we serve that maintaining the same customer service level may not be feasible, with administration blessing? (Some of our constituents are particularly concerned that a consistent policy has not been created or effectively communicated to upper-level management such as VPs, Directors, Deans.)

Question 3, indexing salary ranges and planning for real income growth—Is it possible for us to extend our compensation planning for better economic times by establishing annual indexing of administrative salary ranges and setting merit increase goals at least marginally higher than index growth in the previous year? (Note that we say “goals”, our concern is that our ranges could become increasingly disproportionate to our market and that our administrative staff could end their careers with lower real income than at their beginning in position.)

11/1/01: Meeting with the full Administrative Staff Council

Questions 1, 2, and 3 from above—if desired—also could apply to this audience. Additional questions follow:

Question 4—What kinds of issues should we openly discuss as a community? It seems as though we ought to have at least one big open discussion (or set of discussions) a year on general principles: a means of central administration connecting with the general employee population. Would you agree?

Question 5—Now that the Union will soon open, what is the next big facility renovation or new construction project in the works? In particular, what is your position on the long-discussed convocation center for athletics, concerts, graduation ceremonies, etc.?

Question 6—Is the University proceeding with plans to put a pub in the student union? If so, wouldn’t this be a really poor choice, considering BGSU’s core values (which are all adversely affected by alcohol consumption) and the nationwide concern for binge drinking on college campuses?
January 11, 2002

Dear Fellow Executive Committee Members:

An agenda item at our next ASC Exec meeting (January 15th) is our ASC budget. The following summary of our ASC budget information as of 12/31/00 and my recommendation for a discussion starting point for our 2002-03 budget.

Laura Emch

Our current budget for 2001-02 is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$481.00</td>
<td>Office Supplies (includes awards, plaques, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>Other expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>Postage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>Other expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$581.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 12/31/00 we have spent the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$292.53</td>
<td>Office Supplies (all from awards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$431.75</td>
<td>Meals (fall reception)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>Postage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>Other expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$229.33</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 'meals' are already overspent due to the Fall reception, we use 'other expenses' to cover costs for the Spring Reception. Average cost of each reception is now $500.00. This no longer just includes food, for it now includes each table set up, tablecloths, paper goods, and other dining services costs.
• Known items for three ASC Awards (BG Best, Spirit of BG, and Ferrari):

$650.00 needed for BG Best Awards (birds, plaques, etc)
$1000.00 needed for Spirit of BG Awards (vases, flowers, etc.)
$525.00 approximately needed for mailing costs for each of the three awards.

(Mass mailing of approx. 3000 pieces for each award)

$2175.00 Total

Our supplier of the donated vases has left, so starting this year we purchase these for the Spirit of BG awards.

• For the Scholarship Committee:
There is a need to set an appropriate budget for the Scholarship Committee's mailing expenses and other misc. costs.

My recommendation for the ASC 2002-03 budget:

$2175.00 for Awards
$200.00 for Scholarship
$1000.00 for Two Receptions
$100.00 for Misc. Items of Appreciation
$100.00 for Misc. Office Supplies

$3575.00 Total (increase by $553.00)
One Card Update

We are at the point of putting together a proposal which suggests a phased-in approach to implementation of a one card system. The library will be exempt from this one card.

We'll be going with Diebold products. Dining Services is already using some of their products. Hopefully that equipment won't have to be upgraded to their CS GOLD level. $$$$ 

The proposal will say something about buying new photo id equipment, phasing in some "bursarables" to a debit system rather than a charge system. This might include things such as frat and sorority events, tee-shirt sales, perhaps the vending machines for food and drink.

We got the book store out of the beginning of the implementation at least for a while. Up front money for grad students to buy textbooks would present unnecessary hardships. Future plans will depend on a successful campaign with the students and parents...why it would be good to give BGSU your money up front.... :-)

mbz

Join Grambling and the University Community to participate in security threat Policy for the critical infrastructure.

I was hoping to have increased discussions.

Go along with everything we need to read.

Fac Special Session 9

> Constituent Group Name

Student Rec Center

Out and recommends

income health controls by outside estimate.
Dear Exec Committee members,

Another issue has bubbled up concerning the ASC listproc. Today, the list was "infiltrated," for the 3rd time this year, by an unauthorized posting containing a virus. 2 of the 3 times this has occurred, the person posting to the list wasn't even a BGSU employee—which somehow makes the situation seem worse.

I have queried ITS today about removing open posting access to our listproc. Jen Sader, the email administrator, responded by saying that, if we would like to restrict direct posting access to the listproc, we have two options:

At 1:54 PM -0500 1/14/02, Jennifer Sader wrote:

1) To allow only owners to post to the list, and adding anyone you want authorized to post to the list of owners.
2) To make the list moderated, which means any post by a non-owner would be sent to the owners for approval or rejection. Only approved messages would go to the list.

My view is that only the ASC chair, chair-elect, and secretary should be able to originate messages on our listproc. All subscribers to the listproc would have access to respond to mailed messages but could not originate messages (or "threads") themselves. I would have preferred that we not find it necessary to alter our listproc, but I also feel responsibility to try to control the spread of harmful viruses to our ASC listproc subscribers.

I favor item 2 from Jen's list. If you can, please come to tomorrow's meeting prepared to express your view on control of the listproc: no change (retain totally open access), posting by "owners" only, or posting only when approved by list owners. If you cannot attend tomorrow's meeting, please try to pass along your preference prior to the meeting.

Thank you,

John

--

John M. Clark
Assistant Registrar
110 Administration Building
(419) 372-7993 ph; (419) 372-7977 fax
At the request of one of our Exec Committee members, I am forwarding this explanation of the non-violence/violence policy issue, which Laura sent to me earlier today. I had thought to let Laura provide the details herself, but I can see how further mental preparation could be very helpful; it's a complex issue.

John

On Friday, I attended a very interesting meeting on the proposed University's Policy on Violence. All constituent groups were there except for USG. The policy committee desires to present the Policy on Violence to the Bd of Trustees in March, and wanted to know what was needed to meet that goal.

The Policy Committee was anticipating the constituent groups each having their own method for requesting approval/acceptance of the violence policy to move this forward to the Bd of Trustees. We spent 90% of the meeting time on Faculty Senate's needs for Academic Charter amendment procedures and does this affect the entire University vs. just the faculty. There is a difference of opinion on this issue between Jim Evans and Becca.

Bottom line for us, I asked for clarification if the committee wanted a 'friendly amendment' passed in support of this policy, or if we needed it in our handbook. Answer from Becca: in the handbook. Therefore, we need to have a more formal approach to this since it will be binding. I recommend the approach of separating policy from procedure in order to meet the March goal. We need 2 readings for the policy, but the procedures still need to be written (by PWC I assume). Procedures, in my opinion, include what to do if a grievance was filed against an admin. staff member, going through appeal etc. The rights of the victim and the accused must be protected in our process. Procedures must be written for processing under both the Ohio/Federal laws for violence as well as just the BGSU judicial system. (A victim can choose to go one avenue or both - BGSU system, or State Laws, or both). Administrative staff also need a clear definition of terms, such as in the phrase of the policy "Such behavior will be considered serious misconduct and will be the basis for disciplinary action, up to and including termination/expulsion according to current University policies and procedures". What do we mean by "serious misconduct", is this what is defined in the Academic Charter or do we need our own definition?

If you approve, I would like this to be an agenda item for tomorrow's Exec meeting, and I'll send our exec members a copy of the proposed policy.

John M. Clark
Office of Registration & Records
110 Administration Building
372-7993
DRAFT Policy on Violence

It is the policy of BGSU that acts of violence, threats of violence, or intimidation will not be tolerated. In its mission to become a premier learning institution, BGSU recognizes the importance of providing a safe environment for all its members. In this community, victims, survivors will be treated with dignity and respect.

Definitions for this policy include:

- **BGSU community**: Any faculty, staff, students, and visitors to campus
- **Acts of Violence**: Any exercise of force against another person or against property that could result in physical or emotional harm
- **Threats of Violence**: Any verbal or non-verbal communication that intends to or actually does inflict physical or other harm on any person or on property
- **Intimidation**: Any verbal or non-verbal act towards another person, the purpose of which may be to cause, and the result of which could cause the other person to fear for his or her safety or the safety of others

In many situations, these actions are also considered criminal acts under the Ohio Revised Code. Acts defined in this subsection include but are not limited to:

- Physical assault or abuse
- Sexual assault or abuse
- Stalking
- Verbal or other threats of physical or sexual assault
- Threats that may include a weapon
- Damage or destruction of another’s property

Consequences

Any person who is found to have exhibited violent, threatening, or intimidating behavior will be held accountable for those actions. Such behavior will be considered serious misconduct and will be the basis for disciplinary action, up to and including termination, expulsion according to current University policies and procedures. Violators may also be subject to criminal prosecution.

Resources

BGSU is committed to providing education, prevention, advocacy, intervention, and support services which address acts of violence, threats of violence, and intimidation. The University community values a collaborative relationship with community agencies and professionals in providing these services. All members of the BGSU community are expected to report violations of the policy on violence to appropriate authorities.

Who's on it?

Great Transformation

Women's Center

Faculty: Becky

Transformation
Policy on Violence
01/07/02

Note: This final draft emerged from the Violence Against Women Policy Committee, which emerged from a Department of Justice mandate that accompanied the funding of the Transformation Project at the BGSU Women's Center.

Committee members include: Dedra Bennett (Transformation Project Advocate), Julie Broadwell (Consultant to Transformation Project, SAPE Program), Jill Carr (Associate Dean of Students), Michelle Crossick (Transformation Project Coordinator and Chair of this Committee), Elizabeth Cole (Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences), Tony Denton (BGSU Police Officer), Rebecca Ferguson (Asst. VP, Human Resources), Nancy Feeter (General Counsel), Elizabeth Hoffman (CASO Chair and Wellness Co-Chair), Heath Huber (Transformation Project Community Educator), Beck Hurst (Consultant to Transformation Project, Domestic Violence Advocate), Mary Kinnegar (Director, Women's Center and Transformation Projects), Rebecca Sandlin (Graduate Student and CASO member), Peter Shields (Assoc. Professor and Member of Faculty Senate), Janice Wasserman (Classified Staff representative), Jan Wiegand (Director, BGSU Public Safety), and Elizabeth Farmer (Assoc. Director, Counseling Center).

It is the policy of BGSU that acts of violence, threats of violence, or intimidation will not be tolerated. In its mission to become a premier learning institution, BGSU recognizes the importance of providing a safe environment for all its members. In this community, victims/survivors will be treated with dignity and respect. Any persons found in violation of this policy may be subject to disciplinary action. Violators may also be subject to criminal prosecution.

For purposes of this policy, the following definitions apply: Acts of violence include any exercise of force against another person or against property that could result in physical or emotional harm. Threats of violence include any verbal or non-verbal communication that inflicts harm. Intimidation includes any verbal or non-verbal act towards another person, the purpose of which may be to coerce, and the result of which could cause the other person to fear for his or her safety or the safety of others.

In many situations, these actions are also considered criminal acts under the Ohio Revised Code. Acts defined in this subsection include but are not limited to: physical assault or abuse, sexual assault or abuse; stalking, verbal or other threats of physical or sexual assault, threats that may include a weapon, and damage or destruction of another's property.

BGSU is committed to providing education, prevention, advocacy, intervention, and support services which address acts of violence, threats of violence, and intimidation. In addition, the University collaborates with community agencies and professionals in providing services and referrals. All members of the BGSU community are asked to report violations of the policy on violence to appropriate authorities.
January 11, 2002

Dear Fellow Executive Committee Members:

An agenda item at our next ASC Exec meeting (January 15th) is our ASC budget. The following is a summary of our ASC budget information as of 12/31/00 and my recommendation for a discussion starting point for our 2002-03 budget.

Laura Emch

Our current budget for 2001-02 is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$481.00</td>
<td>Office Supplies (includes awards, plaques, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$310.00</td>
<td>Other costs/travel/meals (receptions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>Postage (used for mailings/paper costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1631.00</td>
<td>Other expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3022.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 12/31/00 we have spent the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$290.83</td>
<td>Office Supplies (all from awards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$431.75</td>
<td>Meals (fall reception)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>Postage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>Other expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$722.58</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 'meals' are already overspent due to the Fall reception, we use 'other expenses' to cover costs for the Spring Reception. Average cost of each reception is now $500.00. This no longer just includes food, for it now includes each table set up, tablecloths, paper goods, and other dining services costs.
• **Known items for three ASC Awards (BG Best, Spirit of BG, and Ferrari):**

$ 650.00  needed for BG Best Awards (birds, plaques, etc)
$1000.00  needed for Spirit of BG Awards (vases, flowers, etc.)
$ 525.00  approximately needed for mailing costs for each of the three awards.
(Mass mailing of approx. 3000 pieces for each award)

**$2175.00 Total**

Our supplier of the donated vases has left, so starting this year we purchase these for the Spirit of BG awards.

• **For the Scholarship Committee:**

There is a need to set an appropriate budget for the Scholarship Committee's mailing expenses and other misc. costs.

---

My recommendation for the ASC 2002-03 budget:

$ 2175.00  for Awards
$ 200.00   for Scholarship
$1000.00   for Two Receptions
$ 100.00   for Misc. Items of Appreciation
$ 100.00   for Misc. Office Supplies

**$3575.00 Total (increase by $553.00)**
Dear exec members,

We have several significant items to discuss—if time allows—on Tuesday. A representative (perhaps not exhaustive) list appears below:

- Decision on council reps with 3 or more council session absences this year
- Finalizing elections ballots/process for next year (if possible, Exec should nominate one or more candidates for chair-elect and secretary—an additional call for nominations will go out over the asc listproc following Tuesday’s Exec meeting)
- Preliminary discussion of goals for next year
- Update from President’s Panel, etc. (Severe Weather Policy may make for heavy seas)

I hope to see all of you on Tuesday! This promises to be one of our most significant meetings of the year.

Thanks,

John

John M. Clark
Assistant Registrar
110 Administration Building
(419) 372-7993 ph; (419) 372-7977 fax
ASC Goals 2002-03
DRAFT

1. Continue working with Human Resources and Administration in developing an approved compensation plan for real compensation growth. Both short and long term plans to reach agreed goals need to be established. Our compensation plan must be consistent, equitable, and market-conscious. Our plan must include rewarding the highest possible quality administrative employees.

2. Develop and implement all policies and procedures needed for the 'Policy on Violence'.

3. Finalize the administrative staff non-compensation conciliation process.

4. Working with Human Resources, develop and implement a comprehensive mentoring program for new administrative staff members.

5. Review, recommend, and implement measures for streamlining and improving our communications with administrative staff members.

NOTE for Exec members: Items in this can include: The work done by internal affairs vs. the New Employee Orientation info, a good means for getting new employees on the ASC listproc, adding to the My BGSU Organization web site the list of asc members and their constituents, enhancing orientation contents and provide mentoring for new ASC members to assure they understand the importance and procedures of all aspects of ASC. This includes, but not limited to, items such as attendance, communication with his/her constituent group, and active involvement on committees.

6. Review of Appendix G dealing with Board of Trustee policies and other University policies. If deemed appropriate, make recommendations for change.

7. Continue working with administration on the wording of the medical release waiver statement all employees are required to sign during the University's Open Enrollment for health care. Assure that this release statement not only permits medical processing, but also protects the employee's privacy.

8. In these times of budget and staffing exigency, promote reasonable and healthy working conditions for administrative staff employees to BGSU including appropriate hours in typical workweeks, appropriate physical and mental demands, and appropriate performance expectations.

9. Establish consistent communication and reporting links with administrative members who are on University Standing committees.
10. Per recommendations from our Elections committee, review, create recommendations, and implement by law and/or procedural changes for various ASC elections.

11. Creation of procedure manual for various ASC committee and leadership activities.
Dear Exec members,

I've heard today from a number of you in response to this morning's posting about Dr. Dobbs' ad hoc committee requests. If it would help you to come to a decision, consider this consensus: that it's OK for me to represent us on the "integrating technology literacy into the curriculum" group and for Mary Beth and Josh Kaplan to represent us on the Severe Weather Policy group. Josh, for those of you who may not know this, was Chair of ASC in 1993 and instrumental in developing the current policy (which administration now has resolved to change). Mary Beth has sounded him out on the question of representing admin staff on this issue again, and he has said that he would do so if asked.

If any other candidates are in the offing, we should definitely consider their wishes in our decision. If we don't hear of any other candidates soon, however, we could scarcely do better than Mary Beth and Josh. [Laura, please chime in; you have a big stake in this policy and a lot of context to this point as well. My only concern on your behalf is getting too many tasks on your own plate.]

A few more yes or nays would be great to hear, if possible.

We could do no better than having Mary Beth and Josh represent us. Totally confident that they will do a superb job (as they ALWAYS do)