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Memorandum

TO:       Dr. Sidney Ribeau, President

FROM:    Bryan Benner
           Kim Grilliot
           Joe Luthman
           Cheryl Purefoy
           Marcos Rivera

RE:      Final Report from the Administrative Staff Compensation Working Group

DATE: May 3, 1999

Enclosed is the final report of the Administrative Staff Compensation Working Group. At your convenience the working group is prepared to meet with you and/or your staff to answer any questions that you may have concerning the report.
1. COMMITTEE CHARGE

The committee charge was as follows: Utilizing the benchmark criteria established after reviewing salary information obtained through the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA), the administrative staff compensation working group is charged with recommending options for a process that will bring administrative staff salaries on average to the benchmark level in five to seven years.

2. BACKGROUND

In accordance with the committee's charge, the Administrative Staff Compensation Working Group (ASCWG) began its task by reviewing relevant compensation reports compiled from the CUPA database and the current administrative staff compensation plan. Additionally, a meeting was scheduled with the Administrative Staff Council to identify the Council's issues concerning compensation.

Review Of CUPA Data

The committee's review of the 1997-98 CUPA reports included focusing on BGSU salaries compared to a peer group of similar residential universities. Those universities were Kent State, Miami, and Ohio University. Regarding the CUPA reports, the data indicates that administrative staff salaries at the selected peer group institutions were on average from 2.5% to 10.4% higher than BGSU salaries. (See attach. A). The decision to develop a similar residential peer group was based on the need to establish a baseline for determining the competitiveness of
current compensation system. The argument was made that the residential peer group competed for staff from the same regional and national candidate pools. Therefore if BGSU were competitive with this peer group, we would be able to attract well-qualified and appropriately experienced candidates for administrative positions.

The committee also reviewed CUPA data that compared administrative salaries to larger regional and national peer groups. The data compared mean salaries for common positions with similar reporting relationships. Of the 75 positions reported to CUPA, 55 or 73% of the salaries were below the CUPA 70th percentile. The national peer group data provided additional evidence that BGSU salaries lag behind a significant number of peer institutions.

CUPA data was also used to measure the competitiveness of the current Administrative Staff Compensation Plan (ASCP). In order to measure competitiveness, BGSU positions in the CUPA database were grouped by pay grade and these positions’ CUPA 70th percentile salaries were averaged to determine a CUPA average salary for each compensation grade. This CUPA average was compared to the actual 70th percentile of the existing ASCP pay grade. The study indicated that present compensation pay grades were competitive with the national CUPA salary data. Specifically for pay ranges 22 through 11, the ASCP 70th percentile is 2.03% ahead of the averaged 70th percentile data when the weighted average is compiled for all positions. Attachment B lists the study results for all compensation grades.

Review Of The Administrative Compensation Plan

Concerning the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan (ASCP) the committee’s review focused on the historical development of the plan as well as how the compensation plan is presently administered. The administrative staff compensation plan development began in 1994 to establish a formal process by which the University could determine appropriate compensation for administrative staff salaries. The compensation plan provided a basis to compare the duties and responsibilities of staff positions and place those positions into compensation grades relative to
To establish the relative grade levels, an analysis of a select number of administrative staff positions common to most university organizational structures was conducted. The study performed by a professional compensation consultant utilized the consultant's proprietary database to determine the appropriate grades for the common positions. With the aid of this initial analysis and the consultant, university staff then evaluated all administrative staff positions based on the consultant's methodology to determine each position's grade level. The process then led to several levels of administrative review, including formal appeals from individual staff members. The consultants' database was also utilized to create pay ranges that were based on existing market conditions (see attachment C). Each pay range had minimum and maximum values. These pay ranges were broad enough in scope to account for the differences in compensation, which could be attributed to factors such as years of service. Basing the compensation plan on market based data ensured that the initial pay ranges were competitive with peer institutions' compensation levels at that time.

Once the ASCP was approved, implementation of the plan required increasing the compensation of all staff salaries below their pay range to the minimum level for their grade. In addition to assuring that pay ranges kept pace with inflation, pay ranges were increased by a factor of one percent less than the approved salary pool for any given fiscal year. One issue that was not addressed during the implementation or the subsequent administration of the ASCP, is the issue of proper placement within grade. The placement issue concerns the progression of staff through the pay range as they successfully perform their responsibilities during the course of their careers with the University. Concerning range placement, it was agreed in the ASCP that assuming appropriate performance levels, staff members should progress to the mid point of the pay range during the first ten years of their career—assuming they remain in the same grade level over that same period. The placement issue was an important factor during the implementation of the ASCP but due to budget constraints was deferred to a later time.
Since its approval, the administration of the ASCP has provided the University with a process to establish compensation levels for replacement positions that are reflective of market conditions. Utilizing the combination of the ASCP grade placement methodology and market surveys for specific positions has generally led to the appropriate salaries for newly hired staff. Studies have been conducted to identify staff who are below their range mid points with 7 to 10 years of University service, in the same pay grade. These studies indicate that properly placing staff in pay ranges at this time would require an estimated $576,000. These studies were based on the assumptions that staff would move to the first quartile of their pay range in the first 7 years of service and to the mid point by the 10th year of service.

Meeting With Administrative Staff Council

The ASCWG's meeting with Administrative Staff Council was helpful in identifying the compensation issues that currently concern administrative staff. A list of those concerns is contained in attachment D. In addition, the Working Group was able to communicate the committee's charge as well as enter into a dialog about compensation concerns. Two key issues were identified. The first concern was for appropriate placement of staff within pay grades. The second concern was the incentives and rewards upon which the compensation plan is based. It was noted that the merit process is presently based on an evolving performance review system. In order for the performance review process to be effective it must be based on measurable objectives.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

The ASCWG offers the following recommendations for consideration:

Compensation Recommendations

1- Placement By Years Of Service Approach

Appropriately placing administrative staff within pay grades, according to their years of service, should receive the highest priority as additional resources become available. The
proper placement of staff within their pay grades would complete the implementation of the
administrative staff compensation plan begun in 1994. The compensation plan is based on
competitive market data. Supporting the administration of the plan would address the need to
maintain a competitive salary system to retain and attract the administrative talent necessary
to assure the success of the University's mission. Addressing the placement issue would
improve the University's competitive position with other Ohio residential universities.
Specific strategies to fund the proper placement of staff could be implemented over a one to
three year period. Over a three-year period the cost of funding this proposal would be
approximately $192,000 each fiscal year for a total cost of $576,000. This option would
affect an estimated 135 staff. All increases should be subject to satisfactory performance
reviews.

2- Quartile Approach

If option 1 can not be implemented, the working group recommends that a lump sum pay
increase be distributed to staff in the 1st and 2nd quartiles of their pay ranges. With respect to
the competitiveness of the ASCP pay grade ranges it would make the entire compensation
plan more competitive to increase those positions in the lower quartiles. Positions in the 3rd
quartile are approaching the 70th percentile and those staff in the 4th quartile are already by
definition above the 70th percentile benchmark. On average the lump sum increases would be
$1,700 in total over the implementation period of 3 to 5 years. However it should also be
recognized that in individual cases there might be market inequities in the 3rd and 4th
quartiles. For this reason, in combination with the lump sum increases, it is proposed that a
compensation adjustment pool of $50,000 be established to address these individual
compensation issues in the 3rd and 4th quartiles. This option would affect an estimated 302
staff in 1st and 2nd quartiles. The total cost of this option should be the same as option one,
$576,000, and could be implemented over the same 3 to 5 year period. All salary increases should be subject to satisfactory performance reviews.

3- Across The Board Approach

If the practical and legal complexities do not permit the implementation of the first two options then it is recommended that across the board lump sum increases of an estimated $1700 be given to all staff regardless of their quartile ranking. This option would affect all administrative staff and would increase the implementation cost by an estimated $283,000, for a total cost of $864,000.

4- Consultants Approach

Less timely than the first three options would be to secure a compensation specialist consultant to determine if each administrative staff's salary is competitive in the marketplace. This study would require at least four months and $40,000 to complete. The key to such a study is determining appropriate compensation levels for positions based on years of service. For example, for the same position the individual salary will vary dependent upon relevant years of experience in the position. The cost to implement this option could be structured so that it is the same as the first two recommendations.

Process Recommendations

1- A compensation pool should be established to address competitive market pressures during the recruitment of staff and to fund appropriate progression of staff through salary ranges in future fiscal years. The initial placement of staff within the salary ranges is the first step of maintaining a competitive compensation plan. Ongoing funding should be made available to administer the compensation plan during the first 10 years of a staff member's employment. After 10 years of service, progression through the remaining range should be merit driven.
2- On an annual basis Human Resources should review the grade placement of one quarter of all administrative positions every fiscal year. The appropriate grading of positions is a key to maintaining a competitive compensation plan. Reviewing the responsibilities and duties of staff positions would also serve to reinforce how each position addresses University needs, as well as assuring that compensation is competitive.

3- Human Resources should develop a residential peer group compensation report based on the CUPA database, which measures and compares the percentile differences amongst similar positions. BGSU, Kent State, Miami, and Ohio University should be part of this base.

4- The continued development and implementation of performance appraisal system should be a high priority for the University. Salary increases must be based on measurable objectives, which support the overall goals of the University. Funding the necessary training and establishing management incentives to perform performance reviews are key factors for maintaining a successful compensation plan.

Working Group members would like to thank: Dr. Chris Dalton, Rebecca Ferguson, Dr. William Knight, and Donna Wittwer for their many hours work in preparing reports and data requests. Without their staff support this report would not have been possible.
1997-98
Summary of Comparison of BGSU Salaries
to Other State Schools Using Common Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th># of Positions</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>BGSU Average Salary</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Difference from BGSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$76,476</td>
<td>$57,124</td>
<td>$21,352</td>
<td>37.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$73,362</td>
<td>$62,028</td>
<td>$11,334</td>
<td>16.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$69,810</td>
<td>$63,227</td>
<td>$6,583</td>
<td>10.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$62,401</td>
<td>$50,016</td>
<td>$2,385</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$59,601</td>
<td>$58,325</td>
<td>$1,476</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$59,659</td>
<td>$58,711</td>
<td>$858</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$58,922</td>
<td>$58,979</td>
<td>($57)</td>
<td>-0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$69,162</td>
<td>$61,567</td>
<td>($7,595)</td>
<td>-10.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$52,553</td>
<td>$58,551</td>
<td>($6,005)</td>
<td>-10.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#VALUE!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Difference

Institution
### Attachment B

**Administrative Staff Compensation Plan 70th Percentile**

By Compensation Plan Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Staff Per Grade</th>
<th>Number of cases in CUPA Study</th>
<th>CUPA 70% for BG Staff</th>
<th>ASGP 70% for BG Staff</th>
<th>Actual Salary Difference</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>99650</td>
<td>86556</td>
<td>-3094</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76290</td>
<td>86973</td>
<td>10682</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81213</td>
<td>78510</td>
<td>-2703</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70018</td>
<td>70984</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64902</td>
<td>64281</td>
<td>-621</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59073</td>
<td>58304</td>
<td>-769</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50256</td>
<td>52086</td>
<td>2710</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49165</td>
<td>48194</td>
<td>-971</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45325</td>
<td>45325</td>
<td>-1900</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52500</td>
<td>40094</td>
<td>12406</td>
<td>-30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31268</td>
<td>36857</td>
<td>5589</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29060</td>
<td>33569</td>
<td>4509</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>\text{NC*}</td>
<td>30791</td>
<td>\text{NA}</td>
<td>\text{NA}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>\text{NC*}</td>
<td>28237</td>
<td>\text{NA}</td>
<td>\text{NA}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>\text{NC*}</td>
<td>26030</td>
<td>\text{NA}</td>
<td>\text{NA}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>\text{NC*}</td>
<td>24061</td>
<td>\text{NA}</td>
<td>\text{NA}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\text{NC*}- no cases
### Administrative Staff Pay Ranges by Grade 1998-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade No.</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>1st Quartile</th>
<th>Midpoint</th>
<th>2nd Quartile</th>
<th>3rd Quartile</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15,574</td>
<td>17,326</td>
<td>19,077</td>
<td>20,829</td>
<td>22,581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16,742</td>
<td>18,672</td>
<td>20,503</td>
<td>22,533</td>
<td>24,463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18,031</td>
<td>20,160</td>
<td>22,288</td>
<td>24,417</td>
<td>26,545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19,449</td>
<td>21,800</td>
<td>24,149</td>
<td>26,499</td>
<td>28,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21,015</td>
<td>23,612</td>
<td>26,209</td>
<td>28,807</td>
<td>31,404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>22,742</td>
<td>25,617</td>
<td>28,491</td>
<td>31,266</td>
<td>34,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24,653</td>
<td>27,833</td>
<td>31,022</td>
<td>34,203</td>
<td>37,390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>26,763</td>
<td>30,300</td>
<td>33,831</td>
<td>37,364</td>
<td>40,895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>29,112</td>
<td>33,035</td>
<td>36,956</td>
<td>40,879</td>
<td>44,801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>31,714</td>
<td>36,074</td>
<td>40,435</td>
<td>44,796</td>
<td>49,156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>34,503</td>
<td>39,457</td>
<td>44,312</td>
<td>49,163</td>
<td>54,019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>37,818</td>
<td>43,229</td>
<td>48,633</td>
<td>54,049</td>
<td>53,458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>41,400</td>
<td>47,437</td>
<td>53,474</td>
<td>59,512</td>
<td>65,549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>45,393</td>
<td>52,139</td>
<td>58,883</td>
<td>65,630</td>
<td>72,376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>49,852</td>
<td>57,399</td>
<td>64,945</td>
<td>72,493</td>
<td>80,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>54,833</td>
<td>63,293</td>
<td>71,745</td>
<td>80,201</td>
<td>88,655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>60,420</td>
<td>69,902</td>
<td>79,335</td>
<td>88,363</td>
<td>98,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>66,677</td>
<td>77,327</td>
<td>87,977</td>
<td>98,628</td>
<td>109,276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>73,702</td>
<td>85,672</td>
<td>97,654</td>
<td>109,631</td>
<td>121,607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrative Staff Compensation Issues include:

• correcting the improper placement of individuals hired prior to the implementation of the administrative compensation plan (in January of 1996). PWC, in conjunction with HR, has been compiling data identifying the persons affected and monies involved. A recommendation, passed by ASC, would be a first step in addressing administrative staff compensation issues.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

• the information gleaned from this initiative should be shared with BGSU’s administrative staff members.
February 14, 2001

To: President's Compensation Working Group

From: Administrative Staff Council

Re: Philosophy of Compensation

Thank you for the invitation to meet with the President’s compensation group. The Administrative Staff Council (ASC) leadership has decided to provide for you some of our thoughts about compensation so that you may be able to discuss them prior to or at that meeting.

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

Again from our handbook: "Each year, the university should identify, review, and address employee salaries, which may be inequitable. Funds should be made available on a regular, on-going basis to correct salary inequities, make market adjustments and salary adjustments deemed appropriate following comprehensive reviews of employee performance and salary, and to support raises for promotions. These funds should not be considered part of the annual merit pool." Administrative Staff at Bowling Green believe that an open, visible process for salary/market adjustments must be accessible to individuals. As well, compensation for upgrades should not depend on the vagaries of the availability of departmental funds.

Regarding the growing work week, we also believe that positions of professional administration at BGSU should be designed and articulated to be performed typically within the forty-hour work week. As our handbook states, "Under normal circumstances, a full-time administrative staff member is expected to work a minimum of 40 hours per week. There may be occasions beyond the 40 hours in order to fulfill the contracted obligations. ...When an administrative staff member's normal duties perpetually require work beyond the 40 hour week, it is assumed that this situation will be taken in account in the employee’s overall compensation and that the employee will be given the opportunity for a variable work schedule." With increased enrollment and a consistent flow of administrative employee turnover, longer and longer work weeks are becoming endemic to the administrative staff positions at BGSU. For the well-being of both employees and institution, this fact must be appropriately addressed, although not solely via compensation.

The concept of merit is not foreign or unwelcome to administrative staff; however, a viable merit pool is a
necessary part of an incentive program. First, no employee who satisfactorily performs the duties articulated in her/his job description should be penalized for working at BGSU because of external economic growth. Thus, meritorious Administrative Staff should be assured that each contract will at minimum provide the same indexed purchasing power as the previous year's contract. Second, compression and inversion problems created by the implementation of our compensation plan must be addressed to assure equity. When merit barely meets or does not meet annual increases in cost of living, meritorious administrative employees in the upper quadrants of their pay ranges cannot be expected to remain stagnant or to fall back in real purchasing power. And equally, merit pools or compensation plans that do not allow for timely progression toward range midpoints surely hurt the morale and retention of administrative staff in the lower quadrants of their pay ranges.

Administrative Staff at BGSU hope the President's Compensation Group will recognize several additional tenets of successful plans for professional compensation. One such tenet is that successful performance by one individual is usually based on a complex inter-dependency of competencies of support by many others. Another tenet is that the relationship between the employer and staff member is one of mutual benefit which should carry increased care and responsibility over years of service. This would include attempts to place and retrain staff who through no failure of performance on their part may be forced from an administrative position after five or more years of service.

We also feel strongly that caps are detrimental to the morale and in opposition to the philosophy of a merit-based compensation system. As a university, the value communicated to individuals who have performed at high levels over the course of their careers at BGSU and who now have reached the top of their established salary range is that the university no longer cares about that individual's performance or is taking that employee's satisfaction, performance, and retention for granted. In addition, the policy of imposing salary caps to only one employee group of the three is systematically unfair.

All staff groups within a single institution should have the same general principles guiding their compensation.

Other areas of compensation or suggestions for compensation that we consider valuable include the following items:

- Administrative staff members who have performed well for a minimum of five years and whose position is in no imminent danger of deletion should be provided multiple-year contracts.

- Administrative Staff should have some reasonable expectation/guidelines as to how they are going to progress through the pay range in their current position and how they might progress, if they desire to do so, in an upward career path within the institution. The present projection of time from minimum-wage (for range) hire-in to range midpoint is 22.2 years, and even hire-ins at first quartile take far longer to reach range midpoint than the expected time in position to reach full proficiency or productivity. This angle of ascent in compensation is much too shallow to suggest retention in position beyond 2-5 years; if institutional resources do not permit lower-quadrant acceleration, we should develop formal processes to encourage upward mobility within the university.

- In the interest of supporting each other in this community, a catastrophic leave pool should be established. Appropriate regulations to prevent abuse of a system could be developed.
• As an incentive toward productivity, a higher percentage of sick leave should be paid out at retirement.

• Given the growing work week and work load of many staff, it is difficult for some individuals to find time in which to take vacation. Currently, at a given point in the year, any hours accumulated over the allowed 44 days are lost. The university should consider paying the individual for those days or removing the cap on administrative vacation accrual. The paradox of too much responsibility to take vacation and the loss of this benefit through too much commitment to the institution must be eliminated. Compounding the problem, every time we lose an administrative employee because our working conditions or compensation are not market-competitive, the employees who remain in that employee’s unit are likely to realize an immediate downturn in their working conditions—just one example of which is the loss of accrued vacation time.

• Currently, when a position is re-evaluated and assigned a higher level as a result of a significant expansion in the position’s existing duties and responsibilities, the incumbent is guaranteed at least a 5% minimum increase in salary or the minimum of the new level. To remain competitive and to reward those who assume additional responsibility, salary should be increased a minimum of 10% and negotiated with the consideration of years of experience, etc. as a condition—as they would be with a new hire.
February 21, 2001

To: Linda Dobb
Chair, President’s Compensation Working Group

From: Administrative Staff Council

Re: Compensation Discussion

Enclosed are two items for discussion with the President’s Compensation Working Group (PCWG) when we meet to discuss compensation issues.

The first set of documents is a proposal, with cover memo, approved by the Administrative Staff Council (ASC) which offers a solution to address the inequities surrounding compensation for teaching by administrative staff.

The second document offers a discussion of our perspective, both philosophical and practical, on administrative staff compensation issues in general.

If the members of the PCWG have need of more information about the documents presented, John Clark or I would be happy to address those issues specifically. In addition, if the PCGW has specific expectations of our meeting—something that we should bring to the meeting or provide prior to the meeting—please let us know.
Teaching Compensation Proposal for Administrative Staff -- 2/2/01
Submitted by ASC Salary Committee, BGSU

Administrative staff personnel who perform official BGSU teaching* beyond the requirements of their position classification shall be offered a part-time teaching contract. The per-hour rate for this contract shall be equal to or greater than the current BGSU part-time teaching rate, congruent with the staff member's teaching experience and highest degree. Although Administrative Staff may voluntarily decline offered teaching compensation, they shall have free choice in this decision. Voluntary teaching may be considered a value-added item for an Administrative Staff employee's performance and/or merit evaluations, but teaching compensated by a part-time contract shall not be thus considered.

In summary...

- A part-time contract shall be offered for any BGSU teaching beyond the requirements of the position classification for Administrative staff.
- The teaching rate for such part-time contracts shall be equal to or greater than the standard BGSU rate for similarly qualified part-time instructors.
- Such part-time contracts, once offered, may be voluntarily declined.
- Compensated part-time teaching shall not be evaluated for "performance" or "merit" for Administrative Staff, but voluntary teaching may be.

* "Official BGSU teaching," for the purposes of this policy statement, refers exclusively to classes with these attributes: (a) university credit is awarded upon successful completion, (b) the instructor awards grades for the course [including "S" and "U"], (c) regular or formal class meetings are held, and (d) the instructor is responsible for creating/maintaining a learning environment and office hours.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mary Beth Zachary, President
   Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Jan Peterson, Member
       ASC Salary Committee

RE: Teaching Compensation Proposal for Administrative Staff

The following is a record of the work of the ASC Salary Committee leading to the Teaching Compensation Proposal for Administrative Staff. This proposal was approved by ASC on February 1, 2001. It is our hope that you will be able to take this proposal forward for consideration, and hopefully approval, by university officials.

Introduction

In May 1997 several concerns were brought to the attention of Administrative Staff Council relative to policies and subsequent remuneration when administration staff teach for BGSU. Initial investigation revealed compensation inconsistencies throughout the campus (e.g., some administrative staff taught for non-compensation, some received compensation at the overload rate, while others were paid as part-time faculty, etc.) Administrative Staff Council thought it worthy to pursue this issue, and created an Ad Hoc Committee to study the issue. The Ad Hoc Committee was disbanded after two years without consensus on a recommendation, and the issue became a two-year agenda item for the ASC Salary Compensation Committee. Now after four years of investigative research and study, a committee consensus has finally been reached, and a proposal was submitted to and approved by Administrative Staff Council at its February 1, 2001 meeting.

Methodology

1. Survey of Administrative Staff

   The committee convened Fall Semester 1997 and (naively) decided to initiate the investigation by surveying all Administrative Staff regarding the issue of part-time teaching compensation. A survey instrument was developed and distributed to all Administrative Staff. As a result of the initial survey, the committee quickly realized the issue was far from clear. Several areas of concern were identified, and there were numerous questions within each area.

   Two of the major areas identified involved the definition of teaching and the relationship of teaching responsibilities to one's job description. How is teaching defined? Are teaching and administrative responsibilities separate? Is teaching a requirement of the position?

   Another area of concern involved the issue of compensation: how does the teaching fit in with the individual's administrative staff compensation plan (i.e., job description, etc.)? Is one paid for teaching as part of one's administrative contract, as a part-time faculty position, or as an overload administrative position?

   The questions went on and on, with many of the major areas of concern overlapping, illustrating how what was thought to be a "simple question" soon becomes the proverbial "thorny issue": Some issues included questions of credit versus non-credit classes; are the courses being taught as independent study, or workshops, or off-campus seminars/classes; are these courses taught voluntarily or at the request of one's supervisor, etc.

2. Contacted other four-year public institutions in Ohio to determine what were their policies on said teaching.

3. Met with Human Resources and analyzed job descriptions of five administrative staff members who teach, to determine if teaching was part of their job analysis by Mercer.


4. Contacted the Office of the Provost to track the origination of the overload teaching compensation, only to go back 30 years without any documentation on its origin and how/when it was determined to be used for administrative staff compensation for teaching guideline.

5. In 1999/00, a draft of the final proposal document was developed.

6. The 2000/01 committee examined a roster of administrative staff teaching Fall Semester 2000 and reviewed it to determine whether there was compensation or not, and if so, whether there was any consistency in salary.

7. Contacted the College of Arts & Sciences, the largest employer of part-time faculty, to educate ourselves on how part-time faculty teaching is budgeted or not, and how it is determined whether a course is taught in load/overload or by part-time contract.

8. Sought information about funding sources for UNIV 100 classes. Credit classes receive revenue for the institution and subsequent subsidy revenue from OER.

Findings

- If you are an employee of another 2 or 4 year institution of higher education and come to BGSU to teach part-time, you are paid by BGSU according to the part-time faculty teaching rate.
- If you are a BGSU administrative staff member teaching at another institution of higher education, you are offered a part-time faculty teaching contract and paid accordingly.
- If a BGSU administrative staff member teaches for BGSU, they may not be paid for their efforts or may be paid only the overload rate versus the higher part-time faculty salary.
- Compensating administrative staff at the Part-time faculty compensation rates should not create a major budget impact on colleges.
- Learned that for the last two years, UNIV 100 classes requested and received Success Challenge Grant funding to pay their instructors.

Conclusion

After a thorough and in-depth four-year investigation, the Teaching Compensation Proposal for Administrative Staff is one that provides the university with an equitable and consistent method of compensation for administrative staff who teach part-time (i.e., over and above their job descriptions) for BGSU.

Attachment: Proposal
BGSU Administrative Compensation

Presented by:
Administrative Staff Council
3/14/01

Our Goal:
A comprehensive, effective, equitable, and feasible plan for BGSU's administrative staff.

Benefits of Building a Systematic Administrative Compensation Plan

- Aids in recruitment, allowing potential employees to visualize opportunities at BGSU
- Reinforces the value of BGSU's current administrative employees
- Aids in building employee awareness and retention
- Creates common ground, minimizing surprise and disappointment
- Minimizes disturbing or unfair expectations and miscommunications
- Builds appropriate expectations for compensation-related decisions
- Allows employees to make informed, rational compensation decisions
- Aids in institutional and unit planning
- Resolves policy conflicts and policy application disagreements
- Provides stability for employees and employer
Three Wise Moves Increase Competitive Positioning of Salaries

- 1992-present: New administrative hires placed with full credit for qualifications
- 1999/2000: Meritorious administrative staff with 9+ years in position adjusted to midpoint or higher
- 2000/2001: Meritorious ad. staff with 5-9 years in position as of 12/31/99 adjusted toward/above midpoint

The Effects of Compensation Revisions since 1998

Employee % by Years in Position
Employee % by Position in Range

- 30%
- 25%
- 20%
- 15%
- 10%
- 5%
- 0%

% Employees

- Quartile 1: 24%
- Quartile 2: 27%
- Quartile 3: 26%
- Quartile 4: 15%
- Above Max: 8%

Positions not Touched:
Years 4, 5, and 6

- Approximately 20 of Those 70 Will Have 4, 5, or 6 Meritorious Years in Position by 6/31/01 and Are Significantly Below 1st Quartile in Range.
- Note: Some 1995 Hires Were Priced to Minimum (only) by Implementation of Mercer in January 1996.
- Note: Progress within range accelerates significantly as quartile position of employee increases.

Values & Philosophy
Systemic Elements to Be Addressed

- Range evaluation and movement of ranges
- Periodic, systematic market review of all positions
- Acceleration to/toward range midpoint (a Mercer assumption)
- Salary progression throughout the ranges
- Salary inversions and egregious compressions

Specific Issues Requiring Timely Resolution

- Positions filled prior to Mercer implementation & below 1st percentile
- Conflict areas: 100% merit system and consistent application of merit
- The growing workforce of employees
- Improved gathering and sharing of data pertinent to administrative staff
- Funding to accomplish these goals:
  - Periodic adjustment to/around midpoint (4-6 merit increases in position)
  - Support for department in funding re-evaluation to a higher range
  - Acceleration of salary inversion problems
  - Reduce salary compression problems
  - Incentives for temporary assumption of additional responsibilities

Non-Salary Compensation Issues

- Multi-year contracts for administrative staff who have performed meritoriously for X years in position
- Catastrophic sick leave pool for administrative staff (If there are Ohio laws or regulations constraining such a pool, what are they?)
Conclusion:

H.R. and A.S.C. Build a Plan for Your Consideration

Thank you for making today's discussion possible and for your thoughtful consideration of the compensation goals of BGSU's administrative staff.
April 19, 2001

Dear Colleague,

As you may have read in my Perspective newsletter and in local newspapers, the budget negotiations in Columbus remain unsettled and the funding picture for higher education for the next biennium is not an optimistic one.

Because of this uncertainty, I am initiating a selective hiring freeze at BGSU effective Friday, April 20 through at least the end of the current fiscal year, June 30, 2001. Instructional faculty positions are not subject to this freeze. By exempting instructional faculty, we can best protect the core mission of the University, which must always be the teaching of students.

The guidelines for this selective hiring freeze for all classified and administrative staff positions are as follows:

• The freeze includes searches currently in progress as well as new searches.
• No new positions or replacement positions will be filled automatically.
• Requests for exceptions will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Such requests should be submitted in writing to me through your area vice president.
• Late offers may be extended to candidates without following this approval process.
• Given the critical need to protect operating budgets, departments should not use temporary full-time or part-time employees or student employees (or individuals hired on non-student letters of appointment) to “fill” permanent positions left vacant because of the freeze. Any exceptions to this guideline require the approval of the area vice president.

Please read the attached Q and A sheet for more information.

We will update you as the situation unfolds. And, as always, we continue to advocate for BGSU at every opportunity. We hope by taking these early steps, we can maintain the progress of the University and enhance our flexibility in reducing the chance of having to take more drastic steps at a later date.

Faced with these harsh economic realities, we must continue to deliver the quality education our students deserve and have come to expect from Bowling Green State University. I very much appreciate your patience and goodwill as we work together to manage this situation as best we can.

Yours very truly,

Sidney A. Ribeau
President
**BGSU Selective Hiring Freeze Q & A**

**Q: What is a selective hiring freeze?**

A. The selective hiring freeze affects all classified and administrative staff positions except those for which an offer has been extended to a candidate. Searches in the interview phase may be completed, but no job offers can be extended to candidates during the selective freeze without vice-presidential recommendation and the written approval of the President. All faculty instructional positions are exempt from the selective freeze.

**Q: When does the selective hiring freeze start?**

A. Friday, April 20.

**Q. How long will the selective freeze be in effect?**

A. The selective freeze will be in effect at least until the beginning of the next fiscal year, July 1, 2001.

**Q. What if a vacant position is critical to the operation of an office or department?**

A. Hiring officers may seek an exception to the selective freeze by documenting the need for filling the post and presenting that documentation to their area vice president. If recommended by the vice president, the request will then be submitted directly to the President for his consideration on a case-by-case basis.

**Q. How do I request an exception?**

A. Requests should be made in writing and submitted to your area vice president. Exception requests might address the following:

- Does the position support critical student services?
- Does the position provide essential support for student instruction?
- Will the position generate revenue?
- Is the position grant-funded?
- Is the position necessary for health purposes or campus safety?

These are just a few examples of justifications that might warrant exceptions. Other options should be discussed with your area vice president.

**Q. Can temporary workers be hired?**

A. Without prior approval by the area vice president, no temporary employees may be hired and no new non-student letters of appointment may be issued. Employees currently on the payroll on a non-student letter of appointment will not be affected.

**Q. Can offices hire student employees?**

A. Yes, offices that are dependent on student employees in order to function effectively may continue to hire students assuming that they have available operating
budget funds. We do not want, however, to permanently replace staff positions with student positions.

Q. What about positions in auxiliary areas such as the Residence Halls or Athletics?
   A. The selective freeze applies to all classified and administrative positions. As noted above, exceptions can be requested on a case-by-case basis.

Q. What about non-instructional faculty positions?
   A. The freeze also applies to non-instructional faculty positions, such as deans. Again, exceptions can be requested on a case-by-case basis. The freeze does not apply to department chairs since they are considered instructional faculty.

Q. When will we know whether faculty and staff will receive salary increases for the 2001-02 fiscal year?
   A. While we’re watching the state budget deliberations carefully, it is still far too early to make any projections regarding allocations to the state universities. We will continue to keep faculty and staff updated regarding the budget situation and its implications. We anticipate that decisions on salary increases for next year will be made at the Board of Trustees meeting on June 29, 2001.

Q. If the budget situation worsens, will the University consider eliminating positions?
   A. This selective freeze is one step the University is taking to head off shortfalls as the budget process unfolds in Columbus. Implementing a selective freeze now will make it less likely that we have to consider eliminating positions later.

Q. What can we do as individuals in the University community to make a difference?
   A. We all need to look for ways to minimize expenditures now and in the months ahead. It is particularly important for areas to reduce discretionary spending in order to conserve funds for their most mission-critical activities. In doing all of this, we must carefully protect the quality of our educational endeavors and service to students.
President's Panel Agenda Items
Thursday, April 19, 2001
2:30 p.m.
Faculty Senate Conference Room

Administrative Staff Council
1) State Budget: What is the budget picture today? What can we do as, either private citizens or employees of the university, to assist legislators in understanding the implications of underfunding higher education in Ohio? Would it be useful to write as constituent group leadership?

2) Systematic Approach to Administrative Staff Compensation: We hope to work with the President's Compensation Working Group to articulate a systematic approach to compensation for administrative staff that is broad enough to provide flexibility to the administration and clear enough to provide for appropriate expectations by staff. We presented the ideas to the President's Compensation Working Group and have given our notes and copies of our slides of the presentation to both Eileen Sullivan and Rebecca Ferguson to be given to the President for his review.

Classified Staff Council
1) An update on the current happenings surrounding the state budget and what the effects will be on BGSU. How does meeting the goal of 3,700 new freshmen effect our budget situation? Are we on target for reaching this goal?

2) We would like clarification on the contract signed with Pepsi in regard to employee fundraisers. For example, last year Pepsi donated canned pop for our Golf Outing which supports our scholarship fund. Since we are no longer to solicit Pepsi, but rather go through the University to receive a donation, we now seem to have no choice but to purchase these beverages out of our budget that in the past have been donated. We received a letter from William Arnold which states that the marketing funds and product associated with the contract will only be available to support student organization and student sponsored programs and events. How is the process of awarding these products decided? We have also been told that we could not ask a competing vendor for a donation. Are there regulations for Pepsi owned companies such as Frito-Lay?

3) At the last Board of Trustees Financial Affairs & Facilities Committee Meeting there was mention of the committee on values. We would like to hear an update on where the University is headed in relation to our Core Values and Mission Statement.

Faculty Senate
1) The asbestos situation in the Education Building.

[Handwritten notes and signatures]
Graduate Student Senate

1) International student issues

2) Graduate student issues overall (which includes the 12 credit hour requirement, stipend, and health insurance)

3) Update on GSS and the graduate community
Folks,

I have a few notes from our meeting with the President on Tuesday, May 15, and I thought I'd pass them along to you before I forgot. If you have any suggested changes or additions, Mary Beth and Laura, please forward. I think we will want to report these conversations to our constituents. -- John

As President Ribucci explained to Administrative Staff Council representatives Clark, Zachary, and Zachary on May 15, the BGSU selective hiring freeze was instituted to accomplish three goals:

1. To protect current BGSU employees from potential layoff, should the budget allocation for next year not provide sufficient support for BGSU to keep all its employees.
2. To try to allow some type of raise for current BGSU employees.
3. To try to maintain quality of services if not quantity; we may have to do less, but we'll still try to do it well.

The President also offered the following information items in subsequent discussion:

1. Unallocated 2000-2001 fund balances, which normally would have been rolled over at the end of this fiscal year into compensation for employees, was "scooped" to repay 800,000 to Columbus (forced by revenue shortfalls in the last quarter of the current fiscal year).
2. Admissions and other university offices are working assiduously to recruit 3700 new first-year students for fall, whom we need for short-term cash flow.
3. 50% of frozen positions, in terms of dollars, have been released through the process of appeal. These released positions, which now may be filled, represent $1 million of $2 million in salaries for initially frozen positions.
4. Nothing is likely to change in our strategic approach to filling administrative or classified staff positions (non-instructional positions) after July 1. The President is assuming that any state budget we might see will include a cut, a non-increase, or an increase that does not cover inflation for BGSU. In any of those scenarios, we still would need to wrench in terms of hiring, because the second year of the upcoming biennium is projected to have even deeper cuts for higher education in Ohio.
5. BGSU will try to keep departmental operating budgets "flat"--no decrease--because those operating budgets already are so austere that cuts would potentially reduce essential services.

--

Dr. John Clark
General Studies Writing
Bowling Green University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
Thought questions for the President to discuss with ASC

10/31/01: Meeting with John Clark, 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 BG SU’s core values (which are all adversely affected by alcohol consumption) and the nationwide concern for binge drinking on college campuses?
President's Panel
Minutes
April 18, 2002

Attendance: President Ribeau, Provost/VPAA John Folkins, Executive VP Linda Dobb, Jim Evans (Faculty Senate Chair), Ben Mueg (Faculty Senate Vice Chair), John Clark (Administrative Staff Council Chair), Laura Emch (ASC Vice Chair), Anne Tracy (Classified Staff Chair), Barbara Garay (CSC Vice Chair), Sarah Saccany (USG President), Kevin Yania (USG Vice President), Joe Skariah (GSS President), Eileen Sullivan (Executive Assistant to the President).

After introductions, President Ribeau reviewed the history and purpose of the President's Panel. Moving first to Faculty Senate concerns, we talked about the status of the state budget situation (approximately $350 million revenue shortfall this year, probably covered from "rainy day fund", and possible $750 million shortfall next fiscal year). At BGSU, the 6% state subsidy cut last year amounted to $5 million which we successfully covered, but we are now facing as a permanent reduction in future budgets. We also anticipate continued increases in health insurance and energy costs. Decisions about tuition for fall will be made at the June 19th Board of Trustees meeting.

The second item was Classified Staff Councils' concern about the severe weather policy. Chair Anne Tracy reviewed the history of the 1993 severe weather policy and its intent to treat all members of the university community equally by making a decision that the University is either open or closed. However the March 25th situation was confusing (classes cancelled by the University not closed) for staff, and created potential hazards for them, and also affected whether or not they received augmented pay (as under the severe weather policy). President Ribeau explained that it may or may not have been correct for classes to have been cancelled that evening, but there was never the intent of closing the University that particular day. In the general discussion that followed, it was agreed that there is confusion about under what conditions the University would ever "close" (having over 7,000 residential students), and there needed to be a clearer understanding or link between levels of weather emergencies and which specific operations would be limited or curtailed. The policy itself will be examined this summer by a task force headed by Linda Dobb with representatives of the various constituencies. In addition, it was suggested that better methods of communication are needed-- such as staff supervisors carrying cell phones, each staff member carrying a beeper, and knowing who to call when contacted (rather than swamping the phone system at HR, for example). It was also suggested there needs to be a clear understanding of under what emergency conditions the libraries, student recreation center, and other non-critical facilities would close. Finally, CSC reiterated its concern about addressing the compensation issue during severe weather conditions or other emergencies.

The third item was ASC's interest in promoting paperless communication, especially such items as class schedules, admissions, bursar, and financial aid materials. There was general discussion about the need for clear legal guidance-- what kinds of
materials (student records, advising, personnel issues) require paper copies and archiving. Many items (such as numerous invitations to events at this time of year) could be transmitted electronically. It was also pointed out that many mailings are not only on paper, but are on glossy (non-recyclable) paper. Finally, there was discussion about the need to understand student access to electronic materials, both at BGSU or local residence, but also at the student’s permanent residence. This might require additional market research.

The fourth item was also from ASC, about the need for a University Policy and Procedures Manual. Among the strengths of doing this would be ease of access to information, consistency, and lack of duplication. Potential problems include the different needs of different constituencies, and inherent difficulties of making changes in the incorporated policies and procedures. It was pointed out the implications for faculty of potential conflicts with the Academic Charter. This agenda item will be considered in more detail in the future.

The final item was from GSS. GSS President Skariah announced the new officers will be Shelly Clagg (President) and Diedra Summerlad (Vice President). He then reviewed the status of three issues: (1) library hours, (2) the 12 credit hour enrollment for GA’s, and (3) developing a Graduate Assistant Handbook. Several participants expressed interest in the GA Handbook, but worried about conflicts with existing department policies (about teaching classes) or with the Academic Charter. The final discussion was about library hours, how this has been affected by the budget and also by use patterns of the new Union.

We adjourned at 4:00 pm.