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### Administrative Staff Council
#### Meeting Schedule 1995-96

**Fall Reception:**

**ASC Meetings:** (meetings are scheduled on the first Thursday of the month)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1995</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>7 September</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>University Union Alumni Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>5 October</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>University Union Alumni Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>2 November</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>University Union Alumni Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>7 December</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>University Union Alumni Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1996</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>4 January</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>University Union Alumni Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>1 February</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>University Union Alumni Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>7 March</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>University Union Alumni Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>4 April</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>University Union Alumni Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>2 May</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>University Union Alumni Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>6 June</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>University Union Alumni Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASC Executive Committee:** (meetings normally are scheduled on the second and fourth Tuesday of the month)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1995</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>9 &amp; 23 August</td>
<td>noon-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>University Union Canal Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>12 &amp; 26 September</td>
<td>noon-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Club 57, Founders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>10 &amp; 24 October</td>
<td>noon-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Club 57, Founders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>14 &amp; 28 November</td>
<td>noon-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Club 57, Founders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>12 December</td>
<td>noon-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Club 57, Founders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1996</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>9 January</td>
<td>noon-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>23 January</td>
<td>noon-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Club 57, Founders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>13 &amp; 27 February</td>
<td>noon-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Club 57, Founders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>12 March</td>
<td>noon-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Club 57, Founders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>26 March</td>
<td>noon-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>9 &amp; 23 April</td>
<td>noon-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Club 57, Founders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>14 &amp; 28 May</td>
<td>noon-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>11 &amp; 25 June</td>
<td>noon-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*4/28/95 adw*
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL AGENDA

Thursday, September 7, 1995
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union

1. Call to Order
2. Introductions
3. Chair's Report
4. Chair Elect's Report
5. Secretary's Report
6. Committee Reports
7. Old Business
8. New Business
   - Review of Goals 1994-95
   - discussion groups for 1995-96 goals
9. Good of the Order
10. Adjourn
Administrative Staff Council Minutes
Thursday, September 7, 1995


Members Absent: Celeste Bland for Joan Morgan

Who Sent Substitutes:

Members Absent: Tom Glick, Jeffery Grilliot, Judy Hartley, Ken Kavanagh, Penny Nemitz, Barry Piersol, Denise Van de Walle, Bob Waddle

Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Chair, Bryan Benner.

Chair's Report:
Bryan Benner distributed a list with the Chairs, and members of the 1995-96 ASC Standing Committees.

Mercer Study
Personnel will distribute the initial results of the Mercer Study to the administrative staff on September 25th. A representative from Mercer will make a presentation the week of the 25th to all administrative staff reviewing the procedures used in the study. ASC will be working to get as much information as possible to our constituents so that they have a clear understanding of how scoring was done and how to approach the appeals process. The ASC members of the Mercer Committee have lobbied to make the point that we do not support salary caps. A separate proposal will go to the Vice Presidents that addresses administrative staff policies and procedures affected by the Mercer Study. Administrative Staff has had input into this document through our representatives on the Committee.

Day Care Advisory Committee
The advisory committee has not been formed yet but ASC expects to have representation on this committee.

Market Adjustments
Last year thirty-four administrative staff members applied for market adjustments under the procedures currently in place for administrative staff. Although the Trustees had identified money in the budget for market adjustments staff members were informed that market decisions were put on
hold until after the Mercer Study was completed. ASC will try to get information from the Vice President's regarding how market adjustments will be handled for administrative staff caught in this situation.

**Internal Affairs Officer**

Joseph Luthman has agreed to accept the newly created position of Internal Affairs Officer for ASC.

**Secretary's Report:**

Gail McRoberts distributed the 1995-96 Administrative Staff Council Constituent Network. This network will be updated monthly as we receive word from Personnel of newly hired administrative staff. Any corrections should be sent directly to Gail.

**Committee Reports:**

**Personnel Welfare Committee**

First meeting scheduled for 9-22-95 will deal with carryover items, Mercer issues and goals for this year.

**Professional Development Committee**

Discussion at the first committee meeting included an assessment of the handbook wording regarding professional development, resources, goals, and constraints. They have begun discussions of a professional development project for the fall, and a reward and recognition program for staff.

**Old Business**

Bryan Benner presented for a second reading the proposed Amendments to the By-Laws that had been recommended by the 94-95 Bylaws committee. Kent Strickland expressed a concern that the wording of "Article I; Section I" might inhibit the Council's ability to move quickly on an issue when warranted. Several members suggested adding a clause that would address the need to suspend the second reading in some situations. The 95-96 Bylaws Committee will bring suggested wording to the October meeting.

**New Business**

Council broke into small discussion groups to review goals for ASC for the coming year using the "ASC Goals 1994-95 Final Report" to start their discussions.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Gail McRoberts
Secretary, ASC

The next meeting of Administrative Staff Council will be:
Thursday, October 5, 1995
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union
• Participate in the Mercer Group's job analysis and compensation study for administrative staff.

Status: Ongoing. A committee of administrative staff members from each of the vice presidential areas have been involved in reviewing the results of the Mercer study and making recommendations to the vice presidents about the appeal process and policies and procedures. It is anticipated the work of the committee will be finished October 1, 1995.

• Seek ways to ensure consistent application of policies relating to the welfare of administrative staff across vice presidential and presidential lines, including annual performance evaluations, merit evaluations, salary adjustments, etc. Continue active participation in development of standard performance evaluation procedure for all administrative staff.

Status: Ongoing. A committee of administrative staff members from each of the vice presidential areas began an examination of annual performance evaluations, merit evaluations and salary adjustments in 1994. The committee was temporarily suspended at the recommendation of Personnel Services in order to determine how the new president felt about these issues. The committee should be back at work in September 1995.

• Continue participation in planning for a university-based day care center; pursue establishment of an advisory committee to assure quality programming and access for all university constituent groups. Pursue Firelands' needs for day care. Examine dependent/elder care (long range).

Status: Partially accomplished. The groundbreaking of the new day care center represents years of hard work by many members of administrative staff as well as the other constituent groups. It is anticipated that administrative staff will be represented on the advisory committee. The need for day care at the Firelands campus has yet to be addressed. In addition, the issues of dependent and elder care still need to be studied on a long term basis.

• Pursue implementation of a clear policy and procedure for addressing wage issues: market adjustments, promotion, equity adjustments, gender inequities, etc. Distribute the approved procedures to all staff.

Status: Pending Mercer results. Personnel Welfare recommended clear policy and procedures for all of these issues. These were adopted by Administrative Staff Council and forwarded to the Administrative Council for approval. The Administrative Council indicated that these issues would be resolved by the results of the Mercer study and therefore, did not take any action on the recommendations.

• Secure an overall salary and benefit package that ranks BGSU's administrative staff in the number four position or higher statewide. Review and make recommendations on future distribution of salary pool with particular attention to how the merit is awarded i.e. dollar amount vs. percentage split.

Status: Ongoing. The goal of ranking BGSU's administrative staff in the fourth position or higher statewide has not yet been met. Further work need to be done in regard to the distribution of merit dollars. The results and implementation of the Mercer study may have a direct affect on how this is pursued.

• Address issues related to increased workloads, e.g., development of interim/acting appointment pay scales and the possibility of alternative means of compensation/recognition.

Status: Pending Mercer results. Same as wage issues above.
• Work with Personnel on the issue of Administrative Staff fringe benefits with a view to equalizing some benefits among employee groups e.g., examine consistency of policy with regard to maternity leave, unpaid leave, family leave, benefits for couples when both are employed by the university.

Status: No action by Administrative Council. Personnel Welfare recommended revisions to the Family and Medical leave policy when two spouses work at the University. Proposed a new Natal leave policy to encompass birth and adoption. (See attached) These were approved by Administrative Staff Council and forwarded to the Administrative Council. The Administrative Council took no action on these issues. Somehow these recommendations were grouped with the salary issues and were included in the issues that the Mercer study would resolve. A subsequent memo to Vice President Martin to separate these from the salary issues and take them back to the Administrative Council for discussion and approval received no response. It is anticipated that ASC will pursue these issues in the fall 1995.

• Establish procedures within ASC for handling policy proposals within an appropriate time frame including those which require Administrative Council action; establish a mechanism for follow-up including determination when to drop a proposal.

Status: Partially accomplished. Personnel Welfare Committee established a timeline with personnel for ASC submissions for the Handbook. In addition, the ASC by-laws will be changed at the September meeting to include a mandatory second reading for major issues brought before Council as a whole. Follow-up mechanisms need to be established to make sure that carryover items from the previous years are addressed.

• Expand communication links among administrative staff; explore potential for e-mail, interest groups, networks for staff members of similar expertise or interest; find ways by which administrative staff can help one another in the workplace; examine ways to improve representative/constituent contact including the way Council elections are held.

Status: Accomplished. A discussion group has been established for ASC and has proved very useful in the dissemination of information quickly and some lively discussion. In addition, the Internal Affairs Committee was very active in polling all staff to determine ways to improve the election process, communication with constituents, and improving the quality of ASC meetings. See attached full report.

• Seek to establish professional development funds to allow for staff participation in professional development opportunities.

Status: Not accomplished. Once again this year a budget request for $5000 to distribute as professional development grants was denied.

• Examine staff development leave potential and develop recommendations/criteria for paid professional leave for administrative staff.

Status: Ongoing. The Personnel Welfare Committee began exploring what other institutions are doing with these issues. However, it was determined that the goals relating to compensation and FMLA and natal leave were top priority. This is deferred to the new committee.

• Continue to raise funds to meet the goal of $35,000 or more for the scholarship corpus.

Status: Accomplished. As of June, 1995 the scholarship corpus has reached $35,000. Administrative staff have been very generous and committed to our scholarship awards.

• Participate in presidential search process on behalf of administrative staff.

Status: Accomplished. Marshall Rose served on the presidential search committee on behalf of Administrative Staff Council.
ASC Standing Committees 1995-96 Update

Amendments
Gail McRoberts
Mary Beth Zachary, Chair

External Affairs
Wayne Colvin
Jeff Grilliot, Chair
Elayne Jacoby
Patricia Kania
Jan Peterson

Ferrari Award
Scott Bressler
Paul Lopez
Gail McRoberts
Penny Nemitz
Barry Piersol
Cindy Puffer, Chair
Paul Yon

Internal Affairs
Ann Betts, Chair
Carmen Castro-Rivera
Cindy Colvin
Jacque Daley-Perrin
Patricia Kania
Inge Kloppong
Paul Lopez
Lauren Managili
Jan Peterson
Bev Stearns
Betty Ward

Professional Development
Pat Green
Lona Johnson
Paul Lopez
Kent Strickland, Chair
Bob Waddle

Salary
Lona Johnson
Deborah Knigga
Joseph Luthman
Rebecca McOmber
Bob Waddle, Chair
Sarbrina White

Scholarship
Scott Bressler
Tom Glick
Judy Hartley
Penny Nemitz, Chair
Sue Perkins
Sabrina White

Personnel Welfare
Deborah Boyce
Wayne Colvin
Barb Keeley
Joyce Kepke
Inge Kloppong
Patricia Koehler
Marcia S. Latta
Joseph Luthman
Ed O'Donnell
Denise Van de Walle
Duane Whitmire, Chair

8/31/95
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL AGENDA

Thursday, October 5, 1995
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union

1. Call to Order
2. Introduction of Substitutes
3. Approval of Minutes
4. Chair's Report
5. Chair Elect's Report
6. Secretary's Report
7. Committee Reports
   Amendments
   External Affairs
   Ferrari Award
   Internal Affairs
   Personnel Welfare
   Professional Development
   Salary
   Scholarship
7. Old Business
   95-96 Goals
   Proposed Amendment to the By-Laws
8. New Business
9. Good of the Order
10. Adjourn
Administrative Staff Council Minutes

Thursday, October 5, 1995

Members Present

Members Absent
Andy Lopuszynski for Inge Klopping, Julie Rogers for Penny Nemitz, Dave Crooks for Ed O'Donnell, Geoff Humphrys for Barry Piersol, Patti Ankney for Pat Green

Members Absent Who Sent Substitutes
Ken Kavanagh, Denise Van de Walle, Sabrina White, Marcia Latta

Guests:
Dr. Michael Maggiotto, Nadine Musser

Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Chair, Bryan Benner.

Approval of Minutes:
Paul Yon moved, Mary Beth Zachary seconded that the minutes be approved as distributed.

Guest Speakers:
Bryan Benner introduced Dr. Mike Maggiotto, Chair of BGSU's 1995 United Way Campaign, and Nadine Musser, Area Director for United Way of Wood County. Dr. Maggiotto introduced a resolution for Council's consideration in support of the current campaign. His presentation highlighted the resolution as an opportunity to rekindle our commitment to the community of Bowling Green and the broader community of Northwest Ohio. He emphasized that rather than setting a money goal this year he had set a goal of increasing the University's participation in the United Way campaign from 17% in 1994 to 40% in 1995.

Nadine Musser emphasized that all money raised for United Way stays in the Community. Community volunteers review agency profiles and determine how the funds will be distributed. The Wood County area United Way has been recognized nationally as the third most efficiently run United Way in the country with 98 cents of every dollar donated going directly to the agencies.

There was no motion in support of the resolution. Council members requested that the minutes reflect that while we strongly support the concept of the United Way we do not wish to set a precedent encouraging this kind of resolution to come before Council.
Chair's Report:

Mercer Study

Bryan Benner stated that he has been inundated with questions regarding the Mercer Study. In discussions at its last meeting ASC Executive Committee identified several concerns: lack of disclosure about the ratings; the unwillingness of Personnel Services to share how the factors were weighted and how point ranges for each level are calculated; salary ranges for each level; the preference for a neutral appellate body to review appeals; lack of training for ASC staff610(498,607),(549,633) regarding how the point system works; lack of training for Supervisors & Managers of Administrative Staff regarding how to review and evaluate the questionnaires that were completed by their employees; confusion about the original purpose of the study; confusion regarding how the Mercer Study will fit into overall policies and procedures for administrative staff including all of the Handbook revisions that were put on hold by the Administration last year; why 48 positions were changed by the VP's after their original ranking; and the need to extend the deadline for the appeals process.

On the positive side, for the first time administrative staff have the beginnings of a salary structure in place, a commitment to raise the salaries of about thirty employees falling below the minimum for their range, and guarantees that there will be no salary caps and no salaries reduced.

Wayne Colvin introduced a resolution to Council addressed to Dr. Ribeau outlining concerns about the Mercer Study. There was lengthy discussion about the wording and tone of the resolution and Council members raised a number of issues and questions including the following:

- The refusal to release information has created an air of suspicion and mistrust in the process;
- The current process seems to be in direct opposition to the atmosphere of trust, collaboration and collegiality that Dr. Ribeau is promoting;
- Firelands had no representation on the initial Mercer Study Committee;
- In the Student Affairs area some employees have received points based on their old positions but their new title appears on the evaluation form;
- It is unclear how long staff (especially in Student Affairs) will have to wait to have their new positions evaluated and whether or not they will have the opportunity to go through the same appeals process;
- Where will the money come from to raise salaries of those employees below the minimum? Will it come from next year's general salary increase?
- We have not received enough information to determine whether or not our positions were evaluated appropriately;
- All employees and supervisors should have been sent their scores whether or not they intended to appeal;
- What is the urgency in having the appeals completed by October 13th? If there is some urgency in getting this study to the Trustees by January 1st we need to understand what it is. Has the Department of Labor imposed this deadline?
- What comparable institutions were used in the study?
- Discussions with constituents at other universities have indicated that the process has been negative at those schools too;
- Lack of information about the scoring has created suspicion that the process has been administered inconsistently or is flawed;
- We weren't told that the Vice President's would review the scoring and realign positions after the initial results were received. At this point the process lost its objectivity;
- The Vice President's who made the final decisions are now also the final appellate body.
The Administrative Staff Council has not been given the opportunity to debate and discuss the issues surrounding the Mercer Study and proposed policies and procedures in our usual committee structure or meetings -- in fact approved policies and procedures currently in place in the Handbook (market adjustments) as well as proposed Handbook changes have all been put on hold for the Mercer Study.

Paul Yon moved that Council go to a Committee of the Whole to discuss the resolution point by point. Several Council members emphasized that the resolution should keep a positive tone and emphasize our willingness to cooperate with the Administration in working through our issues and concerns. The Council reviewed each item in the resolution. Paul Yon called the question and Brian Benner called for a vote on the proposed resolution. The motion was passed unanimously with instructions to the Executive Committee to make minor editorial revisions and distribute the resolution within one week. A copy of the final resolution is attached.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Gail McRoberts
Secretary, ASC

The next meeting of Administrative Staff Council will be:
Thursday, November 2, 1995
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union
Whereas:

The Administrative Staff Council of Bowling Green State University supports President Ribeau's vision to "...create a learning community which promotes technological literacy, partnerships, rational discourse and diversity through planning, assessment & participatory governance" as well as the President's goal to "promote values emphasizing collegiality, mutual respect & trust." (1)

Be it resolved that:

The Administrative Staff Council directs the Chair & Executive Committee to inform the President:

1. The Administrative Staff Council strongly supports the concept of the Mercer Study to help correct the problem of salary inequities among administrative staff;

2. The Administrative Staff Council is not in support of the current process given the information we have received to date and strongly feels the plan to propose the Mercer Study to the Board of Trustees in January is premature for the following reasons:
   a. The process needs to be slowed down and the appeal date should be extended until these issues are resolved,
   b. More complete information is needed,
   c. Impartiality must be built into the appeals process,
   d. Positions which have not been evaluated by Personnel Services should be completed as soon as possible and these staff members should have the same opportunity to go through an appeals process;

3. The implementation of this process should be delayed until such time as a complete, careful and thorough review of the process can be conducted by the Administrative Staff Council. The policies and procedures associated with the Mercer Study should be submitted to ASC as a whole for review and approval;

Be it further resolved:

The Administrative Staff Council directs the Chair and Executive Committee to request a meeting with Administrative Council before October 13th in an effort to begin to establish dialogue for reviewing and resolving the issues related to the Mercer Study;

The Administrative Staff Council directs the Chair to inform the President that the Council would welcome the opportunity to meet with him to discuss these issues.

(1) Dr. Ribeau’s 1995-96 Goals

Passed October 5, 1995
Administrative Staff Council
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL 1995-96 GOALS

Administrative staff members at Bowling Green State University are responsible for promoting a healthy climate for learning as well as professional growth and asserting both the leadership and support essential to enhancing the University's programs and services. Effective administration promotes an institutional reputation of academic and professional excellence as well as the sound management of institutional resources.

The following goals are supportive of this mission of the Administrative Staff Council at Bowling Green State University.

1. TO CONTINUE TO BE AN ADVOCATE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF CONCERNING THE POSITION ANALYSIS AND COMPENSATION STUDY

   • Provide support for administrative staff concerning the position analysis and compensation study.

   • Pursue the articulation and implementation of a clearly defined policies/procedures for dealing with wage related issues such as market adjustments, promotions, equity adjustments, and gender inequities.

   • Address the issues related to increased workloads. Such issues include but are not limited to the development of interim/acting appointment pay scales, and the feasibility of using alternate means of compensation or recognition.

2. TO PARTICIPATE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCEDURE WHICH WILL PROVIDE AN EQUITABLE ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE FOR ALL ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF MEMBERS

   • Develop both merit and across the board salary guidelines and procedures.

   • Advocate for professional development programs designed for supervisors of administrative staff members, these programs should deal with the many personnel issues related to evaluation of job performance.

3. CONTINUE TO OFFER AND EXPAND EXISTING ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF PROGRAMS THAT WILL ENHANCE OPPORTUNITIES FOR BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

   • Increase the corpus of the Administrative Staff Scholarship to $40,000.
• Continue to offer the administrative staff mentoring program, Bowling Green EFFECT, for new students entering the University.

• Develop student co-op program where students work with administrative staff on a for credit basis.

4. TO BE AN ADVOCATE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF MEMBERS AND THEIR CONCERNS AND NEEDS RELATED TO THE UNIVERSITY’S HEALTH BENEFIT PLANS

• Seek to reestablish the University Health insurance committee with representation from all constituent groups on campus.

• Participate in and promote the development of Wellness programs for all university employees.

• Seek to establish a BGSU Health Consumers group to study and advise in the development of health products.

5. TO CONTINUE TO BE AN ADVOCATE FOR AND TO OFFER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

• Seek to establish a paid leave of absence policy for administrative staff.

• Seek to reestablish an ASC professional development fund. The goal for this fund is a total of $10,000.

• Continue to participate in the Professional Development Institute.

• Continue to collaborate with existing programs and offices that develop and offer professional development programs for university employees.

6. SECURE AN OVERALL SALARY AND BENEFITS PACKAGE THAT RANKS BGSU’S ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF IN THE FOURTH POSITION AMONG PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN THE STATE OF OHIO.

7. CONTINUE TO DEVELOP AND IMPROVE COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC RELATIONS AMONG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

• Continue the development of network capabilities.

• Develop a public relations brochure for Administrative Staff Council.
• Continue to distribute e-mail updates to administrative staff.

• Development of a list serve to send minutes from Administrative Staff Council meetings to all administrative staff members.

8. CONTINUE TO COLLABORATE WITH BOTH THE FACULTY SENATE AND CLASSIFIED STAFF COUNCIL ON ISSUES OF COMMON CONCERN

• The establishment of a day care policy committee.

• Personnel Welfare Committee chairs from each constituent group will meet regularly regarding the benefit issues.

• Advocate the implementation of an early retirement program for administrative and classified staff. Advocate the continuation of the early retirement program for faculty.

• Collaborate with faculty Senate and Classified Staff Council in the development of the University community's strategic planning process.
Whereas:

The Administrative Staff Council of Bowling Green State University supports President Ribeau’s vision to “…create a learning community which promotes technological literacy, partnerships, rational discourse and diversity through planning, assessment & participatory governance” as well as the President’s goal to “promote values emphasizing collegiality, mutual respect & trust.” (1)

Be it resolved that:

The Administrative Staff Council directs the Chair & Executive Committee to inform the President:

1. The Administrative Staff Council strongly supports the concept of the Mercer Study to help correct the problem of salary inequities among administrative staff;

2. The Administrative Staff Council is not in support of the current process given the information we have received to date and strongly feels the plan to propose the Mercer Study to the Board of Trustees in January is premature for the following reasons:
   a. The process needs to be slowed down and the appeal date should be extended until these issues are resolved,
   b. More complete information is needed,
   c. Impartiality must be built into the appeals process,
   d. Positions which have not been evaluated by Personnel Services should be completed as soon as possible and these staff members should have the same opportunity to go through an appeals process;

3. The implementation of this process should be delayed until such time as a complete, careful and thorough review of the process can be conducted by the Administrative Staff Council. The policies and procedures associated with the Mercer Study should be submitted to ASC as a whole for review and approval;

Be it further resolved:

The Administrative Staff Council directs the Chair and Executive Committee to request a meeting with Administrative Council before October 13th in an effort to begin to establish dialogue for reviewing and resolving the issues related to the Mercer Study;

The Administrative Staff Council directs the Chair to inform the President that the Council would welcome the opportunity to meet with him to discuss these issues.

(1) Dr. Ribeau’s 1995-96 Goals

Passed October 5, 1995
Administrative Staff Council
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL AGENDA

Thursday, November 2, 1995
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union

1. Call to Order
2. Introduction of Substitutes
3. Approval of Minutes
4. Chair's Report
5. Chair Elect's Report
6. Secretary's Report
7. Committee Reports
   Amendments
   External Affairs
   Ferrari Award
   Internal Affairs
   Personnel Welfare
   Professional Development
   Salary
   Scholarship
7. Old Business
   95-96 Goals
   Proposed Amendment to the By-Laws
8. New Business
9. Good of the Order
10. Adjourn
Administrative Staff Council Minutes
Thursday, November 2, 1995


Members Absent: Lisa McHugh for Wayne Colvin, Tawn Williams-Nell for Becky McOmber, Dave Sanders for Deb Boyce; Deb Wells for Kent Strickland

Who Sent Substitutes: Deborah Knigga, Penny Nemitz, Bob Waddle

Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:34 p.m. by Chair, Bryan Benner.

Approval of Minutes:
Bev Stearns moved, Barb Keeley seconded that the minutes be approved as distributed.

Chair Elect's Report:
The Building Community Task Force has had its first meeting. Focus groups with members of all constituent groups will be established to facilitate the work of the task force. A campus-wide meeting with Dr. Ribeau has been scheduled for November 17th to kick off the project.

The VPAA Search Committee has about 80 applications with more coming in. There seem to be some very strong candidates.

Sandra MacNevin will speak at the December meeting to give us more insight on the "Building Community Project".

Chair's Report:
The Performance Evaluation Committee is meeting again and has visited with staff at the University of Toledo to discuss how their evaluations were developed.

In the past early retirement buyouts were paid for by not replacing staff. It would be difficult for many departments to operate now without replacing retiring staff. Paul Yon asked whether the question of an early retirement buyout could be discussed with other issues related to the position analysis/compensation study.
We have received a thank you from Dr. Ribeau for the resolution regarding the Mercer Study which was passed in October. The administration has been receptive to each of our suggestions: the process has been slowed down; we believe all data is now released and available for administrative staff to review; they have agreed to speed up evaluations that have not been completed; they have agreed to our request for a neutral appeals body; and they have agreed to provide information/training sessions regarding how the evaluations were scored. We have not received a date for ASC Executive Committee to meet with Ad Council but expect this to happen soon.

Council members can forward their suggestions for Administrative Staff to serve on the Appeals Committee to Bryan Benner. Any member of the Administrative Staff who is not submitting their own appeal and was not on the original committee can be nominated.

ASC will recommend that the Appeals Committee review appeals before they are reviewed by the area Vice President.

We want all proposed policies and procedures to come to Administrative Staff Council through the Personnel Welfare Committee for review, including issues like market adjustments, how frequently salary schedules will be adjusted, interim appointments, etc.

ASC should communicate to their constituents that they need to take a close look at the data and make a decision whether or not to appeal. Staff members working in the auxiliary areas or funded by grants should not be concerned with how increases will be paid.

A preliminary review of the data shows that approximately 120 positions were moved down by the VPs and 106 moved up. The VPs particularly impacted changes in Academic Affairs, the President’s Area and Planning & Budgeting.

Pat Green & Duane Whitmire noted that the format of a new document released by Personnel this week would lead anyone looking at it to believe that the Committee and Mercer had reviewed all positions. Mercer reviewed only the benchmark positions. The Committee did not review any positions below about level 14/15. It also did not review Student Affairs or the Athletic Department. Members suggested that Personnel should correct and redistribute this document.

Council members expressed concerns that with so many changes made by the VPs the original study was invalid. The number of changes seemed to indicate that the VPs did not rely on the survey instrument to make decisions but instead went back to existing organizational charts, salary levels and perceptions of positions. This new data has further eroded confidence in how the process has been handled.

Pat Green suggested that with all of the information just released we should ask for an extension of the appeal deadline to allow staff members to review the new documentation.

Council directed Executive Committee to request a 30 day extension of the appeals deadline assuming that no new additional information will be released and that all staff members who are waiting to have their positions evaluated will have a reasonable amount of time after receiving their evaluations to prepare appeals.

New Business:

Tom Glick moved and Pat Koehler seconded that the document on 1995-96 Administrative Staff Council goals be accepted as distributed.
The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Gail McRoberts
Secretary, ASC

The next meeting of Administrative Staff Council will be:
Thursday, December 7, 1995
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL AGENDA

Thursday, December 7, 1995
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union

1. Call to Order

2. Guest Speaker - Ms. Sandra MacNevin
   Special Assistant to the President for Research and Policy Analysis

3. Introduction of Substitutes

4. Approval of Minutes


6. Chair Elect's Report
   Mercer: 30 days from point 2 level assigned

7. Secretary's Report
   Anne Powers, Jeff Billiot, Deb Wells, Jodan, Del McCleary, Tom Cline, Keith Scanlan
   Review trying to get Mercer level by salary level.

8. Committee Reports
   Amendments
   External Affairs
   Ferrari Award
   Internal Affairs
   Personnel Welfare
   Professional Development
   Salary
   Scholarship

9. Old Business

10. New Business

   Proposed Amendment to the By-Laws
   Discussion Groups - "Building Community at BGSU"

11. Good of the Order

12. Adjourn
Mary Beth Zachary
Library & Learning Resources
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL AGENDA

Thursday, December 7, 1995
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union

1. Call to Order

2. Guest Speaker - Ms. Sandra MacNevin
   Special Assistant to the President for Research
   and Policy Analysis

3. Introduction of Substitutes

4. Approval of Minutes

5. Chair's Report

6. Chair Elect's Report

7. Secretary's Report

8. Committee Reports
   Amendments
   External Affairs
   Ferrari Award
   Internal Affairs
   Personnel Welfare
   Professional Development
   Salary
   Scholarship

9. Old Business

10. New Business

   Proposed Amendment to the By-Laws
   Discussion Groups - "Building Community at BGSU"

11. Good of the Order

12. Adjourn

Members Absent: Judy Hartley, Penny Nemitz

Who Sent Substitutes: Perry Franketti for Ann Betts; Tawn Williams-Nell for Becky McOmber; Sabrina White for Carmen Castro-Rivera; Sean Brennan for Lona Leck

Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:34 p.m. by Chair, Bryan Benner.

Guest Speaker:
Sandra MacNevin, Special Assistant to the President for Research and Policy Analysis spoke to Council about the Building Community Task Force. The Task Force will try to find a direction and format that will allow them to be a group that gathers ideas and listens to what the campus community wants. They have begun to define community as they understand it – learning community, collaborative community, diverse community, outreach community and visionary community. In the next few weeks they hope to encourage discussion to define the issues in these areas. An E-Mail account (community@mailserver.bgsu.edu) has been established for members of the campus community to send questions and suggestions. They have received about 150 responses and are beginning to see patterns of concerns as well as some original ideas.

The Task Force plans a week-long series of discussions with the campus community February 5-9 to brainstorm ideas for the project. They are hopeful that supervisors and administrators will encourage their staff in all constituent groups to attend these meetings and participate in discussion groups scheduled throughout the week. Volunteer facilitators (who will be given a half-day of training) are needed to facilitate discussion groups for the event. Anyone interested in becoming a discussion facilitator or with ideas for discussion topics should contact a member of the Task Force or use the E-Mail address to forward suggestions.

In response to a question regarding what patterns of concern the Task Force had identified, Ms. MacNevin said that at the present time she could see interest in the area of collaborative community. In particular, constituents had suggested that in the past community had sometimes been blocked and their was a need to rebuild trust, recognize leadership at every level, and show staff they are valued. Other topics that had been identified included the need to promote a learning community for students that helped them to integrate and move smoothly through the system and the need for career development and training opportunities for staff. The Task Force will also work to identify and nourish the activities already happening on campus that foster building community.
After the week-long meetings in February the Task Force will prepare a report for submission to the President. Dr. Ribeau will take these ideas into consideration and meet with the constituent groups for discussions. The project will culminate in another Town Meeting in the Spring where priorities and plans for the future will be addressed.

Ms. MacNevin finished by noting that the Building Community Task Force is just one of the major initiatives begun by Dr. Ribeau this fall. Other issues of major concern to the president include an "external scan" to develop a comprehensive understanding of what our external constituents (OBOR, business, industry, government) expect of us. The President has also put into place the Campus Technology Plan Steering Community to develop a comprehensive plan for future technology development at BGSU; Learning Technology Steering Committee to assess the use of technology in the learning environment; the Assessment Group to explore the core competencies students should develop during their education at BGSU.

**Approval of Minutes:**

Mary Beth Zachary moved, Joan Morgan seconded that the minutes be approved as distributed.

**Chair Elect's Report:**

Interviews with candidates for the Vice President of Academic Affairs position will begin today. Administrative Staff are encouraged to attend these sessions.

**Chair's Report:**

Diane Cherry will serve as the administrative staff representative on the Child Care Development Committee.

Administrative staff representation is still needed on the AGFA Committee. Anyone interested should contact Bryan Benner. (Note: This committee no longer meets on weekends).

Bryan Benner is a member of the Employee Evaluation Committee. This Committee's recommendations will be brought to ASC for input.

The Board of Trustees have discussed a salary increase in the range of 3% for 1996.

The deadline for Mercer appeals is over (with the exception of some positions in the Student Affairs area). The following individuals will serve on the Appeals Committee and will review all appeals prior to input from the area Vice Presidents: Ann Bowers, Jeff Grilliot, Deb Wells, Greg Jordan, Deb McLaughlin, Tom Glick and Keith Pogan.

These individuals will receive training by staff in Personnel Services. In order to develop a consistent, objective and equitable process for the committee to follow the ASC Executive Committee has developed an "Appeals Committee Policy Statement" and rating form for use by the Appeals Committee during its reviews. Bryan will forward this policy statement to the Vice Presidents with the Council's recommendation that it be used to guide the work of the Appeals Committee.
Discussion from the Council included a suggestion that the Appeals Committee should be trained directly by Mercer rather than Personnel Services. Council members expressed concerns that they have received comments from VP's or their staff that indicate they have been reading and commenting on the appeals as they have come into their offices prior to their review by the Appeals Committee.

When the ASC Executive Committee met with Ad Council they were specifically told that the money for any salary increases mandated by the Mercer Study would come from a general University-wide salary pool. We have now received confirmation from some areas that they are being told that appeals that result in a salary increase must be funded from their individual budgets. This problem exists primarily for auxiliary and grant funded areas. There is concern that managers are being put in the position of being unable to approve appeals because the administration has not provided specific details to all budget administrators about how these salary increases will be funded. No reassurance has been given to the auxiliary areas that they will not be forced to cover salary increases from their own operating budgets or by eliminating positions or not filling vacant positions.

Council members questioned whether the fact that the proposed salary pool for 1996 had dropped from 5% in 1995 to 3% in 1996 indicated that the 2% difference was being reserved for Mercer salary adjustments. It is unclear that the administration has any specific plan in place.

Council approved the "Appeals Committee Policy Statement" (with minor editorial changes) along with a recommendation that the Appeals Committee be instructed to complete its review of all submitted appeals no later than March 15th, 1996.

New Business:

Sally Blair has been appointed as a new member of the Administrative Staff Council in the Public Relations area.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Gail McRoberts
Secretary, ASC

The next meeting of Administrative Staff Council will be:
Thursday, January 4, 1995
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union
Whereas, President Ribeau has identified a collaborative community as one of the four types of communities that Bowling Green State University should strive to become;

Whereas, the Building Community Project has already resulted in numerous positive collaborative efforts;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Undergraduate Student Government, the Graduate Student Senate, the Faculty Senate, the Classified Staff Council, and the Administrative Staff Council develop strategies to collaboratively work together for the betterment of students who attend Bowling Green State University.

To begin the collaborative efforts, it is recommended that members of all constituent groups meet at least once a month during the academic year, and once during the summer, for the expressed interest of collaborating on items of common interest.

Furthermore, it is recommended that when items of common interest are carried forward for approval through the respective channels of each group that a joint timeline be developed so all five groups are proposing the items of common interest in the same time frame as joint submissions.
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL AGENDA

Thursday, January 4, 1996
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union

1. Call to Order

2. Guest Speaker - Dr. Louis Katzner
   - Associate Vice President for Research
   - and Graduate Dean
   - Chair, Campus Technology Plan Steering Committee

3. Introduction of Substitutes

4. Approval of Minutes

5. Chair's Report

6. Chair Elect's Report

7. Secretary's Report

8. Committee Reports
   - Amendments
   - External Affairs
   - Ferrari Award
   - Internal Affairs
   - Personnel Welfare
   - Professional Development
   - Salary
   - Scholarship

9. Old Business

   Proposed Amendment to the By-Laws
   Discussion Groups - "Building Community at BGSU"

10. New Business

11. Good of the Order

12. Adjourn
Administrative Staff Council Minutes
Thursday, January 4, 1996

Members Present: Pam Allen, Bryan Benner, Sally Blair, Deborah Boyce, Scot Bressler, Wayne Colvin, Jodi Ernest-Webb, Pat Green, Judy Hartley, E Ilayne Jacoby, Patricia Kania, Joyce Kepke, Inge Klopping, Patricia Kochler, Joseph Luthman, Rebecca McOmber, Gail McRoberts, Joan Morgan, Donna Nelson-Beene, Sue Perkins, Barry Piersol, Bev Stearns, Kent Strickland, Bob Waddle, Betty Ward, Sabrina White, Duane Whitmire, Mary Beth Zachary

Members Absent: Celeste Bland for Cindy Colvin, Sabrina White for Carmen Castro-Rivera
Who Sent Substitutes: Dave Crooks for Ed O'Donnell, Steve Charter for Paul Yon

Members Absent: Ann Betts, Tom Glick, Jeff Grilliot, Barb Keeley, Deborah Knigga, Lona Leck, Paul Lopez, Penny Nemitz, Jan Peterson, Cindy Puffer, Jack Taylor, Denise Van de Walle

Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Chair, Bryan Benner.

Guest Speaker:
Dean Louis Katzner spoke to Council as Chair of the Campus Technology Plan Steering Committee. The Committee's charge is to steer the development of a comprehensive campus technology plan that will meet the needs of the BGSU learning community for the next 5-7 years. The Committee is the first on campus to have a Web site accessible from the BGSU home page. The site includes a list of committee members, minutes of meetings, and listing of the documentation being reviewed by the committee including previous reports related to technology issues that have been submitted by other BGSU Committees as well as a variety of books and articles.

The President has asked the Committee to report to him by mid-March so that he can take the report to the Trustees by May. The Committee is making a strong effort to solicit the input of the constituent groups as well as many of the existing Committees on campus that currently deal with campus technology issues. Their goal is to develop a plan the entire University will support with the knowledge that the committee recommendations included a thorough review of all available information and a wide range of input from the campus community. An initial draft of the plan will be shared with those who provided input as part of the consensus-building approach the Committee is taking in the development of the report.

Figuring out how to fund the plan is not the responsibility of the Committee. The president has the option of seeking funds through the regular institutional budget process including capital funds and the educational budget as well as seeking external funding.

Approval of Minutes:
E Ilayne Jacoby requested that the minutes be amended to note her announcement that the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee would be looking at the issue of reciprocal fee waiver agreements between other interested Ohio Universities. Inge Klopping moved and E Ilayne Jacoby seconded that the minutes be approved as amended.
Chair's Report:

The Building Community Task Force has gone through the initial responses and suggestions submitted by the Community and is in the process of planning the University-wide meetings in February.

The Appeals Committee is going through its first day of training today. In response to some concerns expressed by administrative staff members Bryan has received assurance that members of the Committee will remove themselves from reviewing any appeals where there could be a conflict of interest because of a Committee member's working relationship with a staff member appealing. The appeals training is being done by staff from our Personnel Office. Mercer will not participate in the training. A total of 94 appeals had been submitted at the end of Fall term.

Joan Morgan and Bryan met with Les Barber to discuss concerns of ASC related to the Mercer Study. Topics they discussed included reports that VP's had returned appeals to the front-line supervisors asking them to change their recommendations, concerns that some VP's referred to current employee salary levels as part of the basis for their review of positions, and questions about how raises will be funded in the Auxiliary and General Fee areas and grants. Bryan and Joan suggested that the University find a central way to fund raises and requested that these discussions be public. Dr. Barber indicated that he would bring these issues to Ad Council and to the President.

It is still unclear how the Department of Labor is driving this process and Joe Luthman suggested that we find out specifically what the Department of Labor has asked for from the University.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs Search is completed and the top two candidates have been recommended to the President.

The ASC Executive Committee and Personnel Welfare Committee are meeting weekly to review the recommendations for policies and procedures after Mercer. In this initial phase of Mercer the difference between "appeals" and "reclassifications" has been confusing. Several staff members requested appeals because of changes in original job descriptions. The new policies and procedures will clarify how these issues will be addressed. The procedures will also ask that a cycle be set in place so that every position on campus is reviewed at regular intervals.

Bev Steams asked Bryan to get clarification regarding exactly what will happen with the market adjustments put on hold prior to the Mercer Study.

Committee Reports

Personnel Welfare Committee

Duane Whitmire announced that the Personnel Welfare Committee met with ASC Executive Committee and voted to endorse the concept of the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee Resolution to explore the possibility of reciprocal fee waiver agreements with other Universities. PWC is also meeting regularly with the ASC Exec Committee to review recommendations for personnel policies and procedures after the Mercer implementation. PWC has also requested clarification again on the status of two handbook changes – the proposed Natal (Birth/Adoption) Leave Policy and the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) Policy. A number of handbook changes sent by ASC to Ad Council last year were put on hold waiting the outcome of the Mercer Study, however these two policies should not have been held up because they are not related to Mercer.
Amendments Committee

Mary Beth Zachary presented proposed amendments to the Bylaws of ASC dealing with the following topics: 1) the number of readings required for major and minor issues brought before the Council, 2) the designation of alternates at ASC meetings, 3) the establishment of Internal Affairs and External Affairs as Standing Committees of the ASC, and 4) the definition of a quorum for ASC meetings. The proposed amendments were voted on by written ballot and passed unanimously. A copy of the amendments are enclosed with the minutes.

New Business:

Deb Boyce announced that an Inauguration Committee has been formed to plan a formal inaugural celebration for Dr. Ribeau. The Committee is gathering suggestions related to a theme, musical events, speakers, dates etc. Some Council members suggested waiting until fall term for such an event to avoid conflict with Spring awards banquets, etc.

Pat Green moved that the Administrative Staff Council contribute $500 to sponsor the "Aids Quilt" on campus in February. Ingle Klopping seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Mary Beth Zachary asked that Council request specific clarification from Personnel Services regarding the University's policy of remaining open when a county snow emergency is in effect that makes it illegal for employees to drive. Members also added that employees need a specific phone number to call on campus to get clear information regarding whether or not the University is open to avoid the recent problems encountered when a local television station inaccurately reported that the main campus was closed.

Council members asked Bryan to get clarification as soon as possible whether or not the University will be closed in December between the Christmas and New Year's holiday and in particular whether or not employees need to save vacation and personal days for this period.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.
RESOLUTION ON TUITION WAIVER BENEFITS FOR BGSU EMPLOYEES

WHEREAS, Bowling Green State University offers a waiver of fees for full-time employees at the University of Toledo (UT), and the Medical College of Ohio (MCO), and

WHEREAS, Bowling Green State University offers a waiver of instructional fees to the cohabitant spouse, child, or children of full-time employees or deceased full-time faculty who have completed three years of full-time service at the University, and

WHEREAS, other state-supported institutions in Ohio offer similar benefits to full-time employees and their spouses or children,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the central administration, with the approval of the Board of Trustees, negotiate a reciprocal agreement with all willing state-supported institutions in Ohio to provide a waiver of fees for the child or children of full-time employees with three years of full-time service at their respective institutions, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that reciprocal agreements reached be effective and available to full-time employees by the commencement of the 1997 academic year, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Senate direct its officers to distribute this resolution to the respective governance groups of all state-supported institutions for endorsement and action, and

BE IT RESOLVED, that this resolution be considered an item for ACTION by the central administration and the Board of Trustees.

approved by the FWC on 12/1/95
The ASC Appeals Committee shall be composed of 7 members representative of all vice-presidential areas. The purpose of the ASC Appeals Committee shall be to review all appeals by administrative staff concerning their assigned level as a result of the position analysis and compensation study. The committee will perform the review before the individual area Vice Presidents make their initial comments. The goal of the committee shall be to ensure that the appeals process is objective, consistent, and equitable. To accomplish this goal, the committee should adhere to the following guidelines:

1) The committee shall receive adequate training concerning how to utilize the criteria contained in the job evaluation plan developed by Mercer, Inc.

2) The committee shall focus their review of appeals to the criteria selected by the appellant.

3) The review shall be restricted to those comments offered by the appellant or their immediate supervisor(s).

4) The committee shall clarify any information submitted for consideration. This would include contacting the appellant or their immediate supervisor(s).

5) The committee shall report their decision and/or rationale in writing to the appellant and/or their Vice President.

6) The committee shall not consider the resulting points, ranges, salary levels, or placement in the organizational chart when determining the appropriateness of an appeal.

7) Personnel Services shall provide the administrative support for the committee.

8) The actions and deliberations of the committee should be kept in confidence by members.

9) The appellant shall be informed in writing of the outcome of the appeal process along with written justification from both the appeals committee and vice presidents. All documentation associated with the appeal shall be made available to the appellant.

Bryan Benner, Chair
ASC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Admin: 401</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Comb M &amp; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA 162</td>
<td>OP 42</td>
<td>P* 18</td>
<td>FB 53</td>
<td>SA 73</td>
<td>LR 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no change</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>619%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm inc, vp ok</td>
<td>2 3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>619%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm dec, vp ok</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm inc, vp inc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm dec, vp inc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm inc, vp dec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm dec, vp dec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm ok, vp inc</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm ok, vp dec</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no change</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inc=dec</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decreased</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no change</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm inc, vp ok</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm dec, vp ok</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm inc, vp inc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm dec, vp inc</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm inc, vp dec</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm dec, vp dec</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm ok, vp inc</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm ok, vp dec</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no change</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inc=dec</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decreased</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* President's Area does not include coaches, trainers, or equip managers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total M&amp;F</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>P*</th>
<th>PB</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>UR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no change</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm inc, vp ok</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm dec, vp ok</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm inc, vp inc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm dec, vp inc</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm inc, vp dec</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm dec, vp dec</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm ok, vp inc</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm ok, vp dec</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>no change</th>
<th>increased</th>
<th>decreased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no change</td>
<td>76 47%</td>
<td>6 33%</td>
<td>11 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inc=dec</td>
<td>9 6%</td>
<td>2 5%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no changes</td>
<td>85 52%</td>
<td>28 67%</td>
<td>6 33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>increased</th>
<th>decreased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>increased</td>
<td>19 12%</td>
<td>54 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decreased</td>
<td>8 19%</td>
<td>6 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total changed</th>
<th>vacant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no change</td>
<td>76 47%</td>
<td>4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased</td>
<td>19 12%</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decreased</td>
<td>54 29%</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* President's Area does not include coaches, trainers, or equip managers.
Don't forget our change in date and location this week!

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL AGENDA

Wednesday, February 7
1:30 p.m.
Campus Room, University Union

1. Call to Order
2. Guest Speaker - Dr. Sidney Ribeau
3. Introduction of Substitutes
4. Approval of Minutes
5. Chair's Report
6. Chair Elect's Report
7. Secretary's Report
8. Committee Reports
   Amendments
   External Affairs
   Ferrari Award
   Internal Affairs
   Personnel Welfare
   Professional Development
   Salary
   Scholarship
9. Old Business
   Discussion Groups - "Building Community at BGSU"
10. New Business
11. Good of the Order
12. Adjourn
Members Present

Members Absent: Sharon Hanna for Pat Koehler, Gail Richmond for Mary Beth Zachary, Bob Graham for Paul Yon

Members Absent: Denise Van de Walle

Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Chair, Bryan Benner.

Guest Speaker:
Bryan welcomed President Sidney Ribeau to his first meeting of the Administrative Staff Council. Dr. Ribeau commented that he felt in general things were going very well and he compared this stage of his administration to that of a farmer preparing the soil for new ideas to take root. Following is a summary of other thoughts Dr. Ribeau shared with the Council during the meeting.

We are driven by the money we have available to spend in our budgets and a large piece of our budget is driven by our enrollment. We currently have an eleven percent decline in applications for this fall. This translates into a two million dollar problem. We are not likely to increase the number of applications we receive for new undergraduate students at this point in time so we will be working hard to increase the number of students that actually choose to attend BGSU in the fall. Enrollment management and retention will be a top priority for the University during the next year.

During the next month the Trustees, Faculty Senate and the President's Office will be working to develop a draft of a vision statement that reflects the core values of the University. For the 96-97 year the University will have a clear set of five priorities.

We are required by the Department of Labor to have a classification system in place for our administrative staff. There are things that could have been handled differently with the Mercer Study however we are confident that with the Council's input we have a good appeals process in place that will work through the remaining problems. The Mercer Study has highlighted the need to build trust between the administration & its employees. We must work to build respect for each other so that we can disagree in an atmosphere of trust. The mistakes made with the Mercer Study have taught us that we need to collaborate to create relationships that allow us to take on these difficult issues in better ways in the future.
In a few weeks the President's Office will distribute the reactions of the administration to the Non-Academic Function Committee's Final Report. Plans are already in place to act on many of these recommendations and others will be built into the budget as soon as possible.

The Building Community Focus groups have had very good attendance and active participation. We will extend some additional groups beyond this week to discuss student issues. The Committee will now distill the discussions and present their recommendations to the President as soon as possible.

As our vision statement is put in place and priorities are identified we will look at whether the current organizational structure is set up to best meet our long-term goals. We can currently predict the need for a senior level manager to coordinate the information systems technology issues on campus. ASC has lobbied for a Vice President for Human Resources position. Reorganization issues will be addressed as we develop our priorities and clarify the kind of senior management team that needs to be in place to meet these priorities.

In response to a question about how we might encourage a move to a more collaborative/mentoring style of learning the President responded that he hoped we could move to a more participatory model of management too. About 50 of the University's managers have been given the opportunity to attend a retreat where they learned more about models of participatory management and how to put these plans into place in their departments. On the academic side we are in the process of establishing a Faculty Development Center which can sponsor workshops on writing and math across the curriculum and help faculty to explore current issues in teaching. The Development Center will give us the opportunity to bring in experts and consultants to keep our faculty up-to-date with new skills and training. Most of our faculty are extremely committed to their teaching mission but our reward system has not always acknowledged that fact. We need to reward good teaching and advising as well as research.

In response to a comment about course availability for incoming freshman being poor the president stated that he expected this to be one of the issues addressed by the new Vice President for Academic Affairs. As part of this issues he has asked a committee to evaluate whether the Early Retirement Programs are meeting the needs of the University.

One Council member asked the President to address the issue of professional development opportunities for staff. Dr. Ribeau responded that he would be in favor of release time for professional development opportunities that related to current job and career skills. Funding for these opportunities may have to start small but he is hopeful that we can raise funds outside the university for this effort. On-going professional development and training needs differ across units but managers should be supportive of these activities.

We will need to enhance the resource base of the University to do some of these things. We will need to work to create a stronger base of funding for sponsored research activity and public-private partnerships with the University if we want to fund many of these initiatives.

In response to a question about recent actions by the Ohio Board of Regents the President cautioned that if they are allowed to continue down the current road it will become a real problem for us. The presidents of the Ohio Universities are not likely to let something happen again like the situation that has occurred with our doctoral program review. It does not serve our best interest to be having someone like OBOR tell us how to run our university. The best defense is a good offense so we need to move quickly to have good solid plans in place as well as methods of assessing our success.
The University needs to discuss the ideological issue of what it means to be an educated person. We want our students to learn how to think critically, analyze and synthesize information. We need to be able to evaluate or assess how well we are teaching. As the President he needs to be able to give a clear explanation to the public of what we are doing here at BGSU and be able to cite specific examples of our effectiveness and quality.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Gail McRoberts
Secretary, ASC

The next meeting of Administrative Staff Council will be:
Thursday, March 7,
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union
Volunteer for BG Effect!

With 'Building Community' projects going on all around campus, the Internal Affairs committee has decided to resurrect BG EFFECT. We invite Administrative Staff, Classified Staff and members of Faculty to give serious consideration to becoming a volunteer and join us in our efforts to reach out to interested students.

So what is BG EFFECT? The concept of the program is fairly simple: we believe faculty and staff are in a good position to help students work their way through problems because we understand how the university works. If we can't answer the question, we usually know who can. It will personalize the college experience a little more, help retain students and make staff more visible on campus. A few suggestions are to:

- Call the student before they get to campus.
- Contact the student early on after classes begin.
- Familiarize students with activities on campus and around town, i.e. shopping, churches.
- Invite student to lunch, dinner, sports event, etc.

With relatively little effort, we can significantly impack a student and family. We all like to have a contact who can help us when we need it! We hope we've persuaded you to 'sign up.' The more of us that participate, the more students we can assist.

We are going to begin by focusing on Summer Freshmen registration May 28, 29.

If you are interested, please e-mail pkania@bgnet with the following information: Your name, campus address and phone number.

Thanks in advance for volunteering!
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL AGENDA

Thursday, March 7, 1996
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union

1. Call to Order

2. Introduction of Substitutes

3. Approval of Minutes
   January 4, 1996 & February 7, 1996

4. Chair's Report

5. Chair Elect's Report

6. Secretary's Report

7. Committee Reports
   Amendments
   External Affairs
   Ferrari Award
   Internal Affairs
   Personnel Welfare
   Professional Development
   Salary
   Scholarship

8. New Business

   96-97 Salary Recommendations

   Discussion Groups - "Building Community at BGSU"

   Administrative Staff Compensation Policies & Procedures - Draft of
   ASC Response to 10-12-95 Document from the VP's
   Please read the enclosed document carefully and be ready to discuss
   any major concerns. Editorial suggestions can be E-Mailed directly to
   Duane Whitmire

9. Good of the Order

10. Adjourn
Administrative Staff Council Minutes
Thursday, March 7, 1996


Members Absent: John Clark for Penny Nemitz, Judy Donald for Jan Peterson, Patti Ankney for Pat Green

Members Absent: Scot Bressler, Wayne Colvin, Jeffrey Grilliot, Elayne Jacoby, Lena Leck, Jack Taylor

Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Chair, Bryan Benner.

Approval of Minutes:
Tom Glick moved, Cindy Puffer seconded that the minutes be approved as distributed.

Chair's Report:
The new day care center -- the Jordan Family Development Center -- is scheduled to open in May. Staff members interested in child care services must complete a lottery application. Applications and an informational packet can be picked up at the Human Resources Office at 100 College Park. For further information call Donna Wittwer at 22113.

Judy Donald asked staff members to take time to carefully complete the Performance Appraisal Survey which has been distributed to all administrative staff members.

Tom Glick reported that the Mercer Appeals Committee has reviewed approximately 130 appeals. Six have been returned to the appellant for additional information. Committee members are very concerned that there are some staff members who submitted their Job Analysis Questionnaire months ago to Human Resources but have not received notification from Human Resources of their evaluation. These staff members deserve to have their evaluations completed quickly so that they have the opportunity to use the Appeals Process. The Appeals Committee plans to complete its work during the next two weeks and submit their report to Human Resources. Human Resources will distribute a form to all appellants with the recommendations of the Appeals Committee and their comments. Council requested that Bryan send a letter to President Ribeau and Bob Martin requesting that administrative staff be notified no later than April 15th of the recommendations of the Appeals Committee.

Joan Morgan and Bryan Benner had the opportunity to participate in a retreat attended by Deans, Vice Presidents, Assistant Vice Presidents and selected directors. The retreat was facilitated by William Loeffler and there was good discussion about collaboration between VP areas, customer service, etc. Follow-up groups and follow-up exercises were assigned to staff members to encourage a continuation of the discussions.
Included with the Agenda for the March meeting Council members received a draft document of ASC's response to the Vice Presidents' Administrative Staff Compensation Policy Document. The policies outlined in this document will eventually replace the policies related to administrative staff compensation in our current Handbook. Bryan encouraged Council members to read the document thoroughly and send any comments to Duane Whitmire. The Executive Committee plans to meet with Ad Council to negotiate these issues and bring a second version back to ASC. Duane Whitmire suggested that Executive Committee try to include Dr. Ribeau in the meeting with the Vice President's. [You may obtain a full copy of the compensation policy document by contacting Gail McRoberts, ASC Secretary, Graduate College or send your E-Mail request to gmicrobe@bgnet.bgsu.edu]

Joan Morgan reported that the current chair of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee has expressed an interest in having representation from the Administrative Staff during the Committee meetings. Joan Morgan has followed up on his request for information.

Scholarship Committee

Judy Hartley reported that applications for the $1000 1996 ASC Scholarship have been distributed across campus.

Internal Affairs Committee

Internal Affairs plans to resurrect the BG Effect program which matches administrative staff with students to assist them in their adjustment to the BGSU campus. For more information on the BG Effect program see the announcement enclosed with these minutes.

96-97 Salary Recommendations

Bob Waddle presented a summary to Council of the proposed salary recommendations developed by the ASC Salary Committee. The Committee reviewed the results of the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) survey of salaries for the institutions in the State of Ohio. Modified Version 3.1 represents all BGSU CUPA positions found at at least five other institutions (without those positions currently filled by faculty and classified staff at BGSU). This version has been recognized by the Administration for the last six years as the one most appropriate for our salary recommendation. This year the report reflected a 2.48% BGSU loss from the state-wide average salary from 94-95 to 95-96. The Salary Committee recommended that ASC continue its goal of attaining the status of at least 4th out of 11 Ohio comparable institutions considered in the analysis. Although BGSU dropped from 7th to 10th place in the salary study this year, we are actually now 2.93% closer to the fourth place institution than we were one year ago. With a projected rate of inflation of 2.7% the Committee recommended that we request a 6.05% increase for 1996-97 contracts. [You may obtain a full copy of the Salary Committee report by contacting Gail McRoberts, ASC Secretary, Graduate College or send your E-Mail request to gmicrobe@bgnet.bgsu.edu]

During its discussions the Council identified several key issues which they felt should be communicated to the Administration as part of our salary recommendation along with the recommended percent increase. These issues included the following:

- The Administrative Staff Council supports the concept of merit pay for administrative staff at Bowling Green State University.
Bowling Green State University does not currently have a fair and equitable performance evaluation and merit pay system in place for administrative staff across campus. Over the years, little money has been available for real merit increases. When money has been available, managers and employees alike agonize over a fair assessment of merit pay. Lacking objective criteria, subjective value judgments must be made. Many managers, accurately recognizing lose-lose propositions, refuse to distinguish between merit increases, assigning values that result in 100% across-the-board pay increases.

The Administrative Staff Council urges the administration to put in place a performance evaluation process and merit pay system that is fair and consistent across the University and that is developed with the full input of the Administrative Staff Council. While merit pay systems may be viewed by some as counterproductive to community building, fair and equitable merit systems can be developed that foster teamwork and improved work performance.

Individual departments/units which currently do have a clearly defined performance evaluation and merit system in place should distribute merit to their administrative staff employees. Funds should be distributed as an across-the-board increase in departments where clearly defined criteria for earning merit have not been developed.

If the total salary increase approved by the Board of Trustees is not above the rate of inflation it should be distributed as a flat across-the-board increase.

Council directed the Chair to continue these discussions with the ASC Executive Committee and to submit a final salary recommendation to Chris Dalton.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Gail McRoberts
Secretary, ASC

The next meeting of Administrative Staff Council will be:
Thursday, April 4th
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union
Draft of Administrative Staff Council Response to 10-12-95 Document from the Vice Presidents

Prepared by

ASC Executive Committee and
ASC Personnel Welfare Committee

Contents

1) Cover Memorandum
2) Original 10-12-95 Draft from the VP Council
3) Draft of ASC Response - Summation of Points
4) ASC Response (Final Date to be Determined)

Date

February 26, 1996
Cover Memorandum (Draft)

To: Les Barber, Executive Assistant to the President
Eloise Clark, VP for Academic Affairs
Chris Dalton, VP for Planning and Budgeting
Nancy Footer, General Counsel
Robert Martin, VP for Operations
Phil Mason, VP for University Relations
John Moore, Assistant VP for Human Resources
Sidney Ribeau, President

From: Administrative Staff Council

Subject: Response to the Vice President Council's Administrative Staff Compensation Policy Document

As you requested, attached are Administrative Staff Council's responses to the enclosed Vice President Council's Administrative Staff Compensation Policy document dated October 12, 1995. You will note that Administrative Staff Council has responded to each of the 18 items that were presented.

Because the University is in the process of revising Administrative Staff Position Analysis and Compensation Policies, it is imperative that we include all policies related to staff compensation. Therefore, the response includes our recommendations for items (6 additional) not discussed in the original document but essential to future policies and procedures for Administrative Staff. The majority of our recommendations are based on the Discussion Guide on the Development of Policies and Procedures presented by Mercer for Bowling Green State University, March 1995. We look forward to working with you on these policies and procedures.
## ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL RESPONSE - FINAL DATE

**SUMMATION OF POINTS**

(current date = February 26, 1996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Full disclosure</td>
<td>Accomplished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Appeals process</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Additional training</td>
<td>Accomplished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Additional information</td>
<td>Accomplished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Appeals form</td>
<td>Accomplished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Positions not in original study</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Administrative positions on faculty contract</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pay below the minimum</td>
<td>Agreement and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Salary caps</td>
<td>Agreement and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Annual salary adjustments</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>New employees hired at the minimum</td>
<td>Disagreement and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Position Reevaluation</td>
<td>Disagreement and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Disagreement and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Appeals Process vs. Position Reevaluation</td>
<td>Disagreement and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Titles</td>
<td>Agreement and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Position Evaluation Process</td>
<td>Disagreement and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Review of Grade/Salary Chart</td>
<td>Disagreement and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Interim/Temporary/Acting Appointments</td>
<td>Disagreement and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEW POINTS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>New Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Progression Through a Salary Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Upgrade to Another Salary Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Demotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Downgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Market Exceptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrative Staff Council has been working on responses to the ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COMPENSATION VP COUNCIL document dated October 12, 1995. As a result of feedback from Administrative Staff Council, several of the points presented in your draft have been addressed—points 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 (full disclosure, appeals process, additional training, additional information, and appeals form). We appreciate the cooperation of the administration in expediting this part of the process.

The balance of this document addresses points 6 through 18 and contains our recommendations. In addition, we have included points 19 through 24 that are essential in completing a comprehensive revised Administrative Staff Handbook. The majority of our recommendations are based on the Discussion Guide on the Development of Policies and Procedures presented by Mercer for Bowling Green State University, March 1995. The Administrative Staff Council looks forward to working with you on these policies and procedures.

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COMPENSATION
VP COUNCIL - 10-12-95

Attending: Martin, Mason, Dalton, Clark, Barber, Footer

1. It was agreed that "Full Disclosure" of processes and study results was desirable within the bounds of customary personal data limitations. Forms describing the rating factors and their associated points, the formulas for extending the ratings to total points, Point ranges assigned to each grade, and salary ranges for each grade will be made available. Job Factor Ratings and total points assigned for each position can also be reviewed in the Personnel Office and will be made available to departmental offices.

ASC Response -Thank you for opening up the channels of communication regarding full disclosure. We hope the full disclosure concept will be carried forward through the appeals process and thereafter.

2. The appeal process will be expanded to include an administrative staff appeal committee appointed by ASC.

   A. Members will include one representative each from every Vice Presidential Area, Office of the President (ICA suggested), and two representatives from Academic Affairs.

   B. Members should not include those having filed appeals.

   C. Members should not have been previously assigned to the Advisory Committee for the Mercer Study.

ASC Response-We have identified members to serve on the appeals committee, and we developed the ASC APPEALS COMMITTEE POLICY STATEMENT and the ASC APPEALS COMMITTEE FORM for committee members to follow.
3. Agreed that additional training should be offered to administrative staff employees and supervisors/managers covering the methods, forms and formulas used to extend job factor ratings to total points and grades. Personnel to schedule, advertise and conduct within next two weeks.

ASC Response-Thank you for holding the informational sessions.

4. Agreed that information needs to be distributed describing the three different groups involved in the rating/grading process emphasizing that they were all part of a sequence of steps to arrive at a final grade for each position. The results of each step for a particular employee would be made available to that employee should he/she seek that information. Since each evaluation was a collective process, written rationale for the results of each step is not available. Further emphasis was recommended in informing employees that the results of intermediate steps in no way affected their appeal process or its consequences. The final step was the step from which appeal information should be presented.

ASC Response-The Progression of Levels document was helpful to people in preparing their appeals, but some of the data was inaccurate and the column titles were misleading. For example, the first column entitled Mercer led staff to believe that the entire column had been determined by Mercer consultants. Also, the second column entitled Committee implied that the Committee reviewed all positions which was not the case.

5. The restrictions included in the instructions on the appeal form may be overly restrictive. If additional space is needed to present information that is essential to the basis for the appeal, the reverse side of both pages one and two of the appeal form can be used. A revised Position Questionnaire is also acceptable.

ASC Response-Additional space was helpful to those appealing, but the approach of submitting a revised Position Questionnaire is beyond the scope of the original intent of the appeals process. Originally, Position Questionnaires are to be used only when a position is to be reevaluated.

6. The positions that were not included in the original analysis should be graded by Personnel Services as soon as time is available utilizing the questionnaire and supervisory/vice president reviews similar to the original process. Grade/Rating recommendations would be forwarded to the Area VP then VP Council. The resulting recommendation would be returned to the employee for an appeal opportunity. Additional information submitted through the appeal process would follow the same steps as the original appeal process for all first time submissions within six months of the implementation date adopted by the Board of Trustees. Appeals submitted subsequent to the six month period would follow policies adopted as a part of the Compensation Plan.

ASC Response-We seek clarification of the status of positions that were not included in the original analysis. Those positions that have not been analyzed yet should be completed immediately. The people in these positions have still not been notified as of February 21, 1996. Any administrative staff position not included in the original analysis should be given the same appeal opportunity as those included in the original study. Anyone who desires to appeal must do so within 30 days of receipt of notification of their grade level from Personnel. The Appeals Committee will remain intact for a reasonable period of time that is yet to be determined by Personnel, the administration, and Administrative Staff.
Council. Once the Appeals process has been completed, the Position Reevaluation process will begin as outlined in point 12.

7. Administrative positions normally held by individuals on faculty contracts are excluded from rating/grading by the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan. Administrative positions currently held by individuals on faculty contracts which could be assigned to administrative positions in the future will not be rated/graded until such time as that position is expected to become vacant and replacement with administrative contract employee is begun.

ASC Response-This seems logical, and it is our belief that rating/grading of positions in the future by Personnel will add consistency to this system as it evolves.

8. If an employee's salary is below the minimum for the assigned grade, it will be adjusted to the minimum effective Jan. 1, 1996.

ASC Response-We agree whole-heartedly. In addition, we believe those positions that fall between the minimum and the midpoint need to be carefully examined for possible salary inequity/discrimination. The Mercer consultants indicated that progression from minimum to midpoint should typically take four to seven years.

9. No current employee's salary will be capped as a result of the implementation of the Compensation Study.

ASC Response-Not only should no current employee's salary be capped; it is our recommendation that no future administrative staff employee's salary should be capped.

10. An individual employee's salary will be adjusted annually through the usual procedure with across the board and merit raises, if applicable, as approved by the Board of Trustees.

ASC Response-We agree.

11. It is the intent of the University that adoption of this compensation plan will normally result in new employees at the minimum salary for the appropriate grade. Variances from this practice based on special departmental needs, market factors, individual qualification, etc., may be approved by area vice presidents after consultation with the Offices of Personnel and Affirmative Action.

ASC Response-If the intent of the University is to hire new employees at the minimum, BGSU runs the risk of developing a pool of applicants that will be lacking in both quantity and quality. New positions should be posted with a salary range from minimum to midpoint. Anything above the midpoint should be considered a variance needing vice presidential approval after consultation with the Offices of Personnel Services and Affirmative Action.

12. In the event that significant changes in duties and responsibilities occur, individuals may initiate a request for reevaluation of their position. A revised questionnaire will be
submitted through the same process as existed during the initial phase of the project. Management reviews, personnel grading and appeal processes will be the same as those submitted subsequent to the six month post implementation period.

A. If a higher grade results, the salary will be adjusted to the minimum of the new grade or an increase of 5% whichever is greater.
B. If a higher grade does not result, no salary adjustment will occur.

ASC Response - We recommend the implementation of the following procedures for position reevaluation. In addition, we concur with the Mercer consultants recommendation that the standard adjustment for significant changes in duties and responsibilities should be 10 percent.

Definition of Position Reevaluation: the formal review of positions at designated intervals for purposes of ensuring that current duties and responsibilities are being appropriately reflected in the position's salary level.

Recommendation:

Positions can be reevaluated within each department upon the request of the incumbent or supervisor, but also all positions will be reviewed regardless of request at least once every four years. Review of one quarter of the positions per year would include all of the employee or supervisor initiated requests for reevaluation.

Process For Reevaluation at Request of Employee or Supervisor

1. Once a year, at any time, an employee or supervisor may request an evaluation of a position to ensure the current duties and responsibilities are appropriately reflected in the position's salary level.

2. A memorandum and completed position analysis form should be forwarded to Personnel Services for evaluation based on the established guidelines.

3. Personnel Services will review the position within 30 days based on the established criteria. If there are questions about the position, Personnel Services can request an interview with the employee and the immediate supervisor.

4. Personnel Services will forward the results of the analysis to the employee, the supervisor and department head, dean or director and vice president regardless of who initiated the request.

Process For Personnel Initiated Reevaluation

1. Personnel Services should establish a system to evaluate one quarter of the positions each year.

2. Employees in those positions to be evaluated will be asked to complete a position analysis form within a 30-day period.
3. These positions will be reviewed by Personnel within 30 days, and the results of the review will be forwarded to the employee and supervisor, dean, director and vice president.

Process For Both Situations Above

1. Positions which are determined by Personnel to fall in a lower salary level due to decreased responsibilities may be appealed by either the supervisor or the appellant. Salaries will remain the same. (See Downgrade policy)

2. Positions determined by Personnel to fall in a higher salary level should receive the increase in salary in the subsequent pay following Personnel's completion of the review.

13. If an employee is promoted to a position in a higher grade, the salary will be adjusted to the minimum of the new grade or a 5% increase, whichever is greater.

ASC Response - We agree that when an employee is promoted there should be a salary increase; however, the increase should be based on 10 percent or should be based on fair market value whichever is greater.

Definition of Promotion: occurs when an incumbent moves from a position requiring a certain level of skill, effort and responsibility to a vacant or newly created position at a higher salary level requiring a significantly greater degree of skill, effort and responsibility.

14. All appeals are initiated by submitting a new Position Questionnaire to the immediate supervisor, then to the department/division/unit heads then to Personnel Services.

A. Initial appeals submitted during implementation or within six months thereafter are forwarded to the ASC Appeal Committee then the area VP and finally the VP Council for final determination.

B. Appeals submitted after the above periods are forwarded from Personnel Services to the area VP for final determination.

ASC Response: The current appeals process is for transitional purposes only. In the future, individuals will follow the procedures for position reevaluation as outlined in point 12.

15. Title revision will not be included as a part of the implementation of the Compensation Study at this time.

ASC Response - We agree. However in the future when a title change is requested, the position would be reevaluated; and if necessary, the title would be adjusted to reflect the duties and responsibilities of the position. Even when a major divisional reorganization occurs, the position reevaluation process as outlined in point 12 should be followed.

16. When new positions are created or existing positions become vacant, revised questionnaires, if appropriate will be prepared by management and submitted to Personnel for grading.
A. During initial implementation plus six months, Personnel will forward grade recommendations to the area VP, through the ASC Appeal Committee, then to VP Council for final determination.

B. After the above period Personnel will forward grade recommendations to the area VP for final determination.

ASC Response - We recommend the implementation of the following procedures for position evaluation.

Definition of Position Evaluation Process: the method whereby vacant or newly established positions are evaluated and assigned to salary levels to establish equity within the organization.

Recommendation:

Evaluations of positions will be handled by Personnel Services in consultation with the hiring official.

Process:

1. When a position becomes vacant or is newly created, the hiring official meets with Personnel Services to review the position responsibilities for accuracy of placement in a salary range and title. Any corrections should be made at this time.

2. The hiring official should be advised at this time of the appropriate salary range for the position.

3. The Position Opening Request & Authorization (PORA) form should be routed as usual. Any recommended changes to the position from a dean, director or vice president should be discussed with Personnel Services and the hiring official to reach consensus prior to the posting of the position.

17. The Administrative Staff Compensation Plan Grade/Salary chart will be reviewed at least every 5 years by the Personnel Services Department to determine its adequacy in meeting market equity. These reviews will be patterned after guidelines provided in the final report from Mercer Inc. and adjustments made as results dictate in minimum, mid-range, and maximum pays for each grade. Annual adjustments to these pay charts will not be automatically made based on annual Board of Trustee approved employee pay increases.

ASC Response: We believe that administrative staff should not be penalized by a review of the Grade/Salary chart every 5 years instead of an annual review. We believe that the Grade/Salary chart should be adjusted each year that there is to be a general salary increase. This is necessary so that administrative salary levels are raised in an amount equivalent to the other constituent groups’ increases each year.

18. When employees are assigned to positions in a higher grade on an interim/temporary/acting basis, a salary increase will be established by the area VP after consultation with the Offices of Personnel and Affirmative Action.
ASC Response: We recommend the implementation of the following procedures for interim/temporary/acting appointments.

Definition of Temporary Upgrade/Interim Appointment: occurs when an administrative staff member is asked to serve any period longer than 4 weeks in a position which has a higher salary level

Recommendation:

Increase salary by 10 percent or to the minimum of the temporary salary level, whichever is greater.

At the end of the appointment the employee will return to his/her original salary plus any raises received during the time of the temporary appointment.

After 26 weeks Personnel Services will review the arrangements.

Although the following points were not included in the original ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COMPENSATION VP COUNCIL document dated October 12, 1995, the inclusion of these policies and procedures in the revised Administrative Staff Council Handbook are essential. Once again, these recommendations are based on the Discussion Guide on the Development of Policies and Procedures presented by Mercer for Bowling Green State University, March 1995.

19. Progression Through a Salary Level

Recommendation:

Progression through a salary level is an important issue that is under review by the Administrative Staff Council's Salary Committee and Personnel Welfare Committee in consultation with Personnel Services. Recommendations will be forthcoming.

20. Upgrade to Another Salary Level

Definition of Upgrade to Another Salary Level: occurs when a position is reevaluated resulting in a higher salary level as a result of a significant expansion in the position's existing duties and responsibilities.

Recommendation:

Increase salary by ten percent or to the minimum of the new salary level, whichever is greater.

21. Demotion - Definition of Demotion: occurs when an incumbent moves from a position requiring a certain level of skill, effort and responsibility to a vacant or newly created position assigned to a lower salary level requiring a significantly lesser degree of skill, effort and responsibility.

Recommendations:
Demotion is an issue that will be reviewed by the Administrative Staff Council's Personnel Welfare Committee in consultation with Personnel Services. Recommendations will be forthcoming.

22. Downgrade - Definition of Downgrade: occurs when a position is reassigned to a lower salary level as a result of a significant reduction in the position's existing duties and responsibilities.

Recommendation:

Maintain incumbent's current pay.

23. Transfer - Definition of Transfer: a lateral move which results when an employee is moved from a position requiring a certain level of skill, effort and responsibility to another position requiring the same degree of skill, effort and responsibility and assigned to the same salary level.

Recommendation:

Maintain incumbent's current pay.

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

Recommendation:

Move the pay range upward (i.e. minimum, midpoint and maximum) by a percentage equal or comparable to the percentage difference between the documented market average pay for the job and its current midpoint value; subject to periodic review to determine appropriateness of premium.

Personnel Services will determine if market exceptions exist and conduct the review process.
CONFIDENTIAL

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COMPENSATION
VP COUNCIL - 10-12-95

Attending: Martin, Mason, Dalton, Clark, Barber, Footer

1. It was agreed that "Full Disclosure" of processes and study results was desirable within the bounds of customary personal data limitations. Forms describing the rating factors and their associated points, the formulas for extending the ratings to total points, Point ranges assigned to each grade, and salary ranges for each grade will be made available. Job Factor Ratings and total points assigned for each position can also be reviewed in the Personnel Office and will be made available to departmental offices.

2. The appeal process will be expanded to include an administrative staff appeal committee appointed by ASC.
   A. Members will include one representative each from every Vice Presidential Area, Office of the President (ICA suggested), and two representatives from Academic Affairs.
   B. Members should not include those having filed appeals.
   C. Members should not have been previously assigned to the Advisory Committee for the Mercer Study.

3. Agreed that additional training should be offered to administrative staff employees and supervisors/managers covering the methods, forms and formulas used to extend job factor ratings to total points and grades. Personnel to schedule, advertise and conduct within next two weeks.

4. Agreed that information needs to be distributed describing the three different groups involved in the rating/grading process emphasizing that they were all part of a sequence of steps to arrive at a final grade for each position. The results of each step for a particular employee would be made available to that employee should he/she seek that information. Since each evaluation was a collective process, written rationale for the results of each step is not available. Further emphasis was recommended in informing employees that the results of intermediate steps in no way affected their appeal process or its consequences. The final step was the step from which appeal information should be presented.

5. The restrictions included in the instructions on the appeal form may be overly restrictive. If additional space is needed to present information that is essential to the basis for the appeal, the reverse side of both pages one and two of the appeal form can be used. A revised Position Questionnaire is also acceptable.

6. The positions that were not included in the original analysis should be graded by Personnel Services as soon as time is available utilizing the questionnaire and supervisory/vice president reviews similar to the original process. Grade/Rating recommendations would be forwarded to the Area VP then VP Council. The resulting recommendation would be returned to the employee for an appeal opportunity.
Additional information submitted through the appeal process would follow the same steps as the original appeal process for all first time submissions within six months of the implementation date adopted by the Board of Trustees. Appeals submitted subsequent to the six month period would follow policies adopted as a part of the Compensation Plan.

7. Administrative positions normally held by individuals on faculty contracts are excluded from rating/grading by the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan. Administrative positions currently held by individuals on faculty contracts which could be assigned to administrative positions in the future will not be rated/graded until such time as that position is expected to become vacant and replacement with administrative contract employee is begun.

8. If an employee’s salary is below the minimum for the assigned grade, it will be adjusted to the minimum effective Jan. 1, 1996.

9. No current employee’s salary will be capped as a result of the implementation of the Compensation Study.

10. An individual employee’s salary will be adjusted annually through the usual procedure with across the board and merit raises, if applicable, as approved by the Board of Trustees.

11. It is the intent of the University that adoption of this compensation plan will normally result in new employees at the minimum salary for the appropriate grade. Variances from this practice based on special departmental needs, market factors, individual qualification, etc., may be approved by area vice presidents after consultation with the Offices of Personnel and Affirmative Action.

12. In the event that significant changes in duties and responsibilities occur, an individual may initiate a request for reevaluation of their position. A revised questionnaire will be submitted through the same process as existed during the initial phase of the project. Management reviews, personnel grading and appeal processes will be the same as those submitted subsequent to the six month post implementation period.

   A. If a higher grade results, the salary will be adjusted to the minimum of the new grade or an increase of 5% whichever is greater.
   B. If a higher grade does not result, no salary adjustment will occur.

13. If an employee is promoted to a position in a higher grade, the salary will be adjusted to the minimum of the new grade or a 5% increase, whichever is greater.

14. All appeals are initiated by submitting a new Position Questionnaire to the immediate supervisor, then to the department/division/unit heads then to Personnel Services.

   A. Initial appeals submitted during implementation or within six months thereafter are forwarded to the ASC Appeal Committee then the area VP and finally the VP Council for final determination.

   B. Appeals submitted after the above periods are forwarded from Personnel Services to the area VP for final determination.

15. Title revision will not be included as a part of the implementation of the Compensation Study at this time.
16. When new positions are created or existing positions become vacant, revised questionnaires, if appropriate will be prepared by management and submitted to Personnel for grading.

A. During initial implementation plus six months, Personnel will forward grade recommendations to the area VP, through the ASC Appeal Committee, then to VP Council for final determination

B. After the above period Personnel will forward grade recommendations to the area VP for final determination.

17. The Administrative Staff Compensation Plan Grade/Salary chart will be reviewed at least every 5 years by the Personnel Services Department to determine its adequacy in meeting market equity. These reviews will be patterned after guidelines provided in the final report from Mercer Inc. and adjustments made as results dictate in minimum, mid-range, and maximum pays for each grade. Annual adjustments to these pay charts will not be automatically made based on annual Board of Trustee approved employee pay increases.

18. When employees are assigned to positions in a higher grade on an interim/temporary/acting basis, a salary increase will be established by the area VP after consultation with the Offices of Personnel and Affirmative Action.
MEMORANDUM

To: Administrative Staff Council
From: ASC Salary Committee
Re: 1996 Salary Recommendation

March 6, 1996

Since work has been undertaken by a joint subcommittee of the Salary Committee and the Personal Welfare Committee to generate a broad recommendation for the award of salary increases, the Salary Committee has concentrated on reviewing the results of the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) survey of salaries for the institutions in the State of Ohio. This has been a consistent exercise for a minimum of six years, which gives us a reasonable base for comparison and trends. It also makes our recommendation specific to the numbers involved, and expressed solely in a numerical fashion.

As noted in the Executive Summary, the University has lost ground in five of the six versions of salary comparisons, with the most severe loss in Modified Version 3.1. MV 3.1 represents all BGSU CUPA positions found at a minimum of five institutions, less the executive positions and those positions filled by faculty and classified staff. This version has been the version on which we have based our recommendations for the past six years, and has always been recognized as the most appropriate for this purpose by the Administration. MV 3.1 reflected a 2.48% BGSU loss from the state wide average salary from 94-95 to 95-96.

While a change in the Presidency may change the pledged support of the President’s Office to bring faculty salaries to the 60th percentile of Category - I Universities, we feel that this remains a reasonable goal, and remains the basis for our goal of attaining the status of 4th out of 11 Ohio comparable institutions considered in our analysis. While we have dropped from 7th place last year to 10th place this year, we are now 2.93% closer to the fourth place institution than we were one year ago. Even with this in mind, with a projected 2.7% rate of inflation for the next year and the assumption that the fourth place University would keep pace with that rate at a minimum, we would need a 6.05% increase to barely move into 4th place. The request for this 6.05% increase is in fact the recommendation of the committee.
March 6, 1996

MEMORANDUM

To: Administrative Staff Council
From: ASC Salary Committee
Re: 1995-96 Executive Summary

The ASC Salary Committee has consistently analyzed data from the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) salary survey for the past seven years. On the basis of the data, the following can be said:

1) BGSU average salaries, when compared to average salaries at similar institutions (Modified Version 3.1) moved from a rank of 7th in 94-95 to a rank of 10th in 95-96. This is a continued drop from the highest ranking achieved in 93-94 of 5th place. (Please see Appendix B)

2) BGSU average salaries, when compared to average salaries at similar institutions (MV 3.1) dropped from -4.67% to -7.15% (see Appendix A.1). This is the second year in a row for such a drop, and it represents a 4.32% drop from our highest position in 89-90. BGSU average salaries also dropped in MV 1.1 by .54%, in MV 2.1 by .88%, in MV 5.1 by .98% and MV 6.1 by 1.57%. BGSU did gain .09% in MV 4.1.

3) The percentage of BGSU salaries that were more than 10% below the state average for that position increased slightly to 32.63% in 95-96 from 32.14% in 94-95 (see Appendix E). BGSU presently has 14.74% of our positions more than 10% above the state average.
Appendix A
1995-96
Summary of CUPA - BGSU Average Salary
Compared to State Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>BGSU # of Cases</th>
<th>BGSU Average</th>
<th>CUPA Average</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MV 1.1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>$55,946</td>
<td>$58,714</td>
<td>($2,768)</td>
<td>-4.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV 2.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$55,054</td>
<td>$58,771</td>
<td>($3,717)</td>
<td>-6.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV 3.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$56,199</td>
<td>$60,525</td>
<td>($4,326)</td>
<td>-7.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV 4.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$59,587</td>
<td>$61,594</td>
<td>($2,007)</td>
<td>-3.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV 5.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>$56,057</td>
<td>$59,020</td>
<td>($2,963)</td>
<td>-5.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV 6.1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$57,076</td>
<td>$60,164</td>
<td>($3,088)</td>
<td>-5.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation based upon MV 3.1
Appendix A.1
Summary of CUPA - BGSU Average Salary
Compared to State Average
Six Modified Versions
Six Year Comparisons
Appendix B
1995-96
Summary of Comparison of BGSU Salaries
to Other State Schools Using Common Positions
(MV 3.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># of Positions</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>BGSU Average Salary</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>%Difference from BGSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$77,990</td>
<td>$56,361</td>
<td>$21,629</td>
<td>38.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$73,531</td>
<td>$60,893</td>
<td>$12,638</td>
<td>20.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$64,302</td>
<td>$58,313</td>
<td>$5,989</td>
<td>10.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$59,946</td>
<td>$58,006</td>
<td>$1,940</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$56,989</td>
<td>$55,319</td>
<td>$1,670</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$59,869</td>
<td>$58,150</td>
<td>$1,719</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$57,425</td>
<td>$55,875</td>
<td>$1,550</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$60,338</td>
<td>$59,110</td>
<td>$1,228</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$58,586</td>
<td>$58,489</td>
<td>$97</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$53,385</td>
<td>$53,893</td>
<td>($508)</td>
<td>-0.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing % difference in salaries for different institutions](image-url)
Appendix B.1
Summary of Comparison of BGSU Salaries
to Other State Schools Using Common Positions (MV 3.1)
Six Year Comparisons
Appendix E

Percentage of BGSU Salaries Greater than 10% Below the State Average for that Position Six Year Comparison
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL AGENDA

Thursday, April 4, 1996
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union

1. Call to Order

2. Guest Speaker - Ms. Donna Wittwer
   Benefits Manager
   Human Resources

3. Introduction of Substitutes

4. Approval of Minutes

5. Chair's Report

6. Chair Elect's Report

7. Secretary's Report

8. Committee Reports
   Amendments
   External Affairs
   Ferrari Award
   Internal Affairs
   Personnel Welfare
   Professional Development
   Salary
   Scholarship

9. New Business

   Discussion Groups - "Building Community at BGSU"

10. Good of the Order

11. Adjourn

12. Old Business
   - [Handwritten note: Bld. Con. of BGSU]
Administrative Staff Council Minutes
Thursday, April 4, 1996

Members Present: Pam Allen, Bryan Benner, Ann Betts, Deborah Boyce, Scott Bressler, Carmen Castro-Rivera, Cindy Colvin, Wayne Colvin, Tom Glick, Pat Green, Judy Hartley, Elayne Jacoby, Patricia Kania, Barb Kepke, Inge Klopping, Deborah Knigga, Patricia Koehler, Lona Leck, Rebecca McOmber, Joan Morgan, Donna Nelson-Beene, Penny Nemitz, Ed O'Donnell, Jan Peterson, Cindy Putter, Bev Stearns, Bob Waddle, Betty Ward, Sabrina White, Duane Whitmire, Paul Yon, Mary Beth Zachary, Tony Howard for Paul Lopez, Mary Helen Ritts for Barry Piersol, Phil Wilkins for Kent Strickland

Members Absent: Sally Blair, Jodi Ernest-Webb, Jeffrey Grilliot, Joseph Luthman, Gail McRoberts, Sue Perkins, Jack Taylor, Denise Van de Walle

Approval of Minutes:
Minutes of the March 7 meeting were approved on a motion by Pat Green and a second by Penny Nemitz.
Chair’s Report:

The 1996-97 salary recommendation has been submitted to Chris Dalton, V.P. Planning & Budgeting. The recommendation for a salary increase of 6.05% went forward without reference to existing procedures for distribution of funds that had been discussed at the previous meeting.

Judy Donald reported that over half of Administrative Staff responded to the Performance Appraisal Survey. Consensus was that the system needs to be improved and it should begin with input from employees.

The administrative staff appeals committee for the Mercer report has concluded reviewing 136 appeals. Tom Glick reported that the committee report should be in the appellants’ hands by April 15; if they are not received shortly thereafter, he suggested contacting Human Resources. The response to each appellant includes a cover letter, copy of the form, the committee’s recommendation and rationale; a copy of the report will be sent to Human Resources and the appropriate VP. Four appeals were returned to Human Resources for more information.

The President’s Panel met recently. Applications for BGSU admission are down 8-10% which translates to a reduction of approximately 1 million dollars. Although a major concern, the reduction will not require staff layoffs during this fiscal year. With open communication a goal, President Ribeau is encouraging staff to take rumors to their area VP for resolution.

Bryan Benner and Joan Morgan will be meeting soon with Bob Martin and John Moore.

Personnel Welfare Committee

PWC chair, Duane Whitmire, reported that he has had little feedback on the Position Analysis and Compensation Study Policies and Procedures draft that was discussed at the ASC meeting last month. That document will go forward on April 15.

Scholarship Committee

Chair Judy Hartley reported that 50 applications have been received for the 1996 ASC Scholarship. The committee will be meeting to make the scholarship selection soon.

Internal Affairs Committee

Pat Kania announced that volunteers are still needed for the BG Effect program; interested staff should contact her if they would like to participate. She also suggested that ASC consider having a Web page and will take proposal to the Web team.

New Business:

The following amended draft was presented to ASC for consideration and was endorsed in concept on a motion by Elaine Jacoby and a second by Beverly Stearms. The draft is to be presented to each of the constituent groups.
Bowling Green State University
Constituent Groups
Collaborative Resolution

Whereas, President Ribeau has identified a collaborative community as one of the four types of communities that Bowling Green State University should strive to become;

Whereas, the Building Community Project has already resulted in numerous positive collaborative efforts;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Undergraduate Student Government, the Graduate Student Senate, the Faculty Senate, the Classified Staff Council, and the Administrative Staff Council develop strategies to collaboratively work together to enhance our University community.

To begin the collaborative efforts, it is recommended that members of all constituent groups meet at least once a month during the academic year, and once during the summer, for the expressed interest of collaborating on items of common interest.

Furthermore, it is recommended that when items of common interest are carried forward for approval through the respective channels of each group that a joint timeline be developed so all five groups are proposing the items of common interest in the same time frame as joint submissions.

Council broke into four focus groups to discuss the following Building Community topics; “Learning Community”, “Collaborative Community”, “Diverse Community”, and “Outreach Community”. Each group addressed the issues and the suggestions associated with the particular topic and responses were recorded for feedback to the committee at large.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 pm.

Pat Koehler for
Gail McRoberts
Secretary, ASC
Whereas, President Ribeau has identified a collaborative community as one of the four
types of communities that Bowling Green State University should strive to become;

Whereas, the Building Community Project has already resulted in numerous positive
collaborative efforts;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Undergraduate Student Government, the Graduate
Student Senate, the Faculty Senate, the Classified Staff Council, and the Administrative
Staff Council develop strategies to collaboratively work together for the betterment of
students who attend Bowling Green State University. To enhance our University
Community.

To begin the collaborative efforts, it is recommended that members of all constituent groups
meet at least once a month during the academic year, and once during the summer, for the
expressed interest of collaborating on items of common interest.

Furthermore, it is recommended that when items of common interest are carried forward
for approval through the respective channels of each group that a joint timeline be
developed so all five groups are proposing the items of common interest in the same time
frame as joint submissions.
1. What are the issues associated with Administrative Staff enhancing the learning community at the University?

2. What are the suggestions you have regarding Administrative Staff enhancing the learning community at the University?
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL
FOCUS GROUP

TOPIC - COLLABORATIVE COMMUNITY

Facilitator: ________________________________
Recorder: ________________________________
Date: ___________ Number of Participants: ___________

*PLEASE SUSPEND JUDGMENT AND CAPTURE WHAT IS SAID*

1. What are the issues associated with Administrative Staff enhancing the collaborative community at the University?

2. What are the suggestions you have regarding Administrative Staff enhancing the collaborative community at the University?
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL
FOCUS GROUP

TOPIC - DIVERSE COMMUNITY

Facilitator: ____________________________
Recorder: ____________________________
Date: ___________ Number of Participants: ___________

*PLEASE SUSPEND JUDGMENT AND CAPTURE WHAT IS SAID*

1. What are the issues associated with Administrative Staff enhancing the diverse community at the University?

2. What are the suggestions you have regarding Administrative Staff enhancing the diverse community at the University?
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL
FOCUS GROUP

TOPIC - OUTREACH COMMUNITY

Facilitator: ____________________________
Recorder: ____________________________
Date: ____________________________
Number of Participants: ____________

*PLEASE SUSPEND JUDGMENT AND CAPTURE WHAT IS SAID*

1. What are the issues associated with Administrative Staff enhancing the outreach community at the University?

2. What are the suggestions you have regarding Administrative Staff enhancing the outreach community at the University?
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL AGENDA

Thursday, May 2, 1996
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union

1. Call to Order
2. Introduction of Substitutes
3. Approval of Minutes
4. Chair's Report
5. Chair Elect's Report
6. Secretary's Report
7. Committee Reports
   Amendments
   External Affairs
   Ferrari Award
   Internal Affairs
   Personnel Welfare
   Professional Development
   Salary
   Scholarship
8. New Business
9. Old Business
   "Building Community at BGSU" - Summary of discussions from April meeting
10. Good of the Order
11. Adjourn
Administrative Staff Council Minutes

Thursday, May 2, 1996

Members Present

Members Absent
Delene Thomas for Betty Ward

Who Sent Substitutes:

Carmen Castro-Rivera, Joyce Kepke, Denise Van de Walle

Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Chair, Bryan Benner.

Approval of Minutes:
Pat Green moved, Jeff Grilliot seconded that the minutes be approved as distributed.

Chair's Report:
The appeals have now been sent to the Vice Presidents who tentatively plan to review about 20 per week. There is still a commitment from the University Administration to make any changes in salary retroactive. Approximately thirty-nine positions have still not been evaluated and assigned Mercer ratings. These will be completed after the appeals process.

Council members expressed a variety of concerns regarding the appeals process and proposed compensation policy document which will be incorporated into the Administrative Staff Handbook. There was general consensus that reviewing the appeals 20 at a time would drag the process out too far into the summer. Some Council members proposed a recommendation that the VPs accept the results of the Appeals Committee across-the-board. Council discussed the pros and cons of separating the appeals process from the policy document and bringing closure to the appeals process and retroactive salary increases as soon as possible but leaving the compensation policy document for a later date. The procedures for the Administrative Staff Handbook could require some time to negotiate. Others expressed concern that the issues should not be separated.

Bryan addressed the rumor that the Administration has changed its position on the salary cap issue by stating that Bob Martin has reiterated that it is still the Vice President's position that there will be no salary caps for current employees. It is unclear however whether new employees would be subject to salary caps or if the Department of Labor could recommend salary caps for employees.

It was the consensus of Council that Bryan should write directly to Dr. Kibbe to highlight and clarify the Council's position regarding the following issues: (1) we recommend that the University brings closure to the appeals process and completes a review of the thirty-nine positions still not evaluated before the June Board meeting; (2) we would be willing to meet with him to discuss the proposed
compensation policy document; (3) Administrative Staff Council entered into the appeals process with the understanding that there would be no salary caps for current or future employees and with any change in this position we may request that the appeals process be reopened.

Secretary's Report

Elections for Representatives to the Administrative Staff Council have been completed. Ballots for the officers elections will be distributed during the week of May 10th.

Ferrari Award Committee

Barry Piersol reported that nomination information will be distributed across campus during the month of May.

Internal Affairs Committee

New ASC Representatives will be invited to the June meeting. The Committee is currently revising and preparing orientation materials for new members.

Scholarship Committee

Penny Nemitz reported the Committee has completed its review of applications and interviews and selected two recipients for the Administrative Staff Scholarship.

Personnel Welfare Committee

Duane Whitmire reported that the PWC Committee will again put together a memo in an attempt to get some kind of feedback regarding the proposed Handbook revisions that were sent forward Spring of 1995. The resolution on collaboration among the constituent groups has been approved by most groups on campus.

A subcommittee of PWC has been analyzing the summaries of our April Meeting Focus Groups on the Building Community Project. Duane asked for feedback (phone or E-Mail) from Council regarding who the target audience should be for the report, its expected outcome, how administrative staff can contribute to the four communities, etc. The subcommittee will present its report at the June meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Gail McRoberts
Secretary, ASC

The next meeting of Administrative Staff Council will be:
Thursday, June 6th
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL AGENDA

Thursday, June 6, 1996
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union

1. Call to Order

2. Introduction of Substitutes & Newly Elected ASC Reps

3. Approval of Minutes

4. Chair's Report

5. Chair Elect's Report

6. Secretary's Report

7. Committee Reports
   Amendments
   External Affairs
   Ferrari Award
   Internal Affairs
   Personnel Welfare
   Professional Development
   Salary
   Scholarship

8. New Business

9. Old Business
   "Building Community at BGSU" - Summary of discussions from April meeting

10. Good of the Order

11. Adjourn
Administrative Staff Council Minutes
Thursday, June 6, 1996

Members Present
Pam Allen, Bryan Benner, Ann Betts, Sally Blair, Deborah Boyce, Carmen Castro-Rivera, Tom Glick, Fat Green, Jeff Grilliot, Elayne Jacoby, Patricia Kania, Barb Keeley, Joyce Kepke, Inge Klopping, Deborah Knigga, Patricia Koehler, Paul Lopez, Joseph Luthman, Rebecca McOmber, Gail McRoberts, Joan Morgan, Donna Nelson-Beene, Ed O'Donnell, Sue Perkins, Jan Peterson, Barry Piersol, Kent Strickland, Denise Vande Walle, Bob Waddle, Sabrina White, Duane Whitmire, Mary Beth Zachary

Members Absent
Norma Stickler for Bev Stearns, Lee McLaird for Paul Yon

Who Sent Substitutes:
Scot Bressler, Cindy Colvin, Wayne Colvin, Jodi Ernest-Webb, Judy Hartley, Lona Leck, Penny Nemitz, Cindy Puffer, Jack Taylor, Betty Ward,

Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Chair, Joan Morgan.

Approval of Minutes:
Ed O'Donnell moved, Elayne Jacoby seconded that the minutes be approved as distributed.

Chair's Report:
Bryan distributed "Certificates of Appreciation" to the Council members who were ending their terms as ASC representatives. Newly elected members of ASC introduced themselves to the Council.

Joan encouraged Council members to sign up for one or more of the ASC standing committees.

Faculty, administrative staff and classified staff will all receive the same 3.0% salary increase.

The Vice President's have completed their review of the Mercer appeals. They will now go to Human Resources for calculation and distribution to staff members. The Appeals Committee has now also completed review of the second group of appeals it received.

Joan Morgan & Duane Whitmire attended the Board of Trustees meeting & committee & dinner meetings.

Secretary's Report
The secretary reported the results of the election for Executive Committee, Secretary & President-Elect. (Summary of 1996-97 Administrative Staff Council membership is attached)

Bylaws Committee
Mary Beth Zachary reported that the By-Laws Committee had presented revisions to the By-Laws at an early fall meeting which were approved by ASC.
External Affairs Committee

Jeff Grilliot reported that the External Affairs Committee worked on plans for the Fall Administrative Staff Council Reception and the food pantry drive.

Ferrari Award Committee

Barry Piersol reported that nomination information had been distributed across campus with a July 12th deadline.

Internal Affairs Committee

Pat Kania reported that the Internal Affairs Committee prepared a guide for new members and worked on planning for the BG Effect Program for incoming freshmen.

Personnel Welfare Committee

Duane Whitmire reported that the Personnel Welfare Committee worked extensively with the Exec Committee to develop the compensation policy document, analyzed focus group results, and reviewed other issues including bereavement leave, full-time staff definitions, and the status of proposed Handbook issues from Spring 1995.

Salary Committee

The Salary Committee analyzed the data from the CUPA report in preparation for the ASC salary recommendations.

Scholarship Committee

The Scholarship Committee reviewed applications and selected the two recipients of the ASC Scholarship.

Professional Development Committee

Kent Strickland reported that the Professional Development Committee discussed issues including beginning a paid leave policy, defining skill and career development, reestablishing a professional development fund and establishing a reward and recognition system for professional development of administrative staff.

Focus Groups - Building Community Project

Duane Whitmire reported that a subcommittee had reviewed the discussion summaries of the April meeting ASC focus groups. Items highlighted in the summaries included:

Learning Community -- focusing on streamlining bureaucracy for students

Collaborative Community -- Eliminating barriers to collaboration & creating a budget process that focuses on collaboration
Diverse Community -- Promoting diversity & sensitivity training to raise awareness of diversity issues

Outreach Community -- How to define and broaden the meaning of outreach

Council members requested another opportunity to review the report in its entirety. Issues discussed included some concern about endorsing specific concepts like "one-stop shopping" without a better understanding of what these things mean rather than a more general concept like "streamlining customer services" for students. They suggested it was inappropriate to offer a specific solution to something that has not been clearly defined. Can we really guarantee that there is one place a student can go to to get every question about the University answered?

Council agreed to allow the report to go to Executive Committee for rewording and asked that Council members make an active effort to get input from their constituents prior to July 1.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Gail McRoberts
Secretary, ASC

The next meeting of Administrative Staff Council will be:
Thursday, September 5, 1996
1:30 p.m.
Alumni Room, University Union