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**Notes**

1. Pencil
2. Photocopies
* Guest Speaker Judy Donald
   Judy will discuss the latest draft of the performance evaluation form.

* Collection of data from other universities
   For both merit pay, and salary progression.

* Are there alternative methods to the standard merit pay system as used by BGSU ???
   Example: (and probably a bad one)
   Each year, $50,000 of the total salary increase for contract staff is set aside for merit pay bonuses of $1,000 to each of 50 qualified employees. These employees either write, or have written by others, a short justification for the merit pay bonus. The bonus exists for just that year.
   All other salary increases are across the board.

Disadvantage: Competition for the bonuses would be keen, inflicting possible damage to team (community) building.

Advantage: A monetary reward for creativity and hard work. Everyone writing up a justification (successful or not) would essentially be answering the question, "Of what value is my performance to the University?"

Judy Donald

- Community effect of synergy of a Lyons Mirror
  (consistent and fair in operations and hiring)
  
  - Change mind of all AIG, AHEC, supervisors
  - Setting goals and expectations
  - Maintaining progress of goals
  - Job description, up to date, clear
  - Supervisors' evaluation of employees
  - Employee evaluation process

PWC: define merit parameters + ours. Board parameter.
Here is the agenda for tomorrow's PWC meeting at the TV station Conference Room B at 10:30am. Sharon will need to leave by 11:15am.

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL
PERSONNEL WELFARE COMMITTEE AGENDA
12/13/96

* Collection of data from other universities

This is the 3rd draft of survey questions for other Universities concerning merit and progression. Tomorrow at the meeting, we can talk about which university each of us can call.

The data I have about who will call the Universities is:
Akron - ??
Cincinnati - Joyce
Kent - ??
Miami - Sharon

This was from last summer, so feel free to request different universities or the same.... But let's don't call until we all OK a final draft of questions.

1) Do you have merit pay?
   If so, do you have another system? How does it work? May we have a copy?

   If so: (on each question, request copies of documents used)
   a) What percentage of a pay raise is merit/across the board?
      - What is the process used for negotiating this percentage?
   b) Is the % of merit/across the board the same every year?
   c) How frequently is merit given? How is this determined?
   d) What criteria are used to determine the amount of the merit pay?
      - Is this tied to performance evaluations? Can we obtain a copy of these criteria?
   e) Is merit given as a "bonus" each year or is it rolled into the base salary?

2) Is there a classification system for contract staff?
   If so: (on each question, request copies of documents used)

   PLEASE SEND A COPY OF THE PAY GRADES/RANGES
   a) What is the process (if possible) for moving from one pay grade to another?
   b) What happens when you reach max pay in your grade - does this mean no more merit?
   c) Given that a staff person receives average merit pay, how long does it take to go from the minimum pay to the maximum pay in the range?
   How long to the midpoint? First quartile?
   - Are there any rules for this movement/progression through the pay range?
Examples include longevity, performance, or ????

d) Does the pay range move up with each across the board increase or is this done every so many years? What determines how much they move?

e) How often are wage assessment surveys done? With which groups are the assessments compared? (ex. manufacturing, education, government, etc.) What changes have happened based on the results of the assessment survey?

3 Do you receive a cost-of-living adjustment?
   If so: (on each question, request copies of documents used)
   a) How are the amount and frequency determined?
   b) If you are at the top of your pay grade, do you receive a cost of living adjustment?

Please critique, and add questions to the above... The intent is to request data just once from our peers at other universities.

* Salary survey for progression. Karen Woods will deliver data to us covering pay grade, salary, hire date, position start date, etc.

* Human Resources Group. A group initiated by Ribeau/Middleton, bringing together the Personnel Welfare representatives from Classified, Administrative, and Faculty.

Joe Luthman 330 Hayes Hall, Comp. Svs.
Sr.Systems Programmer Bowling Green State University
jluthma@bgnet.bgsu.edu Bowling Green,OH 43403
* Collection of data from other universities
   The 3rd draft of survey questions for other Universities

   The data I have about who will call the Universities is:
   Akron - Ohio U. - Ed Cincinnati - Joyce - Ohio State - Joe
   Kent State - Toledo - Miami - Sharon
   This was from last summer, so feel free to request different universities or the same.

1) Do you have merit pay?
   If no, do you have another system? How does it work? May we have a copy?
   a) What percentage of a pay raise is merit/across the board?
      - What is the process used for negotiating this percentage?
   b) Is the % of merit/across the board the same every year?
   c) How frequently is merit given? How is this determined?
   d) What criteria are used to determine the amount of the merit pay?
      - Is this tied to performance evaluations? Can we obtain a copy of these criteria?
   e) Is merit given as a " bonus" each year or is it rolled into the base salary?

2) Is there a classification system for contract staff?
   a) What is the process (if possible) for moving from one pay grade to another?
   b) What happens when you reach max pay in your grade - does this mean no more merit?
   c) Given that a staff person receives average merit pay, how long does it
take to go from the minimum pay to the maximum pay in the range?
   How long to the midpoint? First quartile??
   - Are there any rules for this movement/progression through the pay range?
      Examples include longevity, performance, or ?????
   d) Does the pay range move up with each across the board increase or is
done every so many years? What determines how much they move?
   e) How often are wage assessment surveys done? With which groups are the assessments
compared? (ex. manufacturing, education, government, etc.)
   What changes have happened based on the results of the assessment survey?

3) Do you receive a cost of living adjustment?
   a) How are the amount and frequency determined?
   b) If you are at the top of your pay grade, do you receive a cost of living
adjustment?

* Salary survey for progression. Karen Woods will deliver data to us covering pay grade,
salary, hire date, position start date, etc.

* Human Resources Group. A group initiated by Ribeau/Middleton, bringing together the
   Personnel Welfare representatives from Classified, Administrative, and Faculty.
December 16, 1996

MEMORANDUM

TO: Administrative Staff

FROM: Joan Morgan, Chair, Administrative Staff Council
       Performance Appraisal Committee
       Judy Donald, Chair, Continuing Education
       Shelley Appelbaum, Athletics
       Bryan Berner, Human Resources
       Shirley Colaner, Human Resources
       Robert Graham, Library
       Joann Kroll, Career Services
       Dan Parratt, Environmental Health & Safety
       Judy Paschalis, WBGU-TV
       Lori Schumacher, Payroll
       Karen Woods, Human Resources

SUBJ: Performance Appraisal Form

In the Fall of 1995 the Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal Committee was appointed, with representation from each Vice Presidential Area, charged with the task of developing a performance appraisal process for the administrative staff.

In order to develop an instrument representative of administrative staff at BGSU, the committee spent time researching many existing processes both at BGSU as well as other universities and businesses. A survey was developed and distributed earlier this year to determine the positives and negatives of the current evaluation process for administrative staff. The results were compiled and shared with Ad Council and Administrative Staff late in the spring semester. Using the results of the survey and a random sampling of 40 administrative staff positions at BGSU, the committee developed the dimensions that would be used on the appraisal form. These were presented to the Administrative Staff Council at the September meeting where a request for feedback from Administrative Staff was made.

During the November 1996 ASC meeting, the 1996-97 goals were approved with Goal #2 being the continued development of a performance evaluation procedure which provides an equitable assessment of performance for all administrative staff. Culmination of the committee's efforts as well as keeping on task with the ASC goal, have resulted in the enclosed document that we feel provides the flexibility and uniformity needed to effectively assess administrative staff across the university community.

(over)
This form will be an item on the agenda for the January ASC meeting, so we are soliciting your comments either to your ASC representative, Joan Morgan or Judy Donald before the January 2nd meeting.

In order for this to be a successful and useful tool, the Human Resources Office will be providing a mandatory training session during the spring semester for all administrative staff as well as individuals who supervise administrative staff.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you.
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

BGSU Performance Appraisal

The University has established the following guidelines to assist you with assessing performance, which is a continuous process occurring throughout the year. A performance appraisal process for Administrative Staff should:

- clearly define job expectations;
- improve communication between employee and supervisor;
- align employee goals with the overall goals of the University, college or department;
- link performance with rewards such as compensation increases, promotions, recognition, assignments, professional development opportunities and career advances;
- be consistent across University departments and areas;
- identify employee training and professional development needs;
- establish clear-cut intervention strategies when performance does not meet identified job requirements.

The performance appraisal process is to help facilitate the growth and development of individuals, and in so doing, provide for the growth and development of the organization.

Mandatory training will be provided by the Office of Human Resources in the performance appraisal process to all Administrative staff and their supervisors (including Faculty who supervise Administrative staff).
GETTING STARTED
1ST YEAR.
Goals and objectives for the coming year are established between employee and supervisor after completing the current year performance evaluation.

FIRST YEAR

1. Employee reviews job description, making appropriate changes, and completes Performance Appraisal Form “PAF” for the previous year.

2. Supervisor reviews employee’s job description, completes “PAF” for the previous year, plans goals and objectives for the coming year.

3. Joint supervisor/employee discussion(s) regarding previous year’s performance review, job description, finalize goals and objectives for the coming year.

ON-GOING THROUGHOUT THE YEAR

4. Supervisor sends completed “PAF” and current job description to Human Resources. Copies of all documents are given to the employee.

5. Supervisor observes employee’s performance.


7. Supervisor and employee share feedback regarding performance, goals and objectives

8. Supervisor coaches and models

9. Goals and objectives revised (if applicable)

AT END OF NEXT YEAR

The Performance Appraisal Process cycle continues with Step #1
### BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
#### ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee:</th>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Evaluation Period:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form Completed By:</th>
<th>Date Form Completed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this appraisal is to evaluate employee performance:

**Step 1** - **Identify preliminary goals for discussion.** Prior to meeting, employee and supervisor should give consideration to what major goals/initiatives/achievement were accomplished and be prepared to discuss these.

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

**Step 3** - **Record your performance observations as well as performance information.** Consideration should be given to employee’s major strengths/weaknesses.

**Step 4** - **Complete ratings on dimensions.** Rate performance on the five point scale by circling appropriate number. Circle “not applicable” option if dimension is not part of employee’s job. Consideration should be given to employee’s strengths/weaknesses.

**Step 5** - **Conduct performance appraisal interview.** Consideration might be given to changes needed in the employee’s job description. Remember: goals and objectives define success in the job and must be flexible in response to changes throughout the year, but any changes should be made with the full participation of both employee and supervisor. Keep the goals SMART -- Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Timely. Clearly state how the goals will be measured. Focus on measurable performance such as: "deliver, develop, produce, increase, or improve." Goals must also have a time frame.

**Step 6** - **Provide additional relevant comments, modify ratings as needed, sign, and date completed form.** Consideration might be given to types of training or additional skills that would be desirable in order to fulfill the duties of this position; internal and external professional activities performed in the community; mentoring of students; BGSU committee work; personal goals, etc.

**Step 7** - **Allow employee an opportunity to provide comments and have employee sign and date form.** Comments here might include how supervisor could better aid employee in effectively performing job duties, what the employee needs in terms of feedback and timely communication with supervisor, concerns about safety, confidentiality, objectivity, etc.

**Step 8** - **Return original completed form and current job description to Human Resources and provide employee with a copy of the completed form.**
### General

**Area 1 - Commitment to BGSU Mission, Goals, Policies & Regulations:**
Promotes and works toward achievement of university-related goals within the framework of university policies and procedures (e.g., maintains regular and reliable attendance, enforcement and compliance with safety and health policies/procedures; promotes equity and diversity in the workplace).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far Exceeds</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails To Meet Expectations</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations:**

Goals for next rating period

**Area 2 - Core Professional/Technical Knowledge & Skills:**
Understands and applies job-related knowledge and skills, policies and procedures, and technical expertise to fulfill responsibilities of the position (e.g., comprehends and applies concepts, policies and procedures; and technical skills; adapts to changes in job, methods, or surroundings; originates or improves work methods).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails To Meet Expectations</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations:**

Goals for next rating period
### Area 3 - Professional Development
Maintains and updates professional knowledge and skills necessary for success in current position (e.g., participates in individual/staff training and development activities provided by unit, division, or university; attends off-campus development and educational activities contingent upon support in terms of financial resources and release time by supervisor.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations:**

**Goals for next rating period**

### Area 4 - Written & Oral Communication Skills
Communicates effectively with supervisor, coworkers, and others (e.g., shares information, communicates job-related information, prepares written documentation and administrative procedures, facilitates and participates in meetings, prepares and delivers oral presentations).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations:**

**Goals for next rating period**
### Area 5 - Resource Use & Management

Use appropriate resources to increase effectiveness of unit/area and BGSU (e.g., monitors financial status of unit/area, schedules employees, prepares and interprets statistics, develops and manages budget).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Far Exceeds</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>To Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Fails</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goals for next rating period**

### Area 6 - Service & Quality Orientation

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Far Exceeds</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>To Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Fails</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goals for next rating period**

**Observations:**
**Area 7 - Interpersonal Relations at Work**: Develop and maintain effective working relationships with supervisors, staff coworkers, and others; e.g., deals effectively with interpersonal problems at work, consults with colleagues, demonstrates loyalty, collaborates with colleagues and is able to maintain professional confidentiality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Far</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails To Meet Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations:

Goals for next rating period

**Area 8 - Internal/External Relations & Service**: Presents a positive impression of self and university while participating in university and non-university service activities; e.g., delivers presentations and lectures to the community, networks with off-campus community leaders, participates on university and non-university committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Far</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails To Meet Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails To Meet Expectations</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations:**

**Goals for next rating period**

**Area 12 - Leadership & Vision:** Develop and implement new programs and policies in area/unit to enhance work effectiveness, customer service, and staff morale and motivation (e.g., proposes or champions new initiatives or directions to improve area/unit and university; generates employee support, enthusiasm, and trust; effectively represents area/unit on campus and in the community).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails To Meet Expectations</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations:**

**Goals for next rating period**
### Supervisory/Management

#### Area 9 - Human Resources Development

- Hires, trains, instructs, and evaluates staff members (e.g., aids in selection of staff members; provides release time and financial support for development; develops and monitors performance expectations for staff members; provides continuous feedback, conducts effective performance reviews).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations:**

**Goals for next rating period**

#### Area 10 - Program Monitoring, Coordination & Management

- Monitors, coordinates, and directs program activities to ensure adherence to policies and procedures given available resources, and to meet short- and long-term goals (e.g., ensure quality improvement in programs, reviews customers' progress and attainment of goals, collaborates with appropriate others for program modification and development).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations:**

**Goals for next rating period**
Instructions: Using the scale below, assign an importance weight to each of the relevant performance areas. Multiply each rating by the appropriate weight to obtain an area score. Sum all area scores and divide by the sum of the weights to obtain a total performance score. Circle the number that corresponds to this score below, rounding up if necessary.

1 = Important  
2 = Above Average in Importance  
3 = Extremely Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Performance = \( \frac{\text{Sum B1 + B2}}{\text{Sum A1 + A2}} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails to Meet Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments by supervisor:

Supervisor Signature: Date:

Additional comments by employee:

Employee Signature: Date:

Signature indicates review of evaluation has taken place, not agreement or disagreement with contents.
Hello PWC folks. I will send the survey questions in two formats, so that you may pick either the straight text format here, or attachment format. Please let me know if the data is received OK by you.

Collection of data from other universities

The final draft of survey questions for other Universities

Please call by Jan 10, so we can compare notes during the meeting. The preferred format is as an e-mail attachment, but any way it gets to Sharon or Inge is more important. Here are their E-mail addresses.

HANNA@WBGU
IKLOPPI@CBA

The data I have about who will call the Universities is:
Akron - Inge Ohio U. - Ed Cincinnati - Joyce Ohio State - Joe
Kent - Ann Toledo - Deb Miami - Sharon

p.s. When you find an authoritative person who has a lot of the answers, please send their name and phone number to me, so that I can give it to Joan. ASC can always use an up-to-date listing of contacts.

1) Do you have merit pay? If so, do you have another system? How does it work? May we have a copy?

If no, how has it been in place? How satisfied is the staff?

If so: (on each question, request copies of documents used)
a) What percentage of a pay raise is merit/across the board?
   - What is the process used for negotiating this percentage?

b) Is the % of merit/across the board the same every year?

c) How frequently is merit given? How is this determined?

d) What criteria are used to determine the amount of the merit pay?
   - Is this tied to performance evaluations? Can we obtain a copy of
Pension

Salarial

20,000

all salaries =

w = 200,000 = 100%

Satisfactory or better =

recommend

ment:

1) Satisfactory performance

2) Satisfactory completion of goals

Best wishes,
The bulk of this proposal is taken from an older merit document used by the library for a number of years in assigning merit to Administrative staff. (It may assist in clarifying my position in the discussion.) I think it may even address what we discussed today concerning job performance and the merit process.

*****

Administrative Staff Merit Policy/Procedure

The evaluation of job performance and the awarding of merit are by their nature interrelated. Performing one's job at a satisfactory level and in a competent manner is to be expected. Merit is to be awarded for performance above and beyond that expectation. No merit is to be received if job performance falls below a satisfactory level.

Meritous service may be represented by:

A. Performance of basic responsibilities exceedingly well, above expected levels, in one or more of the following areas (80%)

1. subordinate or peer relationships
2. client relations
3. policy development
4. procedural innovation
5. exceptional performance in extreme situations

B. Additional accomplishments not part of the basic job responsibilities (20%).

1. professional development
2. service to the University, Library and Learning Resources
3. research/publications/presentations
4. initiation, development, and implementation of innovations

C. Other events or circumstances worthy of note (to be detailed separately; but included in A or B for Merit consideration).

Procedure:

Annually each administrative staff employee will submit to his/her immediate supervisor a brief written statement (outline is acceptable) reporting meritorious service in categories A, B, and C listed above. The report is to cover the most recent calendar year (now changed to April 1-May 30) or the same time period as the annual evaluation. It is to be submitted prior to the annual evaluation.

The supervisor will assign a numerical rank from 1 (low) to 10 (high) for merit based on the written statements, the annual evaluation for the same time period, and his/her own considered judgement, and report to the Dean. The Dean may at his/her discretion, adjust the ranking up or downward not more than 2 points before awarding dollar amounts for merit.

Each employee will be advised of the dollar amount by the Dean prior to the issuance of the next annual contract. The decision on merit money may be appealed to the Dean.
e) Is merit given as a "bonus" each year or is it rolled into the base salary?

2) Is there a classification system for contract staff?
   How long has it been in place? How satisfied is the staff?

   If so: (on each question, request copies of documents used)
   PLEASE SEND A COPY OF THE PAY GRADES/RANGES

   a) What is the process (if possible) for moving from one pay grade to another?

   b) What happens when you reach max pay in your grade - does this mean no more merit?

   c) Given that a staff person receives average merit pay, how long does it take to go from the minimum pay to the maximum pay in the range?
   How long to the midpoint? First quartile??
   Examples include longevity, performance, or ?????

   d) Does the pay range move up with each across the board increase or is this done every so many years? What determines how much they move?

   e) How often are wage assessment surveys done? With which groups are the assessments compared? (e.g., manufacturing, education, government, etc.)
   What changes have happened based on the results of the assessment survey?

3) Do you receive a cost-of-living adjustment?
Luthman 1/3/97 9:17 AM Survey questions
Bowling Green State University

(On each question, please circle or initial the code)

a) How are the amount and frequency determined?

b) If you are at the top of your pay grade, do you receive a cost of living adjustment?

Attachment converted: Macintosh HD:PWCSURVY.TXT (TEXT/MSWE) (0000CDF5)
Joe Luthman 330 Hayes Hall, Comp. Svcs.
Sr. Systems Programmer Bowling Green State University
jluthman@bgnet.bgsu.edu Bowling Green, OH 43403

Salary

1. How does scale move up annually?
   a. Next pool + x %
   b. Do decide
Hello PWC folks. In the interests of getting some issues on the table, I added some thoughts to discussions we have conducted to date. Please comment often and liberally.

Contract Staff Merit Pay at Bowling Green State University
ROUGH DRAFT 1/7/1997
This is a position paper concerning merit pay at Bowling Green State University. Comments as to process have been discussed at Personnel Welfare Committee meetings, but changes to content will occur as survey results come in from other Ohio universities.

The power to amend the form which assesses merit pay resides solely in ASC. Changes may be made on an annual basis, in accordance with restrictions stated below.

A) Definition

1. Satisfactory performance \Rightarrow \text{ merit from part }

Merit pay is money added to the base salary of an eligible employee.
Bonus merit is a sum of money awarded to employees during the course of the contract year who have successfully completed special duties. Its effect is similar to a back-dated salary increase. The amount earned is added to the base salary of the next contract year.
Merit pay is determined by the job performance of an employee. (and job performance is a measure of how the employee has executed management goals for the institution). Customizations for areas must be approved by the Salary Committee of Administrative Staff Council, and the Vice President to whom the unit reports.

JUSTIFICATION of merit bonus.
While merit pay should serve to improve job performance, the once per year occurrence may not stimulate production through the year. Bonus merit, awarded by the area Vice President at the successful conclusion of 'beyond the call of duty' projects, should stimulate short term consistent performance throughout the year.

Permissible Customized Merit Pay Characteristics
Units must be permitted to elect raises of 100% across the board and no merit.

It is noted that the Library, Student Affairs and the Athletic Department have established their own merit pay systems with both objective and subjective qualifications. Already working systems must be respected.
For some areas across campus, merit pay may not fit. Assigning merit pay in other areas may be so divisive as to seriously damage any sense of community in the office. Trying to force merit pay onto an area where it is next to impossible to differentiate between staff, cannot nurture university goals. We must respect those units who determine, with Vice Presidential and Salary Committee approval, that they prefer 100% across the board raises.

B) Process
Guidelines for merit pay

TIME DEADLINES
1. Performance appraisal forms must be completed by May 15 of the prior contract year
3. Merit pay criteria must be known prior to the contract year.

3.5 Failure to meet any of items 1-3 defaults to the employee being awarded AT LEAST the average increase given to all contract staff. For the raise of 7/1996, this would have meant that the default pay increase was 3%.

JUSTIFICATION:
For merit pay to increase productivity, it must be administered openly and reliably. Thus, changes in evaluation and merit pay criteria must be completed BEFORE the contract year. This translates to a completion deadline of June 30 of the prior contract year.

To ensure that employees can contest unfair merit pay assessments, a timely disclosure of the VALUE of the merit pay recommendation is necessary.

General comments

4. We recommend periodic dialogue between supervisor and employee to discuss progress toward annual goals.

5. Until a performance appraisal form is in use and its effectiveness has been measured, the merit pay portion of new raises should not exceed 40%.

JUSTIFICATION for (5)
Without working documents for merit pay assessment, the handbook definitions are still in effect.

C) Content
The source for merit pay assessment will be the second part of the performance evaluation form being constructed by the Administrative Performance Appraisal committee.

A rough draft of this form follows (12/16/1996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rating x Weight = Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area1</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area2</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area3</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area4</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area5</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area6</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area7</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area8</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Performance = (Sum B1 + B2) / (Sum A1 + A2) = ________

The weighting factors of this form are intended to enhance institution goals. It is the responsibility of the supervisor, communicating with the employee, to specify the weighting factors in this form, before May 31. And it is the responsibility of the employee to contest weighting factors that are detrimental to the institution.

Appeals of weighting factors should be made to the supervisor's manager. Unsuccessful appeals needing further clarification should first obtain a recommendation from the Salary Committee of ASC and then be carried forward to Human Resources, whose decision is final.
BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee:</th>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Evaluation Period:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form Completed By:</th>
<th>Date Form Completed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Instructions

The purpose of this appraisal is to evaluate employee performance

Step 1 - Complete the employee information block at the top of this page.

Step 2 - Record your performance observations as well as performance information.

Step 3 - Complete ratings on dimensions. Rate performance on the five point scale by circling appropriate number. Circle not applicable option if dimension is not part of administrator's job. Identify preliminary goals for discussion.

Step 4 - Conduct performance appraisal interview.

Step 5 - Provide additional relevant comments, modify ratings as needed, sign, and date completed form.

Step 6 - Allow employee an opportunity to provide comments and have employee sign and date form.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 1 - Core Professional/Technical Knowledge &amp; Skills: Understands and applies job-related knowledge and skills, policies and procedures, and technical expertise to fulfill responsibilities of the position (e.g., comprehends and applies concepts, policies and procedures and technical skills; adapts to changes in job, methods, or surroundings; originates or improves work methods).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goals

### Area 2 - Professional Development: Maintain and update professional knowledge and skills necessary for success in current position (e.g., participates in individual/staff training ad development activities provided by unit, division, or university; attends off-campus development and educational activities contingent upon support in terms of financial resources and release time by supervisor. |

| Far Exceeds Expectations | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Sometimes Meets Expectations | Fails To Meet Expectations | NA |
|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Observations: |

### Goals
### Area 3 - Written & Oral Communication Skills

Communicates effectively with supervisor, coworkers, and others: (e.g., shares information, communicates job-related information, prepares written documentation and administrative procedures, facilitates and participates in meetings, prepares and delivers oral presentations).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails To Meet Expectations</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations:**

**Goals**

### Area 4 - Resource Use & Management

Use appropriate resources to increase effectiveness of unit/area and BGSU (e.g., monitors financial status of unit/area, schedules employees, prepares and interprets statistics, develops and manages budget).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails To Meet Expectations</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations:**

**Goals**
### Area 5 - Service & Quality Orientation

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails To Meet Expectations</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations:**

---

### Area 6 - Interpersonal Relations at Work

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails To Meet Expectations</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations:**

---

**Goals**
| Area 7 - Internal/External Relations & Service: Present a positive impression of self and university while participating in university and non-university service activities (e.g., delivers presentations and lectures to the community, networks with off-campus community leaders, participates on university and non-university committees). |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Far | Exceeds expectations | Sometimes | Meets expectations | Fails to meet expectations |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Observations:

Goals

| Area 8 - Commitment to EGSU Mission, Goals, Policies & Regulations: Promotes and works toward achievement of university-related goals within the framework of university policies and procedures (e.g., maintains regular and reliable attendance, enforcement and compliance with safety and health policies/procedures; promotes equity and diversity in the workplace). |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Promotes Diversity |
| b) Safety Compliance |
| Far | Exceeds expectations | Sometimes | Meets expectations | Fails to meet expectations |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Observations:

Goals
## Supervisory/Management

### Area 9 - Human Resources Development
- Helps, trains, instructs, and evaluates staff members (e.g., aids in selection of staff members; provides release time and financial support for development; develops and monitors performance expectations for staff members; provides continuous feedback, conducts effective performance reviews).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far Exceeds</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails To Meet Expectations</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations:**

**Goals**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Far Exceeds</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails To Meet Expectations</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations:**

**Goals**
### Area 11 - Supervision/Team Building

Provides direction and support to individuals and teams to improve their work effectiveness (e.g., assign tasks and responsibilities to staff/teams; ensures and monitors adequacy of resources necessary for staff/teams to accomplish their jobs; develops an atmosphere of teamwork and cooperation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Far Exceeds</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails To Meet Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations:

**Goals**

### Area 12 - Leadership & Vision

Develop and implement new programs and policies in area/unit to enhance work effectiveness, customer service, and staff morale and motivation (e.g., propose or champion new initiatives or directions to improve area/unit and university; generates employee support, enthusiasm, and trust; effectively represents area/unit on campus and in the community).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Far Exceeds</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Sometimes Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails To Meet Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations:

**Goals**
PWC folks: Please remember the joint meeting with ASC exec, PWC, and Dr. Middleton tomorrow (Wednesday) at the TV station at noon. This will be a brown bag luncheon with questions and answers concerning merit pay. Dr. Middleton has not seen the current draft, so high-level questions are the purpose of the meeting. He expects to arrive at 12:15 and must leave by 1:00.

Here is the current draft (2/18/1997)

Principles and Recommendations for a Performance-Based Merit System for Administrative Staff at Bowling Green State University

The Administrative Staff Council has reviewed the principles and recommendations for a performance-based merit system proposed by the Faculty Task Force on Employee Evaluation and Reward Policy. We are incorporating some principles enumerated in this document with appropriate modifications for Administrative Staff.

The Administrative Staff Council believes that a number of important principles must form the foundation for the periodic staff review process and for the equitable distribution of salary increment awards. The Council endorses the concept of a performance-based merit system for awarding employee salary increases provided such a system is fair, equitable, and firmly founded on these ten underlying principles. By "merit", the Council means a salary increment that is allotted for performance of duties that meets or exceeds unit expectations. The rationale for this definition is provided by the following ten principles for an effective merit system.

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

2. A salary system should be designed to promote internal salary equity (based upon the Mercer classification) as well as external equity (based upon salary comparisons among individuals in similar positions from similar universities, colleges or departments).

3. A performance-based merit system should include peer, team, or client review when appropriate.

4. This system should engender the type, quantity, and quality of performance that contributes to the achievement of institutional and unit
missions and goals. The reward system also needs to recognize that there are often multiple paths that may be taken in support of missions and goals.

5. The process must insure that employees who have unit-approved individual variations of effort are reviewed and rewarded proportionately to their own approved percentage of effort distributions.

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

7. The process of review should provide employees with results and constructive feedback that enables them to develop professionally and to make improvements in performance.

8. Whenever resources are limited the merit system must respond to a more restricted set of institutional priorities in order to avoid trivializing the system by too thinly spreading and thus minimizing the impact of any incentive awards given.

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

10. A performance-based salary reward system should foster cooperation rather than antagonism among staff, should reward groups and teams as well as individuals for collaborative work performances, and should generate wide support and general satisfaction on the University campus.

Provided these ten principles are followed, the Administrative Staff Council recommends that Bowling Green State University adopt a performance-based merit reward system. The Council believes it is better to improve the existing system than to abandon it completely. Following are the specific recommendations for an employee performance-based merit system which is specific for Administrative Staff Council and which differs from the faculty proposals in some respects.

Recommendations

1. Funds should be made available on a regular, on-going basis to support raises for promotions, salary equity adjustments and salary adjustments deemed appropriate following comprehensive five-year reviews of employee performance and salary. These funds should support the administration's commitment to move long term staff into the appropriate quartile of their salary range. These funds should not be considered a part of the annual merit pool.

2. For merit pay to increase productivity, it must be administered openly and reliably. Thus, changes in evaluation and merit pay criteria must be completed BEFORE the new contract year. This translates to a completion
TO: Administrative Staff

FROM: Joan Morgan, Chair Administrative Staff Council
Joe Luthman, Chair, Personnel Welfare Committee JLUTHMA@BGNET
Ann Betts ABETTS@BGNET
Deb Boyce DBOYCE@BGNET
Sharon Hanna HANNA@WBGU
Joyce Kepke KEPKEJM@BGNET
Inge Klopping IKLOPPI@CBA
Ed O'Donnell EODONNE@BGNET

RE: Draft Document: Principle and Recommendations for a Performance-Based Merit System for Administrative Staff at Bowling Green State University

To Be Discussed March 13 at 1:30 during an on-call meeting of ASC

Attached you will find a draft document prepared by the Personnel Welfare Committee (PWC) of Administrative Staff Council (ASC). This document contains recommendations for a performance-based merit system for administrative staff. This document was prepared in response to a resolution passed at the May 24, 1996, Board of Trustees meeting in which the Board "request(ed) that the Central Administration work with the Faculty Senate and the Administrative Staff Council to carefully re-evaluate the process for determining merit salary increases during the coming year" and clearly indicated its intention to "re-evaluate the balance of merit and across-the-board salary increases for the 1997-98 fiscal/academic Year."

In response to this mandate two committees composed of Administrative Staff have been looking at two separate but closely related processes: the performance appraisal process and the merit award process. The first committee, chaired by Judy Donald, started meeting prior to the Board's mandate. A draft of the process and evaluation form has been shared with ASC. A final revision of the document is underway.

The second committee, composed of a subgroup of our PWC has been working throughout this fiscal year on a policy that will deal with merit for administrative staff. It reviewed the Faculty draft of merit pay policy while evaluating its own version of a policy. We are pleased that both groups independently arrived at many of the same conclusions. ASC has adopted some of the language of the Faculty document. A copy of this draft document is attached.

An on-call meeting of ASC has been called on March 13 to discuss this draft document. It is important that we get as much input as possible before we submit revisions of this draft document to the administration. We ask that comments and suggestions on this merit proposal from administrative staff be shared with representatives so these can be
discussed at our March 13 on-call meeting. Certainly any comments you would like to make to members of PWC would also be appropriate. Personnel Welfare will review all comments and suggestions and modify the proposal as it deems appropriate.

Dr. Middleton has indicated that he would like to present information about our progress at the April 24, 1997, Board of Trustees meeting so we have a little more than a month to make comments and revisions. As we work with this document it is important that we understand the administration believes that this is a first try at something new and plans to revisit this document and the entire process on a regular basis. ASC believes that annual review and revision of the documents is imperative and has incorporated the concept in its ten principles.

We feel it is essential that we get input from as many administrative staff as possible because this proposal deals with an issue that will affect all of us. Please share your thoughts with us. Thanks for your cooperation in this important matter.

Principles and Recommendations for a Performance-Based Merit System
for Administrative Staff at Bowling Green State University

3/4/1997

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

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

2. A salary system should be designed to promote internal salary equity (based upon the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan) as well as external salary equity (based upon salary comparisons among individuals in similar positions from similar universities, colleges or departments).
3. A performance-based merit system may include a component of peer-review when appropriate. Appropriateness will be determined jointly by the supervisor and staff member.

4. A performance-based merit system should engender the type, quantity, and quality of performance that contributes to the achievement of institutional and unit missions and goals. The reward system also needs to recognize that there are often multiple paths that may be taken in support of missions and goals.

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

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

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

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

9. A performance-based salary reward system should foster cooperation among staff, reward groups and teams as well as individuals for collaborative work performances, and should generate wide support and general satisfaction on the University campus.

10. Both the performance based merit system and the performance appraisal process will be reviewed annually by ASC.

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

1. Funds should be made available on a regular, on-going basis to support raises for promotions, salary equity adjustments, market adjustments and salary adjustments deemed appropriate following comprehensive reviews of employee performance and salary. These funds should support the administration's commitment to move staff into the appropriate quartile of their salary range. These funds should not be considered a part of the annual merit pool.

2. Meritorious performance should be rewarded:
   a. Upon the completion of multiple years (3-5) of meritorious assessment, an employee's salary shall be increased to the next quartile of their assigned grade in the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan.
   b. After multiple years (3-5) of meritorious assessments, the employee shall be granted a renewable three year contract with provisions for annual salary increases.

3. To increase productivity, a merit system must be administered openly and reliably. Thus, changes in evaluation and merit pay criteria must be completed BEFORE the new contract year, i.e. before June 30 of the prior contract year. To ensure that employees can contest unfair merit pay assessments, a timely disclosure of the AMOUNT of the merit pay recommendation is necessary. Continual dialogue between the supervisor and the employee about progress towards goals is essential.

TIME DEADLINES

a. Performance appraisal forms must be completed by May 15 of the prior contract year

b. Merit pay recommendations must be known at the completion of the evaluation process. (May 31)

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

Failure to meet any of items a-c defaults to the employee being awarded AT LEAST the average increase given to all contract staff. For example, in 1996, the default pay increase was 3%.

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

4. A supervisor's merit pay is contingent upon completing performance evaluations and merit pay recommendations for their staff on time.

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

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

7. All merit-eligible employees will be evaluated in their annual performance reviews as "meritorious" or "non-meritorious". Merit eligibility is determined by the job performance of an employee, as assessed by the Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal Form. Performing one's job at a satisfactory level and in a competent manner is the prerequisite for merit pay.

8. Any employee who receives a "non-meritorious" annual performance review will not qualify for a merit increase. In lieu of a merit increase, professional development moneys equal to the raise that would have been allocated to the individual should be made available to the department or academic unit for employee development, with priority given to assisting employees who have failed to qualify for a merit increment.

9. If the merit pool in a given year is Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) or less, merit-eligible employees will receive that same percentage increase in salary.

10. If the merit pool in a given year is more than COLA but less than or equal to COLA + 2%, it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

a. Fifty percent (50%) of the merit pool will be allocated as an equal percentage increase in salary to all merit-eligible employees.
b. The remaining fifty percent (50%) of the merit pool will be allocated to departments and academic units for recognition of merit-eligible employees whose level of performance exceeds departmental expectations as defined by its merit policies.

c. The remaining fifty percent (50%) of the merit pool will be allocated to departments and academic units for recognition of merit-eligible employees whose level of performance exceeds departmental expectations as defined by its merit policies.

11. If the total merit pool in a given year exceeds COLA + 2%, it will be allocated according to the following guidelines.

a. Fifty percent (50%) of the merit pool will be allocated as an equal percentage increase in salary to all merit-eligible employees.

b. Forty-five percent (45%) of the merit pool will be allocated to departments for recognition of merit-eligible employees whose level of performance exceeds departmental expectations as defined by its policies.

c. The remaining fifteen percent (5%) of the merit pool will be allocated to the area or division head for recognition of merit-eligible employees who have demonstrated significant achievements. An area or division head may choose to reallocate the funds to departments for distribution through their existing merit system or through some other method(s) for rewarding distinguished levels of performance by individuals, by groups or teams, and/or by departments.

DEFINITIONS:

Merit-eligible employee - An employee who is rated as meritorious in their performance review.

Quartile - 25% of the difference between the minimum and maximum salaries for a salary classification range. Example: salary range X has a minimum salary of $25,000 and a maximum of $37,000. The difference between the two endpoints is $12,000 and each quartile has a range of $3,000. Then,

Second quartile begins at $28,000
Third quartile begins at $31,000 (and $31,000 is the midpoint)
Fourth quartile begins at $34,000
Principles and Recommendations for a Performance-Based Merit System for Administrative Staff at Bowling Green State University

The Administrative Staff Council has reviewed the principles and recommendations for a performance-based merit system proposed by the Faculty Task Force on Employee Evaluation and Reward Policy. We are incorporating some principles enumerated in this document with appropriate modifications for Administrative Staff.

The Administrative Staff Council believes that a number of important principles must form the foundation for the periodic staff review process and for the equitable distribution of salary increment awards. The Council endorses the concept of a performance-based merit system for awarding employee salary increases provided such a system is fair, equitable, and firmly founded on these ten underlying principles. By "merit", the Council means a salary increment that is allotted for performance of duties that meets or exceeds unit expectations. The rationale for this definition is provided by the following ten principles for an effective merit system.

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

2. A salary system should be designed to promote internal salary equity (based upon the Mercer classification) as well as external equity (based upon salary comparisons among individuals in similar positions from similar universities, colleges or departments).

3. A performance-based merit system should include a component of peer-review when appropriate. Appropriateness will be determined by the supervisor and staff member in consultation.

4. This system should engender the type, quantity, and quality of performance that contributes to the achievement of institutional and unit missions and goals. The reward system also needs to recognize that there are often multiple paths that may be taken in support of missions and goals.

5. The process must insure that employees who have unit-approved individual variations of effort are reviewed and rewarded proportionately to their own approved percentage of effort distributions.

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

7. The process of review should provide employees with results and constructive feedback that enables them to develop professionally and to make improvements in performance.

8. Whenever resources are limited the merit system must respond to a more restricted set of institutional priorities in order to avoid trivializing the system by too thinly spreading and thus minimizing the impact of any incentive awards given.

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

10. A performance-based salary reward system should foster cooperation rather than antagonism among staff, should reward groups and teams as well as individuals for collaborative work performances, and should generate wide support and general satisfaction on the University campus.

Provided these ten principles are followed, the Administrative Staff Council recommends that Bowling Green State University adopt a performance-based merit reward system. The Council believes it is better to improve the existing system than to abandon it completely. Following are the specific recommendations for an employee performance-based merit system which is specific for Administrative Staff Council and which differs from the faculty proposals in some respects.

Recommendations

1. Funds should be made available on a regular, on-going basis to support raises for promotions, salary equity adjustments and salary adjustments deemed appropriate following comprehensive reviews of employee performance and salary. These funds should support the administration's commitment to move long term staff into the appropriate quartile of their salary range. These funds should not be considered a part of the annual merit pool.

Yet there needs to be a correlation between good performance and salary attributes that is unique to administrative staff. Specifically, the
Council believes that consecutive years of meritorious achievement warrants unique alterations:

a. Upon the completion of three successive years of meritorious assessment, an employee's salary shall be increased to the next quintile of their Mercer classification system. This movement can be repeated until the employee has reached the midpoint of their salary range. After the midpoint has been reached, regular merit rules apply.

b. Where ranking occurs, (i.e. junior, regular, senior) five successive years of meritorious assessment earns the next ranking for the employee.

c. After seven years of successive meritorious assessments, the employee is eligible for three year contracts.

2. For merit pay to increase productivity, it must be administered openly and reliably. Thus, changes in evaluation and merit pay criteria must be completed BEFORE the new contract year. This translates to a completion deadline of June 30 of the prior contract year. To ensure that employees can contest unfair merit pay assessments, a timely disclosure of the AMOUNT of the merit pay recommendation is necessary. Dialogue between the supervisor and the employee about progress towards goals is essential.

TIME DEADLINES

a. Performance appraisal forms must be completed by May 15 of the prior contract year

b. Merit pay recommendations must be known at the completion of the evaluation process. (May 31)

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

Failure to meet any of items a-c defaults to the employee being awarded AT LEAST the average increase given to all contract staff. For the raise of 7/1996, this would have meant that the default pay increase was 3%.

d. A supervisor will meet with an employee at mid-year for a dialogue on progress toward annual goals. The supervisor will document at that time an employee's performance which is falling below a satisfactory level.

3. Until a performance appraisal form is in use and its effectiveness has been measured, the merit pay portion of new raises should not exceed 40%. Without working documents for merit pay assessment, the handbook definitions are still in effect.

4. A supervisor's merit pay is contingent upon completing evaluations and merit pay recommendations for their staff on time.
5. Human Resources will review all annual performance evaluations and merit pay recommendations to ensure consistency and integrity.

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

7. All merit-eligible employees will be evaluated in their annual performance reviews as "non-meritorious" or "meritorious." Merit eligibility is determined by the job performance of an employee, as assessed by the Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal Form. Performing one's job at a satisfactory level and in a competent manner is the prerequisite for merit pay. Area-specific changes in criteria for merit must be approved by
   a) Administrative Staff Council; and
   b) Human Resources.

8. Any employee who receives a "non-meritorious" annual performance review will not qualify for a merit increase. In lieu of a merit increase, professional development moneys equal to the raise that would have been allocated to the individual should be made available to the department or academic unit for employee development, with priority given to assisting employees who have failed to qualify for a merit increment.

9. If the merit pool in a given year is three percent (3%) or less, merit-eligible employee who are rated as meritorious in their performance reviews will receive that same percentage raise in salary.

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

   A. Fifty percent (50%) of the merit pool will be allocated as an equal percentage increase in salary to all merit-eligible employees who are rated as meritorious in their performance reviews.

   B. The remaining fifty percent (50%) of the merit pool will be allocated to departments and academic units for recognition of merit-eligible employees whose level of performance exceeds department expectations as defined by its merit policies.
11. If the total merit pool in a given year exceeds five percent (5%), it will be allocated according to the following guidelines,

A. Fifty percent (50%) of the merit pool will be allocated as an equal percentage increase in salary to all merit-eligible employees who are rated as meritorious in their performance reviews.

B. Forty-five percent (45%) of the merit pool will be allocated to departments for recognition of merit-eligible employees whose level of performance exceeds department expectations as defined by its policies.

C. The remaining five percent (5%) of the merit pool will be allocated to the area or division head for recognition of merit-eligible employees who have demonstrated significant achievements. An area or division head may choose to reallocate the funds to departments for distribution through their existing merit system or through some other method(s) for rewarding distinguished levels of performance by individuals, by groups or teams, and/or by departments.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Deans
Vice Presidents
Hal Lunde, Chair, Faculty Senate
Joan Morgan, Chair, ASC

FROM: Charles P. Middleton
Provost and Vice President

RE: Committee on Dual Career Couples

March 31, 1997

Attached you will find a copy of the report of the Committee on Dual Career Couples which has completed its work and submitted several recommendations to me for my consideration. In order for these recommendations to receive wider discussion in the faculty and administrative staff, I am forwarding this document to you at this time. I ask that you and your colleagues review it thoroughly. I anticipate discussing it with you after you have had an opportunity to conduct that review.

Thank you for your assistance in developing a policy that will assist the University in the recruitment and retention of faculty and administrative staff who have the unique needs of the modern dual career couples.

Enclosure

cc: President Ribeau (with enclosure)
Dual Career Couples Committee Members
MEMORANDUM

To: Charles R. Middleton  
   Provost and Vice President

From: Committee on Dual Career Couples  
Peggy Giordano, Sociology (Chair)  
Marvin Belzer, Philosophy  
John Hayden, Mathematics and Statistics  
Beth Jakob, Biological Sciences  
Naomi Lee, Technology  
Mary Ann Roberton, HPER  
John Sampen, Performance Studies  
Norma Stickler, Provost/VPAA Office  
Paul Yon, Center for Archival Collections

Re: Recommendations of the Committee

The members of the dual career couples committee are in agreement that Bowling Green State University needs to be more supportive and pro-active regarding the needs of dual career couples. Increasingly, considerations about seeking and accepting employment have involved decisions concerning two careers. The committee analyzed written materials, brochures, and policy statements of other universities which have developed programs designed to address concerns of dual career couples. We also interviewed personnel at several institutions (Purdue, Oregon State, Minnesota, Nebraska, Arizona, and Pennsylvania State) who are involved with these programs. The interviews were designed to elicit more information about the scope of each university’s program, the types of individuals served, and the perceived impact/success of each program. We also attempted to determine whether there had been any negative consequences stemming from the implementation of these programs. Finally, the committee reviewed recommendations of an earlier (1989) BGSU committee which had received a similar charge.

The interviews with other institutions suggested that these types of programs can be successful. The programs varied widely and received differing levels of financial/personnel support, but it appeared that a critical variable relating to a program’s success was the active encouragement and support of top-level administrators. Given your own assessment regarding the desirability of developing specific strategies in this area, and the enthusiasm of staff at these other institutions, the committee is encouraged about the potential of a dual career program at BGSU.
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON DUAL CAREER COUPLES

RATIONALE

To become more responsive to the needs of today's university employees, the Committee on Dual Career Couples recommends that Bowling Green State University institute a policy to accommodate the unique employment concerns of career couples. Such a policy would serve to strengthen BGSU's recruitment potential and increase the likelihood of attracting the most qualified applicants for future positions. Further, by alleviating the transitional stress of worrying about partners' career opportunities, such a policy would contribute to the optimal performance of recently hired personnel.

Not only would such a policy be an advantage in the recruitment of new faculty and administrative staff, but it could also serve to retain those employees who might otherwise choose to leave. Having both partners employed in meaningful work decreases the incentive to look elsewhere for employment.

In addition to the benefits to the individual employees involved and the departments that recruit them, the university as a whole benefits from the positive affirmative action statement made by this policy. BGSU is more likely to attract female candidates if they know that the partner's search for employment will be facilitated. Similarly, by assisting the search of female partners of male candidates, we potentially increase the number of women on campus. In both instances we have made a positive move in the balance of male to female faculty and administrative staff members.

SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM

1. The Committee recommends that BGSU implement a program designed to assist and support the employment search of partners of recruited faculty or administrative staff. Although some university programs provide an array of other services (e.g., assistance with the search for housing), Committee members agreed that the primary emphasis should be placed on the employment concerns of the accompanying partner.

2. The Committee concluded that the program should emphasize partners of newly recruited faculty/administrative staff. However, the partners of existing employees may also benefit from these services on a case by case basis as resources permit. Thus, the program ideally would enhance our efforts with regard to both recruitment and retention of outstanding BGSU faculty/administrative staff. Given the limited resources likely to be available, the Committee suggested further that partners of graduate students or classified staff would not be included within the program's scope.

3. The services of this program should be open to partners as they are defined by the recruited faculty member or administrator. Therefore, terms such as "spouse" or "family" should be avoided, and more inclusive language should be adopted for use in connection with the program (e.g., couple or partner).

4. Employers within BGSU or the extended business community will not be asked to create positions that do not support the University or department's mission or hire those who are unqualified. Employers will not be asked to change hiring policies and will retain the right to make their own decisions.
NATURE OF THE PROGRAM

A position of Coordinator of the Dual Career Program should be created and funded. At several institutions (e.g., Purdue, Nebraska) this has consisted of a 1/2 time position and appropriate clerical support. At the University of Minnesota a graduate student (from Counseling or a related area) was also assigned to work closely with the program coordinator. Our program should have a close connection with the Office of Academic Affairs (in terms of the physical location of the program and/or the reporting hierarchy). The Committee felt that this arrangement would have a symbolic value in enhancing the perceived legitimacy of the new program and its Coordinator; however, even aside from such considerations, Academic Affairs is likely the most appropriate unit.

The Program Coordinator will need to develop strategies to assist two different types of partners: a) partners who wish to obtain a position at BGSU and b) partners who seek other types of employment (e.g., in business, law, primary/secondary education or at another university). Interviews with staff at other universities suggest that a majority of the partners of new hires involve the second type of employment. Some activities of the Coordinator will apply in either type of situation, but there are some issues unique to each type:

Off-campus Positions

The Dual Career Program should be an important resource for the professional partner seeking non-academic employment. The Coordinator, an external liaison, should develop a network of formal and informal contacts so as to be prepared to match professional expertise with organizations, businesses, schools, and agencies in the region. The formal contacts could build on existing programs such as the "Relocation Assistance To Spouses" program developed by the Employers Association of Toledo. The importance of informal networks was also emphasized repeatedly in our interviews. These networks include alumni, University personnel with unique external relationships (e.g., faculty in the College of Education who can assist in partners' searches for teaching positions in elementary/secondary education), and networks of peer professionals. Using the network, the Coordinator will initiate correspondence with appropriate agencies, distribute resumes, and assist in arrangements for the partner to interview with identified potential employers. In addition to this critical networking role, the Coordinator may also direct the partner to other campus resources/services (e.g., Jerome Library's Center for Career Resources). The Coordinator should develop a thorough understanding of these other resources, in order to avoid duplication of effort. We recommend that the Dual Career Program should continue to offer support in career planning and placement services for a period of time (e.g., one year) after the couple has relocated to Bowling Green.

It is also important that BGSU attempt to establish creative relationships with business, governmental agencies and other universities that will increase the probability of finding or developing suitable employment for partners. An example: a person might work 1/2 time as an adjunct professor at BGSU and 1/2 time for Wood County or the City of Perrysburg on problems associated with rapid population growth. Creative affiliations of this type, which can be established only if we build the necessary relationships within the community and then aggressively pursue and support the development of path-breaking jobs, also would establish valuable external affiliations for BGSU within the community.

On behalf of academic partners seeking employment outside of BGSU, we recommend that the University President, Provost, Deans, and the Program Coordinator attempt to establish innovative reciprocal relationships with other Universities and Colleges in the region. These relationships will increase the probability that an academic partner will be successful in finding suitable employment.
when placement at BGSU is not feasible. Such relationships no doubt will be even more
complicated than those involving different units on campus. Nonetheless, we believe that BGSU
should lead in aggressively attempting to establish such relationships with the institutions within
commuting distance, including the University of Michigan, Eastern Michigan University, the
University of Toledo, the Medical College of Ohio, and the smaller universities and colleges in the
region.

On-Campus Positions

The successful coordination of a recruitment effort involving two University positions is
complicated and difficult to accomplish "politically." Nevertheless, if we become more responsive
and proactive in this regard, we could greatly enhance BGSU's ability to attract and retain
outstanding faculty and administrative staff. Therefore, the Committee favors the idea of devoting
increased attention to the employment concerns of the accompanying partner, but believes that in
these cases the active support of chairs, relevant deans and the VPAA will be required. In
addition, to facilitate such hires, constituent leaders should attempt to educate the existing
employees about the general desirability of working together across units. It is necessary to change
norms and attitudes as well as to implement specific procedures which ensure that such cases are
handled in an equitable manner.

Some incentives and resources are needed if this aspect of the program is to be successful.
University units value their decision-making autonomy and do not wish to give anything up in
order to facilitate another unit's hiring activities. Therefore, the unit involving the partner must
first make a decision about the qualifications and areas of expertise of the partner. If it is
determined that the candidate has outstanding qualifications which fit well with that department's
long term goals and objectives, one of several strategies could be implemented, depending on the
circumstances involved:

1. Regular Positions. At some universities (e.g., Kansas) several positions are "held back" at the
Provost level with the expectation that these may be needed to facilitate dual career hires. Another
strategy would be to examine a given department's retirement patterns. If one or more retirements
are likely to occur within a reasonable period of time, the VPAA could fund the partner on a
temporary basis, until such time as a position is made available through retirement or resignation.

2. Bridge Funding. Every potential faculty member would like a secure, tenure-track position,
however, the University may be able to provide some level of assistance/employment short of this.
A Faculty Fellowship program could be implemented. For example, the University of Nebraska-
Lincoln offers a one-year stipend of $15,000 plus benefits to its faculty fellows. These are funded
2/3 by the Dual Career office and 1/3 by the relevant Dean. This would be a relatively low-cost
way of providing a home base to the partner, as well as a degree of academic legitimacy. The
University of Minnesota has also developed a program designed to provide bridge funding for the
accompanying partner. They fund the partners at a level commensurate with their qualifications,
and gradually reduce this amount over a 3 year period. Bridge funding allows partners a longer
window of opportunity in which to secure employment—either with the initial "home base" or
elsewhere.

3. Other Options. Department chairs should be open to discussions regarding the availability of
laboratory and/or office space, temporary teaching assignments, or to exploring other ways in
which their department can facilitate the partner's employment needs. It is recognized that these
will not always be available, but it is very important to communicate with the partner about any
short or long term prospects for employment. If the chairs and directors could receive some funds
from their Dean or the VPAA for these purposes, they would obviously have additional motivation
to work something out.
Other Recommendations for Implementation

1. Advertisements for positions should state that Bowling Green State University is responsive to the needs of dual career couples. This initial statement "opens the door" early for faculty to discuss issues that may relate to their partner's employment needs. This will allow Bowling Green adequate lead time to assist partners in finding employment as quickly as possible.

2. A brochure describing the services offered to dual career couples should be developed and sent to candidates as soon as possible during the hiring process. This is another way to facilitate an early discussion of these issues.

3. Information about the Dual Career Program should be available on University and department web pages.

4. The above suggestions should be discussed with faculty and administrative staff (e.g., Faculty Senate and Administrative Staff Council) in order to get additional ideas and input.

5. The program will undoubtedly go through several phases. Initially, some attention will need to be directed to dual career issues facing current faculty; eventually the emphasis should shift to new hires. In addition, personnel at other universities noted that it takes time for networks and effective contacts to develop. Therefore, the program should not be abandoned after a short period if it is not immediately successful in all instances.

6. We recognize that not all dual career issues can be solved through the use of one of the above-mentioned suggestions. Although such strategies as shared positions (or 1/2 times positions; leaves without pay) are beyond the scope of the current committee, there is a real need to become more open to the creative use of faculty and staff line/resources in order to attract and retain the best personnel.
Principles and Recommendations for a Performance-Based Merit System for Administrative Staff at Bowling Green State University

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

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

2. A salary system should be designed to promote internal salary equity (based upon the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan) as well as external salary equity (based upon salary comparisons among individuals in similar positions from similar universities, colleges or departments).

3. A performance-based merit system may include a component of peer-review when appropriate. Appropriateness will be determined jointly by the supervisor and staff member.

4. A performance-based merit system should engender the type, quantity, and quality of performance that contributes to the achievement of institutional and unit missions and goals. The reward system also needs to recognize that there are often multiple paths that may be taken in support of missions and goals.
5. A merit system needs to establish a clear connection between employee performance and reward. A department or unit must clearly identify the normal expectations and performance standards that are expected of all staff. Through this process, indicators must be identified for performances that fall below standard expectations for merit as well as those types of achievements that surpass the unit's standard expectations.

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

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

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

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

10. Both the performance based merit system and the performance appraisal process will be reviewed annually by ASC.

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

1. Each year the University should first review and address those employees whose salaries are less than the midpoint of their salary grade, to identify and rectify potential salary inequities. Funds should be made available on a regular, on-going basis to support raises for promotions, salary equity adjustments, market adjustments and salary adjustments deemed appropriate following comprehensive reviews of employee performance and salary. These funds should support the administration's commitment to move staff into the appropriate quartile of their salary range. These funds should not be considered a part of the annual merit pool.

2. Meritorious performance should be rewarded:
   a. Upon the completion of five years of meritorious assessments, an employee's salary shall be increased by at least more than their proposed merit increase.
   b. Upon the completion of seven years of meritorious assessments in the same salary grade, any employee whose salary is below the midpoint of their assigned grade in the Administrative Salary Compensation Plan, will have their salary increased at least to the midpoint.

3. To increase productivity, a merit system must be administered openly and reliably. Thus, changes in evaluation and merit pay criteria must be completed BEFORE the new contract year, i.e. before June 30 of the prior contract year. To ensure that employees can contest unfair merit pay assessments, a timely disclosure of the AMOUNT of the merit pay recommendation is necessary. Continual dialogue between the supervisor and the employee about progress towards goals is essential.
TIME DEADLINES

a. Performance appraisal forms must be completed by May 15 of the prior contract year.

b. Merit pay recommendations must be known at the completion of the evaluation process. (May 31)

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

Failure to meet any of items a-c defaults to the employee being awarded AT LEAST the average increase given to all contract staff. For e.g. in 1996, the default pay increase was 3%.

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

4. A supervisor's merit pay is contingent upon completing performance evaluations and merit pay recommendations for their staff on time.

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

6. The annual merit allocation should be based upon the meritorious accomplishments over the most recent three-year period on a rolling basis, i.e., each year new information is added to the file for the most recent year and information for the oldest year is eliminated from the file. This will help to reduce inequities that can result from differences in the merit funds available each year and from fluctuations in performance that may occur from year to year.
7. All employees will be evaluated in their annual performance reviews to determine their eligibility for merit. Merit eligibility is determined by the job performance of an employee, as assessed by the Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal Form. Performing one’s job at a satisfactory level and in a competent manner is the basis for merit pay. Given that an employee will qualify for a merit increase by meeting, as well as exceeding, unit standards, it is expected that very few employees will fail to qualify for merit.

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

9. For recommendations (9a) and (9b) below, the threshold shall be the greater of 3% or Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA).

   a. If the total merit pool in a given year is the threshold or less, all administrative staff employees who qualify for merit by meeting or exceeding departmental expectations in their annual performance reviews will receive the same percentage increase in salary.

   b. If the merit pool in a given year is more than the threshold, the amount over the threshold will be allocated to departments and academic units for recognition of merit-eligible employees whose level of performance exceeds departmental expectations as defined by its merit policies.
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Principles and Recommendations for a Performance-Based Merit System for Administrative Staff at Bowling Green State University

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

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

2. A salary system should be designed to promote internal salary equity (based upon the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan) as well as external salary equity (based upon salary comparisons among individuals in similar positions from similar universities, colleges or departments).

3. A performance-based merit system may include a component of peer-review when appropriate. Appropriateness will be determined jointly by the supervisor and staff member.
4. A performance-based merit system should engender the type, quantity, and quality of performance that contributes to the achievement of institutional and unit missions and goals. The reward system also needs to recognize that there are often multiple paths that may be taken in support of missions and goals.

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

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

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

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

9. A performance-based MERIT OR salary reward system should foster cooperation among staff, should reward groups and teams as well as individuals for collaborative work performances, and should generate wide support and general satisfaction on the University campus.

10. Both the performance based merit system and the performance appraisal process will be reviewed annually by ASC.
Provided these ten principles are followed, the Administrative Staff Council recommends that Bowling Green State University adopt a performance-based merit reward system. The Council believes it is better to improve the existing system than to abandon it completely. What follows are the specific recommendations for an employee performance-based merit system which is specific to Administrative Staff members.

Recommendations

1. Funds should be made available on a regular, on-going basis to support raises for promotions, salary equity adjustments, market adjustments and salary adjustments deemed appropriate following comprehensive FIVE YEAR reviews of employee performance and salary. These funds should support the administration's commitment to move staff into the appropriate quartile of their salary range. These funds should not be considered a part of the annual merit pool.

2. Meritorious performance should be rewarded:

   a. Upon the completion of three years of meritorious assessments, an employee's salary shall be increased to the next quartile of their assigned grade in the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan.

   b. Upon the completion of seven years of meritorious assessments in the same salary grade, any employee's salary which is below the

(proposed new version of 2a) - this from Middleton. The thrust is to guarantee additional merit pay to all staff at 5 year review intervals, ensuring the University is significantly addressing just 20% of staff each year. The prior clause (2a) was faulty in that extremely meritorious staff could already be in the next quartile after a three year period, so would not get any increase. The five year review cycle is Middleton's. The percentage increase has not been discussed.

   a. Upon the completion of five years of meritorious assessments, an employee's salary shall be increased by 3% more than their proposed merit increase.

   (Clause 2b added to enable keeping some version of salary grade movement in the document.)
midpoint of their assigned grade in the Administrative Salary Compensation Plan, will have their salary increased at least to the midpoint.

\[\text{annually}\]

c. After FIVE [[three]] consecutive years of meritorious assessments, the employee shall be granted a renewable FIVE [[three]] year contract with provisions for annual salary increases.

3. To increase productivity, a merit system must be administered openly and reliably. Thus, changes in evaluation and merit pay criteria must be completed BEFORE the new contract year, i.e. before June 30 of the prior contract year. To ensure that employees can contest unfair merit pay assessments, a timely disclosure of the AMOUNT of the merit pay recommendation is necessary. Continual dialogue between the supervisor and the employee about progress towards goals is essential.

**TIME DEADLINES**

a. Performance appraisal forms must be completed by May 15 of the prior contract year

b. Merit pay recommendations must be known at the completion of the evaluation process. (May 31)

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

Failure to meet any of items a-c defaults to the employee being awarded AT LEAST the average increase given to all contract staff. For e.g. in 1996, the default pay increase was 3%.

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

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

6. The annual merit allocation should be based upon the meritorious accomplishments over the most recent three-year period on a rolling basis, i.e., each year new information is added to the file for the most recent year and INFORMATION FOR the oldest year is eliminated from the file. This will help TO reduce inequities that can result from differences in the merit funds available each year AND FROM FLUCTUATIONS IN PERFORMANCE THAT MAY OCCUR FROM YEAR TO YEAR.

7. All employees will be evaluated in their annual performance reviews as "meritorious" or "non-meritorious". Merit eligibility is determined by the job performance of an employee, as assessed by the Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal Form. Performing one's job at a satisfactory level and in a competent manner is the basis for merit pay.]

7. All employees will be evaluated in their annual performance reviews TO DETERMINE THEIR ELIGIBILITY FOR MERIT. Merit eligibility is determined by the job performance of an employee, as assessed by the Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal Form. Performing one's job at a satisfactory level and in a competent manner is the basis for merit pay. GIVEN THAT AN EMPLOYEE WILL QUALIFY FOR A MERIT INCREASE BY MEETING, AS WELL AS EXCEEDING, UNIT STANDARDS, IT IS EXPECTED THAT VERY FEW EMPLOYEES WILL FAIL TO QUALIFY FOR MERIT.

8. Any employee who DOES NOT QUALIFY FOR MERIT IN THEIR annual performance review SHOULD NOT RECEIVE a SALARY increase. A professional development FUND equal to the UNIFORM PERCENTAGE
raise that would have been allocated to the individual, should be made available to the department or academic unit for employee development, with priority given to assisting employees who have failed to qualify for a merit increment.

9. If the TOTAL merit pool in a given year is Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) or less, ALL ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF employees WHO QUALIFY FOR MERIT BY MEETING OR EXCEEDING DEPARTMENT/UNIT EXPECTATIONS IN THEIR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWS will receive the same percentage increase in salary.

10. If the merit pool in a given year is more than COLA but less than or equal to COLA + 2%, the amount over COLA will be allocated to departments and academic units for recognition of merit-eligible employees whose level of performance exceeds departmental expectations as defined by its merit policies.

11. If the total merit pool in a given year exceeds COLA + 2%, the amount over COLA will be allocated according to the following guidelines.

a. Ninety percent (90%) of the amount over COLA will be allocated to departments for recognition of merit-eligible employees whose level of performance exceeds departmental expectations as defined by its policies.

b. The remaining ten percent (10%) of the amount over COLA will be allocated to the area or division head for recognition of merit-eligible employees who have demonstrated significant achievements. An area or division head may choose to reallocate the funds to departments for distribution through their existing merit system or through some other method(s) for rewarding distinguished levels of performance by individuals, by groups or teams, and/or by departments.
Principles and Policies/Procedures of the Performance-Based Merit System for Faculty at Bowling Green State University

The faculty and administration of Bowling Green State University believe that the following principles must form the foundation for the periodic process of faculty review and the equitable distribution of faculty salary increments. The concept of a performance-based merit system for awarding faculty salary increments is endorsed, provided that such a system is fair, equitable, and firmly grounded on these principles. In this policy, “merit” is defined as a salary increment that is allotted for the performance of duties that meets or exceeds department or academic unit expectations. The rationale for this definition is provided by the following principles:

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

2. A salary system should be designed to promote internal equity (based upon salary comparisons within the University, college or department) as well as external equity (based upon salary comparisons among individuals from similar universities, colleges or departments). Internal salary equity promotes performance, whereas external salary equity promotes retention.

3. A performance-based merit system should be based on a collegial peer review process that places primary responsibility on the collegiate department or academic unit and that requires careful evaluation of performance utilizing the collective best judgment of faculty.

4. This THE MERIT system should engender the type, quantity, and quality of performance that contributes to the achievement of institutional UNIVERSITY, college, and departmental missions and goals. The reward MERIT system also needs to recognize that there are often multiple paths that may be taken in support of missions and goals.

5. The department or academic unit approved allocations of effort and evaluative criteria should be reflected in its merit review process. That process must ensure that faculty who have unit-approved individual variations of effort are reviewed and rewarded proportionately to their own approved percentage of effort distributions.
6. A merit system needs to establish a clear connection between faculty performance and reward. A department or academic unit must clearly identify the normal expectations and performance standards for teaching, research/creative activity, and service that are expected of all faculty IN THE DEPARTMENT OR UNIT. Through this process, THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT must identify indicators for performances that fall below standard expectations for merit as well as those types of achievements that surpass the unit's standard expectations OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT.

7. The process of PERFORMANCE review should provide faculty members with results and constructive feedback that enables them to develop professionally and to make improvements in THEIR performance.

8. Whenever resources are limited, the merit system must respond to a more restricted set of institutional priorities in order to avoid trivializing the system by too-thinly spreading TOO THINLY, and thus minimizing, the impact of any MERIT incentive awards given AS INCENTIVES.

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

10. A performance-based MERIT OR salary reward system should foster cooperation rather than antagonism among faculty, should reward groups and teams as well as individuals for collaborative work performance(s), and should generate wide support and general satisfaction on the University campus ES.

Bowling Green State University is committed to follow the foregoing ten principles, and hereby, adopts a performance-based merit reward system for its faculty as outlined BY THE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES LISTED below:

1. The revised THIS merit policy should SHALL not NEITHER be implemented retroactively-NOR IN THE MIDDLE OF A CALENDAR YEAR. It should take effect-no earlier than the department/unit recommendations in 1999 for the 1999-2000 academic year. SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED AT THE BEGINNING OF THE CALENDAR YEAR COMMENCING ON JANUARY 1, 1998. In the meantime, faculty in each academic unit should determine the means of implementation in that unit. All faculty must be aware of the revisions in department standards and processes sufficiently in advance of implementation to understand the implications of those revisions and to adjust their performance accordingly.
2. Funds should be made available on a regular ongoing basis to support raises for promotions in rank, salary equity AND MARKET adjustments, and salary adjustments deemed appropriate following comprehensive five-year reviews of faculty performance and salary. These funds should not be considered a part of the annual merit pool FOR CONTINUING FACULTY SALARY INCREMENTS. The merit pool is the product of the total salaries of the continuing faculty times the percentage salary increase approved by the Board of Trustees.

3. All faculty should receive an annual performance review with informative written feedback provided to them in a timely manner. Faculty have a right to expect that their annual reviews accurately reflect their actual workload responsibilities, assigned duties, and percentage allocations of effort.

4. WITH THE EXCEPTION OF EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW, the same performance criteria used in tenure and promotion should be used for annual merit review, but the number of performance indicators and the amount of evidence submitted to demonstrate performance will not be as comprehensive, AND THEY SHOULD BE CONSISTENT WITH THOSE CRITERIA FOUND IN THE ACADEMIC CHARTER (SEE CHARTER SECTION B-1.C & B-1.D). A faculty member’s review should reflect the agreed upon allocation of that faculty member’s efforts. External PEER reviews of faculty should not be used for purposes of the annual merit review OR CONTRACT RENEWAL.

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

6. Normally each department or academic unit shall receive the FULL amount available for merit as a percent of the total salaries of the continuing faculty in that department or unit. Two exceptions may be made:

A. The faculty of a school or college may decide, with the approval of its dean, to allocate merit on a school-wide or college-wide basis rather than on a department or academic unit basis if they unanimously decide that such an approach would be more appropriate.

B. In the case of a department or academic unit found to be particularly unproductive as determined by a systematic review of its quality that includes external evaluations, a dean may seek the approval of the Provost to reduce the merit funds available to that unit to less than the percentage amount that would have been available to the unit from the merit pool and
7. Continuing faculty MEMBERS should WILL be evaluated in their annual performance reviews AT THE DEPARTMENT OR ACADEMIC UNIT LEVEL to determine THEIR eligibility for merit. A THE department/unit should SHALL recognize and reward levels of performance that meet or exceed its standard expectation. This recognition and reward should SHALL be based on A THE department/unit's policies OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT and THE ACADEMIC CHARTER criteria, with appropriate indicators, which establish standards of performance that determine whether the faculty member: (a) qualifies FOR MERIT BY MEETING OR EXCEEDING DEPARTMENT/UNIT STANDARDS, or (b) does not qualify for merit. GIVEN THAT A FACULTY MEMBER WILL QUALIFY FOR A MERIT INCREASE BY MEETING, AS WELL AS EXCEEDING, DEPARTMENT/UNIT STANDARDS, IT IS EXPECTED THAT VERY FEW FACULTY WILL FAIL TO QUALIFY FOR MERIT.

8. If the total merit pool for continuing faculty SALARY INCREMENTS in a given year is three percent (3%) or less, all CONTINUING faculty who qualify for merit BY MEETING OR EXCEEDING DEPARTMENT/UNIT EXPECTATIONS in their annual performance reviews will receive the same percentage increase IN salary.

9. If the total merit pool for continuing faculty SALARY INCREMENTS in a given year is more than three percent (3%) but less than or equal to five percent (5%), it should WILL be allocated according to the following guidelines:

   A. Fifty percent (50%) THREE PERCENT (3%) OF THE TOTAL SALARIES OF THE CONTINUING FACULTY shall SHALL be allocated as an equal A THREE percentage (3%) increase in salary to all faculty who MEET DEPARTMENT/UNIT EXPECTATIONS AND THEREBY qualify for merit in BASED ON their annual performance reviews.

   B. The remaining fifty percent (50%) should DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TOTAL MERIT POOL AND THE THREE PERCENT (3%) OF THE TOTAL SALARIES OF THE CONTINUING FACULTY SHALL be allocated to departments and academic units for recognition of those faculty whose level of performance exceeds department or academic unit expectations as defined by the department/unit's merit policy OF THE DEPARTMENT OR UNIT.
10. If the total merit pool in a given year exceeds five percent (5%) or more, it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

A. Fifty percent (50%) should SIXTY PERCENT (60%) SHALL be allocated to departments and academic units to be used as an equal percentage increase in salary to all faculty IN THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT who MEET DEPARTMENT/UNIT EXPECTATIONS AND THEREBY qualify for merit in their annual performance reviews.

B. Forty-five percent (45%) should FORTY PERCENT (40%) SHALL be allocated to departments and academic units for recognition AND REWARD of those faculty whose level of performance exceeds department or academic unit expectations as defined by the department’s/unit’s merit policy.

C. The remaining five percent (5%) will be allocated to the deans of colleges for recognition of those faculty who have demonstrated significant achievements in teaching, research, creative performance, and service. A dean may choose to allocate the funds to departments or academic units for distribution through their existing merit system or may use some other method(s) for rewarding distinguished levels of performance by individuals, by groups or teams, and/or by departments or academic units.

11. Any faculty member who does not qualify for merit in their annual performance review should not receive a salary increase. A professional development fund equal to the uniform percentage raise that would have been allocated to that individual, HAD HE/SHE BEEN DEEMED TO MEET BUT NOT EXCEED DEPARTMENTAL/UNIT EXPECTATIONS, shall be made available to him or her. THIS FUND SHALL be used exclusively for professional development activities TO IMPROVE HIS/HER PERFORMANCE TO A LEVEL WHICH WILL MEET OR EXCEED THE PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT (AS DEFINED BY THE MERIT POLICY OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT), AND THEREBY, QUALIFY HIM/HER FOR MERIT IN SUBSEQUENT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND REWARDS FOR MERIT.

TO: Administrative staff  
FROM: Personnel Welfare Committee ASC  

Attached for your information are the results of a survey comparing other Ohio universities on issues that are 'near and dear' to contract staff at BGSU. To determine how issues such as merit, longevity, salary caps, pay classification systems, etc. are addressed at other universities, PWC surveyed six of these institutions. Reading this document will provide you with an understanding of what other universities are doing in these areas. A brief summary follows:

* Most have 100% merit. Across the board is reserved for union members.
* All but OSU have salary classification systems
* Only half the universities have a standardized evaluation tool, but nearly all tie merit to performance
* Two of the six have salary caps
* Three of six have an aim of getting an employee to the midpoint of their salary range within a prescribed number of years, or competency level
* Only one of the universities has a cost of living adjustment

Please direct comments and questions to your ASC representative.
## A Comparison of Ohio’s State Universities on Merit and Salary Classification for Administrative Staff

**Part 1**  
February 21, 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Akron</th>
<th>Cincinnati</th>
<th>Miami</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you have merit?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How does merit work?</td>
<td>A pool of money based on X% is allocated to units. Units allocated based on whatever mechanism they choose.</td>
<td>Merit is allocated to units 0-8% can be allocated. Department decides mechanism.</td>
<td>Available pool determined by V.P. Business &amp; Finance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How long has merit been in place?</td>
<td>At least since 1979. Became a state u. in 1960's. Assumes merit's existence since that time.</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>At least 7 years (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What % of pay raise is merit/across the board?</td>
<td>100% Merit</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Recently its been 2%. (In addition to merit, Miami has annually awarded equity increases, recently between 2-3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is the process used for negotiating this %?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is % of merit/across board same every year?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How frequently is merit given? How determined?</td>
<td>Once a year, depending on financial situation.</td>
<td>Annual, except the year of financial problems</td>
<td>Once a year, depending on financial situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Miami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>What is criteria used to determine amt merit pay?</td>
<td>Each unit/area has its own method or procedure.</td>
<td>Supervisor/manager may decide how much of the available departmental pool will be awarded each employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None. Each department decides own process. Some do across the board. Have a university form, few use it. Departments decide--discretion, no consistency, no evaluation form consistency. Some don't. Lots of departments across the board merit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Is merit tied to performance evaluations?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In most cases, but no appraisal tool used in many departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each does own. Have form, not used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Is merit given as bonus or rolled into base salary?</td>
<td>Base salary</td>
<td>Base salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Base salary</td>
<td>Base salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Is there classification system for contract staff?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>How long has system been in place?</td>
<td>Since 1979; for position by grade. Does not deal with annual salary review process.</td>
<td>Not definite, at least 7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>How satisfied is the staff with the system?</td>
<td>Not satisfied. In process of revision.</td>
<td>Frustrated with the current system. Uneasy about what impact Mercer results will have on establishing another system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is OK; functional, needs to be updated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>What is the process for moving from grade to grade?</td>
<td>Promotion and job audit program (based on a point factor system)</td>
<td>Promotion certainly, but not sure what other criteria may be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job families, not grades Can move to Sr. level Dept. recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Miami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. What happens when reach top of pay grade? Do staff get merit?</td>
<td>No salary caps so doesn’t affect merit. However, expects to have salary caps in future for adm. staff only.</td>
<td>At top can’t receive more except by merit</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Given staff receives average merit pay, how long to move from minimum to maximum? To midpoint? First quartile?</td>
<td>Doesn’t know; has never tracked information</td>
<td>No set time</td>
<td>Not sure. Intermediate ranges not determined yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Are there rules for progression through ranges (i.e., longevity, performance)?</td>
<td>No. Years of service was not considered when the classification system was put in place in 1979.</td>
<td>Not ranges Job families they progress through</td>
<td>Not yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Does pay range move with each across board increase?</td>
<td>Salary ranges do move. However, last year there wasn’t an increase made to the salary ranges. Two years ago there was a 2% increase.</td>
<td>No across the board increases</td>
<td>Not yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. What determines how much pay ranges move?</td>
<td>The President and Board make all decisions on salary range movements and on the %.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>The Board makes all final financial decisions. Mercer will certainly impact the movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. How often are wage assessment surveys done?</td>
<td>Don’t know, but internal surveys have been done.</td>
<td>Benchmarks usually done annually. Special market families are looked at more often such as computer services.</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Miami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>What external groups are assessments compared against?</td>
<td>No external benchmarking.</td>
<td>Didn't ask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>What changes have occurred based on results of assessments?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Is there cost-of-living adjustment?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Called the equity pool at Miami. Generally 2-3% given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>How is amount &amp; frequency determined?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.P. Business &amp; Finance annually designates an amount available for two pools (equity &amp; merit). The Board votes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>What happens when reach top of pay grade? Do staff get cost-of-living?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No cost of living, can add merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not yet determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Sending copies of documents</td>
<td>Admin. Staff handbook pay range scale performance evaluation form when revised, information related to pay classification</td>
<td>No handbook, sending other forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will send whatever can be gather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Send our final documents to Miami.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ohio State</th>
<th>Ohio University</th>
<th>Toledo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you have merit?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes. Goal is to develop a quantifiable merit performance appraisal system over the next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How does merit work?</td>
<td>Broad banding--gives more flexibility to each chair/dean. The broad banding will not withstand a fed labor audit as well as “microboxes” but OSU believes that it will handle a large institution better.</td>
<td>A pool of money is determined by the BOT. The average amount is set at X%. Dept. Dir. or chairs are given a range from 2%-7% that they can assign.</td>
<td>A pool of money, based on X% of the unit’s salary pool, is allocated to the unit. Units allocate merit as they choose to individuals who earn a satisfactory or better performance evaluation during a given year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How long has merit been in place?</td>
<td>Since 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>Since 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What % of pay raise is merit/across the board?</td>
<td>Only unions get across the board . . . everyone else 100% merit (last year 4%, provost had additional 1%; 4% year before)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is the process used for negotiating this %?</td>
<td>Administrative Senate recommends % but BOT rarely agrees</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel Office makes salary % increase recommendation to the President and the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is % of merit/across board same every year?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ohio State</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ohio University</strong></td>
<td><strong>Toledo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>How frequently is merit given? How determined?</td>
<td>Once per year (if a salary is in the bottom half of pay scale, mid-year is possible)</td>
<td>Once a year depending on financial situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>What is criteria used to determine amount merit pay?</td>
<td>Evaluation and goal achievement</td>
<td>Satisfactory or better performance evaluation leads to merit increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reviews all evaluations and merit increases to ensure merit is distributed fairly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Is merit given as bonus or rolled into base salary?</td>
<td>One time bonus might be used for relatively high paid staff</td>
<td>Base salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>How long has system been in place?</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Since 1994, a performance management system is in place for unclassified positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>How satisfied is the staff with the system?</td>
<td>When they publicized their intent to move away from any across-the-board raises, they conducted many seminar on campus--and received only 15 letters against moving to 100% merit</td>
<td>Fairly satisfied. Very few appeals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>What is the process for moving from grade to grade?</td>
<td>Appeal audit promotion</td>
<td>Promotion and/or position job re-analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>What happens when reach top of pay grade? Do staff get merit?</td>
<td>Dept. Head or chair may appeal to V.P. to waive cap (usually this done)</td>
<td>Guidelines call for salaries to be frozen at the top of a pay grade and employees are &quot;red-lined&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Given staff receives average merit pay, how long to move from minimum to maximum? To midpoint? First quartile?</td>
<td>No assumption about getting to maximum. Aim is to get to midpoint.</td>
<td>2.5 years to 1st quartile 5 years to midpoint (longer to maximum, not a designated time period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Are there rules for progression through ranges (i.e., longevity, performance)?</td>
<td>Movement is based on how good budgets look.</td>
<td>Performance is the primary guide for progression. Equity is a factor also.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ohio State</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ohio University</strong></td>
<td><strong>Toledo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Does pay range move with each across board increase?</td>
<td>1/3 to 1/2 of normal pay raise (last year, this meant that the pay scales moved up 2%, pay raise was 4%)</td>
<td>Pay range moves 50% of merit pool</td>
<td>No, but pay ranges are re-examined every 2 years by the Personnel Office, who recommends to the President and the Board that the ranges be increased by X%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. What determines how much pay ranges move?</td>
<td>BOT and Admin. make decision</td>
<td>On an as-needed basis, for individual positions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. How often are wage assessment surveys done?</td>
<td>Every 5 years</td>
<td>At least every two years, for salary ranges. Director of Compensation and Benefits monitors institution's salaries both from an internal and external perspective annually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. What external groups are assessments compared against?</td>
<td>The groups chosen depend on the occupation. For academic advising, they compare to other Big Ten schools. For computing, to central Ohio business.</td>
<td>CUPA and possibly other market studies</td>
<td>CUPA, Bureau of Labor Statistics, IUC and MAC school salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. What changes have occurred based on results of assessments?</td>
<td>Some salary have been adjusted, both up and down</td>
<td>Competitive market adjustments for individual positions and the entire salary grade structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Is there cost-of-living adjustment?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>How is amt &amp; frequency determined?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Personnel monitors external salary guidelines to ensure Toledo’s salary ranges are competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>What happens when reach top of pay grade? Do staff get cost-of-living?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Sending copies of documents</td>
<td>Pay range scale portion of Adm. Handbook</td>
<td>Copies of pay grades, of performance management system and evaluation forms received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Joan Morgan, Chair
    Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Charles R. Middleton
      Provost and Vice President

RE: Administrative Compensation Plan

Per your request I am writing to confirm our conversation at Tuesday's meeting regarding the administrative staff compensation plan. As we discussed, the administration is presently waiting for confirmation from the Department of Labor that the first phase of the administrative staff compensation plan is in compliance with current statutes. We had anticipated that by now that the University would have been notified by the DOL.

I cannot give you a firm date when this notification will be forthcoming. However, I have been assured that the DOL review is progressing in a timely fashion. Until the first phase of the compensation plan is approved by the DOL, it would not be prudent for the administration to proceed with further policy development because any changes would require re-submission to the DOL and might delay their review even more.

I confirm my commitment to developing an equitable compensation plan for all administrative staff. This is a top priority. I continue to be impressed with the collaborative relationship the administration has with the Council leadership and I look forward to building upon that relationship in the future.

skg

xc: President Ribeau
    Cabinet
Principles and Recommendations for a Performance-Based Merit System for Administrative Staff at Bowling Green State University

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

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

2. A salary system should be designed to promote internal salary equity (based upon the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan) as well as external salary equity (based upon salary comparisons among individuals in similar positions from similar universities, colleges or departments). THE INSTITUTION SHOULD MONITOR AND ENSURE THAT EMPLOYEE SALARIES CONTINUE TO BE COMMENSURATE WITH INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYEE'S SKILLS, ABILITIES, AND EXPERIENCE.

3. A performance-based merit system may include a component of peer-review when appropriate. Appropriateness will be determined jointly by the supervisor and staff member.

4. A performance-based merit system should engender the type, quantity, and quality of performance that contributes to the achievement of institutional and unit missions and goals. The reward system also needs to
recognize that there are often multiple paths that may be taken in support of missions and goals.

5. A merit system needs to establish a clear connection between employee performance and reward; MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE SHOULD BE REWARDED IN TANGIBLE WAYS THROUGH: SIGNIFICANT PROGRESSION WITHIN A SALARY RANGE, RENEWING MULTIPLE-YEAR CONTRACTS, AND/OR PROMOTION AND MOVEMENT TO A NEW SALARY RANGE WHEN DEEMED APPROPRIATE. A department or unit must clearly identify the normal expectations and performance standards that are expected of all staff. Through this process, indicators must be identified for performances that fall below standard expectations for merit as well as those types of achievements that surpass the unit's standard expectations.

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

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

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

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

10. Both the performance based merit system and the performance appraisal process will be reviewed annually by ASC.
Provided these ten principles are followed, the Administrative Staff Council recommends that Bowling Green State University adopt a performance-based merit reward system. The Council believes it is better to improve the existing system than to abandon it completely. What follows are the specific recommendations for an employee performance-based merit system which is specific to Administrative Staff members.

Recommendations

1. Each year the University should IDENTIFY, REVIEW AND ADDRESS EMPLOYEE SALARIES WHICH MAY BE INEQUITABLE, SUCH AS THE SALARIES OF THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE BELOW THE MIDPOINT OF THEIR SALARY GRADE. Funds should be made available on a regular, on-going basis TO CORRECT SALARY INEQUITIES, make market adjustments and salary adjustments deemed appropriate following comprehensive reviews of employee performance and salary, and to support raises for promotions. These funds should not be considered a part of the annual merit pool.

2. TO ESTABLISH A CLEAR CONNECTION BETWEEN EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AND REWARD, MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE SHOULD BE REWARDED IN TANGIBLE WAYS THROUGH: SIGNIFICANT PROGRESSION WITHIN A SALARY RANGE, RENEWING MULTIPLE-YEAR CONTRACTS, AND/OR PROMOTION AND MOVEMENT TO A NEW SALARY RANGE WHEN DEEMED APPROPRIATE.

   a. Upon the completion of five years of meritorious assessments, an employee’s salary shall be REVIEWED AND increased TO FURTHER PROGRESSION THROUGH THE DESIGNATED SALARY RANGE. THE AMOUNT AWARDED WILL BE CONTINGENT UPON AVAILABLE INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES.

   b. After five consecutive years of meritorious assessments, the employee shall be granted an annually renewable five year contract with provisions for annual salary increases; THIS FIVE-YEAR CONTRACT WILL BE RENEWED ANNUALLY, SO LONG AS THE EMPLOYEE’S
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE CONTINUES TO BE RATED AS MERITORIOUS.

3. A merit system must be administered openly and reliably. Thus, changes in evaluation and merit pay criteria must be completed BEFORE the new contract year, i.e. before June 30 of the prior contract year. To ensure that employees can contest unfair merit assessments, TIMELY DISCLOSURES OF MERIT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS ARE necessary. Continual dialogue between the supervisor and the employee about progress towards goals is essential.

TIME DEADLINES

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

b. MERITORIOUS ASSESSMENT must be known at the completion of the evaluation process. (May 31)

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

Failure to meet any of items a-c defaults to the employee being awarded AT LEAST the average increase given to all contract staff. For e.g. in 1996, the default pay increase was 3%.

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

4. A supervisor's merit pay is contingent upon completing performance evaluations and merit pay recommendations for their staff on time.
5. Human Resources will review all annual performance evaluations and merit pay recommendations to ensure consistency and integrity. Issues concerning the process will be communicated to ASC - PWC on an annual basis.

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

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

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

9. IF THE TOTAL MERIT POOL FOR SALARY INCREMENTS IN A GIVEN YEAR IS THREE PERCENT (3%) OR LESS, ALL EMPLOYEES WHO QUALIFY FOR MERIT IN THEIR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWS WILL RECEIVE THE SAME PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN SALARY.
10. IF THE TOTAL MERIT POOL FOR SALARY INCREMENTS IN A
GIVEN YEAR IS MORE THAN THREE PERCENT (3%) BUT LESS THAN
FIVE PERCENT (5%), IT WILL BE ALLOCATED ACCORDING TO THE
FOLLOWING GUIDELINES:

A. THREE PERCENT (3%) OF THE TOTAL SALARIES OF
EMPLOYEES SHALL BE ALLOCATED AS A THREE PERCENT (3%)
INCREASE IN SALARY TO ALL EMPLOYEES WHO QUALIFY FOR
MERIT BASED ON THEIR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWS. 

B. THE REMAINING DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TOTAL MERIT
POOL AND THE THREE PERCENT (3%) OF THE TOTAL SALARIES OF
THE CONTINUING FACULTY SHALL BE ALLOCATED TO
DEPARTMENTS AND UNITS FOR RECOGNITION OF THOSE
EMPLOYEES WHOSE LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE EXCEEDS
DEPARTMENT OR UNIT EXPECTATIONS AS DEFINED BY THE MERIT
POLICY OF THE DEPARTMENT OR UNIT.

11. IF THE TOTAL MERIT POOL IS FIVE PERCENT (5%) OR
MORE, IT WILL BE ALLOCATED ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING
GUIDELINES:

A. SIXTY PERCENT (60%) SHALL BE ALLOCATED TO
DEPARTMENTS/UNITS TO BE USED AS AN EQUAL PERCENTAGE
INCREASE IN SALARY TO ALL EMPLOYEES WHO MEET
DEPARTMENT/UNIT EXPECTATIONS AND THEREBY QUALIFY FOR
MERIT IN THEIR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWS.

B. FORTY PERCENT (40%) SHALL BE ALLOCATED TO
DEPARTMENTS/UNITS FOR RECOGNITION AND REWARD OF THOSE
EMPLOYEES WHOSE LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE EXCEEDS
DEPARTMENT/UNIT EXPECTATIONS AS DEFINED BY THE MERIT
POLICY OF THE DEPARTMENT/UNIT.
MEMORANDUM

To: Administrative Staff Council
FROM: Salary Committee
RE: 1996-97 CUPA Results

The ASC Salary Committee has received, reviewed and summarized information from the 1996-97 College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) salary survey. This review and summarization is consistent with analysis performed in previous years. One new analysis based on Mercer groups is provided.

1. BGSU average salaries, when compared to the average salaries of eleven Ohio institutions, ranks BGSU in seventh position. This rank has varied between position five and position ten over the past seven years with an average rank of 7.4. Kent State, Miami University, Ohio University and Toledo have usually ranked higher than Bowling Green over the past seven years.

   Ref.: Appendix B / Appendix B.1

2. BGSU salaries when compared to the average salaries of the eleven Ohio universities trail by 3.92%. When compared to Kent, Miami, Ohio U. and Toledo BGSU trails by 4.38%.

   Ref.: Appendix A

3. The CUPA analysis is based on 93 ASC positions at BGSU. 87 of these positions are in Mercer grades fourteen or higher. Average salaries for these 93 positions are usually above the midpoint for their respective Mercer grade. This report provides no insight for Mercer positions below grade fourteen, gender/ethnic issues or time in position.

   Ref.: Appendix C

4. We believe BGSU salaries should be at a level consistent with Kent/Miami. To become a reality this will require an equivalent salary increase to that of Kent/Miami plus an additional 3.38% to equal Kent or an additional 3.82% to equal Miami. Providing salary increases higher than Kent and Miami over the next several years would have the same result.

   Ref.: Appendix B

This report does not address any issues concerning merit pay or increases advancing a person within their Mercer group. These issues are being addressed by the Personnel Welfare Committee.
### Appendix A
1996-97
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>$57,710</td>
<td>$59,353</td>
<td>($1,643)</td>
<td>-2.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV 2.1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$57,157</td>
<td>$59,388</td>
<td>($2,231)</td>
<td>-3.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV 3.1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$56,258</td>
<td>$58,551</td>
<td>($2,293)</td>
<td>-3.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV 4.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$60,843</td>
<td>$63,633</td>
<td>($2,785)</td>
<td>-4.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV 5.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>$57,823</td>
<td>$59,871</td>
<td>($1,848)</td>
<td>-3.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV 6.1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$57,172</td>
<td>$58,792</td>
<td>($1,620)</td>
<td>-2.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows the average salaries and the differences between BGSU and CUPA averages for various versions, including the percentage difference. The chart below visually represents the data, highlighting the differences in percentage across versions.
Appendix B
1996-97

Summary of Comparison of BGSU Salaries
to Other State Schools Using Common Positions
(MV 2.1)

<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>43</td>
<td>$75,998</td>
<td>$55,893</td>
<td>$20,099</td>
<td>35.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$70,352</td>
<td>$53,845</td>
<td>$11,507</td>
<td>13.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$68,230</td>
<td>$62,206</td>
<td>$6,024</td>
<td>9.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$58,353</td>
<td>$57,171</td>
<td>$2,182</td>
<td>3.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$58,284</td>
<td>$56,374</td>
<td>$1,910</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$58,853</td>
<td>$58,666</td>
<td>$193</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td></td>
<td>$57,018</td>
<td>$57,012</td>
<td>($294)</td>
<td>-0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$57,613</td>
<td>$57,912</td>
<td>($299)</td>
<td>-0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$54,953</td>
<td>$56,924</td>
<td>($1,971)</td>
<td>-3.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$58,249</td>
<td>$61,339</td>
<td>($3,090)</td>
<td>-5.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$50,671</td>
<td>$55,916</td>
<td>($5,245)</td>
<td>-9.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Difference Graph
## Appendix B.1

**Summary of Comparison of BGSU Salaries to Other State Schools Using Common Positions (MV 3.1)**

### Seven Year Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>19.36%</td>
<td>23.87%</td>
<td>25.08%</td>
<td>24.86%</td>
<td>39.37%</td>
<td>38.38%</td>
<td>35.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>10.35%</td>
<td>13.68%</td>
<td>12.95%</td>
<td>12.34%</td>
<td>12.45%</td>
<td>20.75%</td>
<td>19.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>8.63%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
<td>11.61%</td>
<td>10.28%</td>
<td>10.27%</td>
<td>9.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>7.99%</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td>6.62%</td>
<td>6.27%</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
<td>3.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>35.91%</td>
<td>35.91%</td>
<td>35.91%</td>
<td>35.91%</td>
<td>35.91%</td>
<td>35.91%</td>
<td>35.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>-0.52%</td>
<td>3.06%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>-1.02%</td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>-1.39%</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>-2.90%</td>
<td>-1.18%</td>
<td>CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS</td>
<td>-1.60%</td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>-0.31%</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>-3.86%</td>
<td>-1.26%</td>
<td>WS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>-2.87%</td>
<td>YS</td>
<td>-0.94%</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>-1.68%</td>
<td>-5.53%</td>
<td>KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>-3.07%</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>-5.10%</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>-3.54%</td>
<td>-6.25%</td>
<td>CS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mercer Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BSU</th>
<th>CUPA</th>
<th>Mercer</th>
<th>Mercer</th>
<th>CUPA</th>
<th>CUPA Mercer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$21,598</td>
<td>$14,396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$23,396</td>
<td>$16,014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$25,390</td>
<td>$17,246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$27,594</td>
<td>$19,603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$30,037</td>
<td>$20,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$32,750</td>
<td>$21,752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$35,763</td>
<td>$23,580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$39,118</td>
<td>$25,093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$42,351</td>
<td>$27,845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$47,017</td>
<td>$30,278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$51,393</td>
<td>$33,097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$56,291</td>
<td>$36,741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$62,973</td>
<td>$39,593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$68,226</td>
<td>$43,115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$70,527</td>
<td>$47,632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$84,377</td>
<td>$52,451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$94,070</td>
<td>$57,790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$104,531</td>
<td>$68,775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$116,315</td>
<td>$70,494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Counts:**

- Mercer Min: 448
- Mercer Max: 93

The graph shows the distribution of annual pay across different grades, with Mercer Min, Mercer Max, and the CUPA Average represented.
To: Joe Luthman <jlutluna@bgnet.bgsu.edu>, ABETTS@bgnet.bgsu.edu, HANNA@wbgu.bgsu.edu, KEPKEJM@bgnet.bgsu.edu, IKLOPPI@CBA.bgsu.edu, EODONNE@bgnet.bgsu.edu, jmorga3@bgnet.bgsu.edu, whitmire@bgnet.bgsu.edu

From: dboyce@bgnet.bgsu.edu (Deborah Boyce)

Subject: Re: New merit draft

At 10:57 AM 5/1/97, Joe Luthman wrote:

>TO: PWC folks
>
>As incredible as this may seem (the ASC meeting is in just 2 hours), here is
>the newest merit draft, with changes made as recommended by Middleton. If
>you have a few minutes, please read the capitalized sections for the most
>recent changes. This will be the version that is discussed during today's
>meeting.
>
>Please call or send mail if you see any typos.
>
>5/1/1997

Principles and Recommendations for a
Performance-Based Merit System
for Administrative Staff at Bowling Green State University

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

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

2. A salary system should be designed to promote internal salary
equity (based upon the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan) as well as
external salary equity (based upon salary comparisons among individuals
in similar positions from similar universities, colleges or departments).

THE INSTITUTION SHOULD MONITOR AND ENSURE THAT EMPLOYEE
SALARIES CONTINUE TO BE COMMENSURATE WITH INDIVIDUAL
EMPLOYEE'S SKILLS, ABILITIES, AND EXPERIENCE.

3. A performance-based merit system may include a component of
peer-review when appropriate. Appropriateness will be determined jointly
by the supervisor and staff member.

4. A performance-based merit system should engender the type,
quantity, and quality of performance that contributes to the achievement of
institutional and unit missions and goals. The reward system also needs to
recognize that there are often multiple paths that may be taken in support
of missions and goals.

5. A merit system needs to establish a clear connection between
employee performance and reward; MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE SHOULD

implement for implementation under faculty umbrellas
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> BE REWARDED IN TANGIBLE WAYS THROUGH: SIGNIFICANT
> PROGRESSION WITHIN A SALARY RANGE, RENEWING MULTIPLE-YEAR
> CONTRACTS, AND/OR PROMOTION AND MOVEMENT TO A NEW SALARY
> RANGE WHEN DEEMED APPROPRIATE. A department or unit must clearly
> identify the normal expectations and performance standards that are expected of
> all staff. Through this process, indicators must be identified for performances
> that fall below standard expectations for merit as well as those types of
> achievements that surpass the unit's standard expectations.
>
> 6. The performance appraisal process should provide employees
> with constructive comments that enable them to develop professionally and
> to make improvements in performance.
>
> 7. The merit system must avoid trivializing the system by spreading
> merit too thinly and thus minimizing the impact of any incentive awards
> given.
>
> 8. Even the best annual review systems may produce salary
> inequities or may fail to appropriately reward contributions or performances
> that occur over longer periods of time. Thus, an annual merit review
> system needs to be supplemented by periodic five-year comprehensive
> reviews on a rotating schedule.
>
> 9. A performance-based merit or salary reward system should foster
> cooperation among staff, should reward groups and teams as well as
> individuals for collaborative work performances, and should generate wide
> support and general satisfaction on the University campus.
>
> 10. Both the performance based merit system and the performance
> appraisal process will be reviewed annually by ASC.
>
> Provided these ten principles are followed, the Administrative Staff
> Council recommends that Bowling Green State University adopt a
> performance-based merit reward system. The Council believes it is better
> to improve the existing system than to abandon it completely. What follows
> are the specific recommendations for an employee performance-based
> merit system which is specific to Administrative Staff members.
>
> Recommendations
> 1. Each year the University should IDENTIFY, REVIEW AND
> ADDRESS EMPLOYEE SALARIES WHICH MAY BE INEQUITABLE,
> SUCH AS THE SALARIES OF THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE BELOW
> THE MIDPOINT OF THEIR SALARY GRADE. Funds should be made
> available on a regular, on-going basis TO CORRECT SALARY
> INEQUITIES, make market adjustments and salary adjustments deemed
> appropriate following comprehensive reviews of employee performance
> and salary, and to support raises for promotions. These funds should not
> be considered a part of the annual merit pool.
>
> 2. TO ESTABLISH A CLEAR CONNECTION BETWEEN
> EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AND REWARD, MERITORIOUS
> PERFORMANCE SHOULD BE REWARDED IN TANGIBLE WAYS
> THROUGH: SIGNIFICANT PROGRESSION WITHIN A SALARY RANGE,
> RENEWING MULTIPLE-YEAR CONTRACTS, AND/OR PROMOTION AND
> MOVEMENT TO A NEW SALARY RANGE WHEN DEEMED
> APPROPRIATE.
Joe Luthman, ABETTS@bgsnet.bgsu.edu, H„Re: New merit draft

> a. Upon the completion of five years of meritorious assessments, an employee's salary shall be REVIEWED AND increased TO FURTHER PROGRESSION THROUGH THE DESIGNATED SALARY RANGE. THE AMOUNT AWARDED WILL BE CONTINGENT UPON AVAILABLE INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES.

> b. After five consecutive years of meritorious assessments, the employee shall be granted an annually renewable five year contract with provisions for annual salary increases; THIS FIVE YEAR CONTRACT WILL BE RENEWED ANNUALLY, SO LONG AS THE EMPLOYEE'S ANNUAL PERFORMANCE CONTINUES TO BE RATED AS MERITORIOUS.

> 3. A merit system must be administered openly and reliably. Thus, changes in evaluation and merit pay criteria must be completed BEFORE the new contract year, i.e. before June 30 of the prior contract year. To ensure that employees can contest unfair merit pay assessments, TIMELY DISCLOSURES OF MERIT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS ARE necessary. Continual dialogue between the supervisor and the employee about progress towards goals is essential.

> TIME DEADLINES
> a. Performance appraisal forms must be completed by May 31 of the prior contract year.
> b. MERITORIOUS ASSESSMENT must be known at the completion of the evaluation process. (May 31)
> c. Merit criteria must be known prior to start of the next contract year.
> Failure to meet any of items a-c defaults to the employee being awarded AT LEAST the average increase given to all contract staff. For e. g. in 1996, the default pay increase was 3%.
>d. A supervisor will meet with employees between November 15 and January 15 for a dialogue on progress toward their annual goals. The supervisor will document at that time an employee's performance which is falling below a satisfactory level. The supervisor will be expected to continue to engage in ongoing dialogue with the employee to improve employee performance.

> 4. A supervisor's merit pay is contingent upon completing performance evaluations and merit pay recommendations for their staff on time.

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

> 6. The annual merit allocation should be based upon the meritorious accomplishments over the most recent three-year period on a rolling basis, i.e., each year new information is added to the file for the most recent year and information for the oldest year is eliminated from the file. This will help to reduce inequities that can result from differences in the merit funds available each year and from fluctuations in performance that may occur from year to year.
7. All employees will be evaluated in their annual performance reviews to determine their eligibility for merit. Merit eligibility is determined by the job performance of an employee, as assessed by the Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal Form. Performing one's job at a satisfactory level and in a competent manner is the basis for merit pay.

Given that an employee will qualify for a merit increase by meeting, as well as exceeding, unit standards, it is expected that very few employees will fail to qualify for merit.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Dr. Joan Morgan, Chair
    Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Charles R. Middleton
    Provost and Vice President

RE: Administrative Compensation Plan

May 1, 1997

Per your request I am writing to confirm our conversation at Tuesday’s meeting regarding the administrative staff compensation plan. As we discussed, the administration is presently waiting for confirmation from the Department of Labor that the first phase of the administrative staff compensation plan is in compliance with current statutes. We had anticipated that by now that the University would have been notified by the DOL.

I cannot give you a firm date when this notification will be forthcoming. However, I have been assured that the DOL review is progressing in a timely fashion. Until the first phase of the compensation plan is approved by the DOL, it would not be prudent for the administration to proceed with further policy development because any changes would require re-submission to the DOL and might delay their review even more.

I confirm my commitment to developing an equitable compensation plan for all administrative staff. This is a top priority. I continue to be impressed with the collaborative relationship the administration has with the Council leadership and I look forward to building upon that relationship in the future.

skg

xc: President Ribeau
Cabinet