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Notes
Hi Everyone:
Here is the vacation lost by Admin. Staff during 04/05.
Please review with discretion!!!
Thanks Dave

Great phone conversation regarding salary continuance protection from our sick leave accrual, leave bank ideas and short term disability. Any way, I am sure we will be talking more about this in the future. As I mentioned, attached is the list of administrative staff who had vacation hours lost at the end of this last fiscal year.

Administrative staff in total reported about 4900 hours of usage for the month of June before we removed hours. This group of administrative staff reported a total of 1963 hours used in June before losing their vacation hours.

In addition, only 4 administrative staff members received letters from their VP requesting that their vacation hours would not be removed.

Hope this is what you needed.

Donna
1) Increase accrued maximum of vacation days from 44 to 60 days. This would provide equity with Classified Staff who are eligible for payment for 60 days at retirement. This increase would only be available to Administrative Staff members while employed at the University. Monetary payment for the additional 16 days would NOT be made to them at their retirement.

2) Develop guidelines for consistency in summer hours work schedule. 

3) Develop guidelines for utilization of Flexible Scheduling for Administrative Staff who consistently work more than 40 hours. Also there should be a clarification of the statement in the AS Handbook which refers to the opportunity to use flexible scheduling when departmental needs require perpetual/consistent work of more than 40 hours per week is needed.

4) Complete the Implementation of the Mercer – BGSU Compensation Plan
   A. Standardize how Mercer is used in the hiring process to identify the starting salary.
   B. Clarify role of Mercer in determining market salaries and their role in determining salary ranges.
   C. Identify criteria for all BGSU Administrative Staff to move through their salary range, and especially to achieve the midpoint of their range. Estimate costs for salary adjustments to midpoint.

5) Continue overall review and analysis of Compensation including benefits package at BGSU.

6) Request salary and turnover study by gender, # yrs service.

7) Provide 30 hours of Personal Leave for all staff who receive a meritorious appraisal.

8) Provide pro-rated costs for Health care benefits for part-time staff.

9) Continue to explore concepts of wellness programs to reduce health care costs.

10) Develop a Sick Leave Bank concept to be utilized in situations where catastrophic illness occurs for BGSU staff.

11) Strive for merit evaluation process for all administrative staff. Continue to collect salary review and evaluate all merit documents!
All administrative tasks should be made clear of criteria.
3. Increase accrued maximum number of vacation days from 44 to 60 days. This would provide equity with Classified Staff who are eligible for payment for 60 days. The increase would only be available to Administrative Staff members while employed at the University. Monetary payment would NOT be made at retirement. By replacing vacant administrative staff positions current staff would have the opportunity to utilize the vacation time earned.

2. Develop guidelines for consistency in summer hours work schedule. Although the University may need to remain open 3-5 Monday through Friday, individuals could still be allowed to leave early on Friday or come in late on Monday through the use of flexible scheduling.

8. Develop guidelines for utilization of Flexible Scheduling for Administrative Staff who consistently work more than 40 hours. Also there should be a Clarification of the statement in the AS Handbook which refers to the opportunity to use flexible scheduling when departmental needs require perpetual/consistent work of more than 40 hours per week is needed.

1. Complete the Implementation of Meet with the Mercer review team to discuss fully implementing the Mercer - BGSU Compensation Plan. Adequate lead time must be given prior to this working session.
   A. Standardize how Mercer is used in the hiring process to identify the starting salary.
   B. Clarify role of Mercer in determining market salaries and their role in determining salary ranges.
   C. Identify criteria for all BGSU Administrative Staff to move through their salary range, and especially to achieve the midpoint of their range. Estimate costs for salary adjustments to midpoint.

5. Continue overall review and analysis of Compensation including benefits package at BGSU.

6. Request salary and turnover study by gender, yrs service.

7. Provide an extra 8 hours of Personal Leave for all staff who receive a meriticious appraisal.

8. Provide pro-rated costs for Health care benefits for part-time staff

9. Continue to explore concepts of wellness programs to reduce health care costs.

10. Develop a Sick Leave Bank concept to be utilized in situations where catastrophic illness occurs for BGSU staff.

2. Strive for an evaluation process for all administrative staff must be evaluated annually. Continue to catalog collect, review and evaluate all merit documents! Provide all employees with criteria for merit increases.

12. No administrative staff member should be without a pay grade for a period exceeding twelve months.
1. Range is it in market shall be adjusted
   every 3rd year annually
2. Individual movement through range
3. Nurse recommendations from last year not addressed

To achieve midpoint by beginning of 4th successful year
and subsequently maintain market wage throughout employment

A nurse comes in every 3 years to
do a market adjustment, & range

each year 1% list or what raise ranges go up in end year more increases.

Go back to original Nurse agreement

Faculty ranges should be in 70% percentile
of market nationally

AS 50% percentile
regionally

We are either going to
a commitment from University to give
reasonable consideration of Nurse recommendations
or pay them $30,000 and ignore recommendations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Grade spent on grade</th>
<th>Total dollars</th>
<th># of admin staff in grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total Salary of Staff in grade</th>
<th>$/Grade</th>
<th>Penetration to Grade</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 $ 423,481.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>423,481</td>
<td>132%</td>
<td>141,160</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 $ 1,411.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3M</td>
<td>423,481</td>
<td>132%</td>
<td>141,160</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 F</td>
<td>727,076</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>121,179</td>
<td>9.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 M</td>
<td>664,461</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>114,077</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 $ 678,402.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 F</td>
<td>282,626</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>94,209</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 M</td>
<td>385,776</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>98,944</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 $ 1,528,320.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 F</td>
<td>663,595</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>82,629</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 M</td>
<td>864,725</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>96,081</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 $ 1,343,610.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 F</td>
<td>480,122</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80,020</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 M</td>
<td>863,488</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>78,499</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-totals** $3,975,224.54

| 17 $ 3,219,035.00        |               |                          | 26 F   | 1,722,424                     | 67%     | 66,247              | 8.97     |
| 16 $ 6,392,502.00        |               |                          | 22 M   | 1,498,611                     | 73%     | 68,028              | 5.9      |
| 15 $ 5,238,596.00        |               |                          | 54 F   | 3,714,490                     | 53%     | 58,039              | 5.04     |
| 14 $ 4,741,069.00        |               |                          | 55 M   | 2,678,012                     | 64%     | 59,511              | 5.46     |
| 13 $ 4,333,941.00        |               |                          | 53 F   | 3,281,461                     | 54%     | 51,769              | 5.9      |
|                          |               |                          | 53 M   | 1,977,135                     | 55%     | 52,030              | 4.85     |
| 12 $ 1,557,695.00        |               |                          | 70 F   | 3,107,681                     | 39%     | 44,395              | 5.27     |
| 11 $ 485,005.00          |               |                          | 36 M   | 1,633,388                     | 44%     | 45,372              | 6.29     |
| 10 $ 61,084.00           |               |                          | 53 F   | 2,166,142                     | 41%     | 40,871              | 4.49     |
|                          |               |                          | 53 M   | 2,167,799                     | 41%     | 40,902              | 5.26     |

**Sub-totals** $23,925,143.00

| 9 $ 165,424.00           |               |                          | 29 F   | 1,049,247                     | 33%     | 36,181              | 14.1     |
| 8 $ 24,437.00            |               |                          | 14 M   | 508,448                       | 34%     | 36,318              | 3.31     |
| 7 $ 39,247.00            |               |                          | 7 F    | 245,692                       | 46%     | 35,099              | 8.34     |
| 6 $ 57,777.00            |               |                          | 7 M    | 239,313                       | 40%     | 34,188              | 7.99     |
|                          |               |                          | 1 F    | 35,500                        | 71%     | 35,500              | 0.2      |
|                          |               |                          | 1 M    | 25,584                        | -4%     | 25,584              | 0.7      |
| 5 $ 165,424.00           |               |                          | 4 F    | 132,712                       | 75%     | 33,178              | 12.2     |
|                          |               |                          | 1 M    | 32,712                        | 71%     | 32,712              | 15.2     |
| 4 $ 24,437.00            |               |                          | 1 F    | 24,437                        | 19%     | 24,437              | 14.3     |

**Sub-totals** $2,390,669.00

**Sub-totals** $995,250.00

**Totals** $31,286,286.54
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Gender</th>
<th>By Gender</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penetration</td>
<td>Penetration</td>
<td>for under 5</td>
<td>for 5 to less yrs in position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>191%</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102%</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87%</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>153%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>106%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71%</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Grade</td>
<td>Total dollars spent on grade</td>
<td>By Gender # of staff in grade</td>
<td>By Gender: Average % &amp; Average Salary in Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$422,461.00</td>
<td>0 F</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$1,411,542.00</td>
<td>3 M</td>
<td>422,461 12% 114,110 5.72 191% 102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$675,002.00</td>
<td>6 F</td>
<td>727,076 116% 121,179 9.17 49% 102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$1,528,329.00</td>
<td>4 F</td>
<td>601,461 102% 114,077 10.7 153% 111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$1,345,610.00</td>
<td>8 M</td>
<td>322,236 30% 94,209 4.26 115% 111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$6,232,502.00</td>
<td>10 F</td>
<td>565,275 9% 96,844 6.13 106% 77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$1,411,542.00</td>
<td>5 M</td>
<td>663,595 7.9% 92,629 6.81 80% 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$5,200,500.00</td>
<td>6 M</td>
<td>612,705 31% 86,081 6.15 76% 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$1,345,610.00</td>
<td>11 F</td>
<td>439,122 90% 90,020 6.67 91% 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-totals</td>
<td>$5,675,031.54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$3,219,035.00</td>
<td>26 F</td>
<td>1,722,421 67% 66,247 8.97 32% 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$6,232,502.00</td>
<td>22 M</td>
<td>1,496,611 73% 63,023 5.9 71% 76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$5,308,656.00</td>
<td>54 F</td>
<td>1,314,970 58% 53,699 6.03 52% 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$2,075,682.00</td>
<td>55 M</td>
<td>2,670,612 64% 59,551 5.46 53% 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$1,345,610.00</td>
<td>62 F</td>
<td>1,731,151 61% 51,769 5.56 46% 53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$4,332,394.00</td>
<td>53 M</td>
<td>1,971,156 55% 52,050 4.25 48% 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-totals</td>
<td>$9,352,313.00</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$1,557,635.00</td>
<td>39 F</td>
<td>1,049,247 33% 36,181 4.17 28% 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$2,503,600.00</td>
<td>29 M</td>
<td>508,340 24% 36,318 2.81 30% 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$426,995.00</td>
<td>7 F</td>
<td>245,692 48% 25,090 3.31 29% 52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$61,964.00</td>
<td>7 M</td>
<td>339,313 40% 24,168 7.99 29% 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$165,124.00</td>
<td>1 F</td>
<td>122,712 75% 33,173 12.2 36% 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$24,437.00</td>
<td>1 M</td>
<td>24,437 100% 32,712 15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-totals</td>
<td>$2,390,669.00</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-totals</td>
<td>$1,295,250.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$31,308,265.64</td>
<td>610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Increase accrued maximum number of vacation days from 44 to 60 days. This would provide equity with Classified Staff who are eligible for payment for 60 days. The increase would only be available to Administrative Staff members while employed at the University. Monetary payment would NOT be made at retirement. By replacing vacant administrative staff positions current staff would have the opportunity to utilize the vacation time earned.

2) Develop guidelines for consistency in summer hours work schedule. Although the University may need to remain open 8-5 Monday through Friday, individuals could still be allowed to leave early on Friday or come in late on Monday through the use of flex time.

3) Develop guidelines for utilization of Flexible Scheduling for Administrative Staff who consistently work more than 40 hours. Also there should be a Clarification of the statement in the AS Handbook which refers to the opportunity to use flexible scheduling when departmental needs require perpetual/consistent work of more than 40 hours per week is needed.

4) Complete the Implementation of Meet with the Mercer review team to discuss fully implementing the Mercer - BGSU Compensation Plan. Adequate lead time must be given prior to this working session.
   A. Standardize how Mercer is used in the hiring process to identify the starting salary.
   B. Clarify role of Mercer in determining market salaries and their Role-in determining salary ranges.
   C. Identify criteria for all BGSU Administrative Staff to move through their salary range, and especially to achieve the midpoint of their range. Estimate costs for salary adjustments to midpoint.

5) Continue overall review and analysis of Compensation including benefits package at BGSU.

6) Request salary and turnover study by gender, # yrs service

7) Provide an extra 8 hours of Personal Leave for all staff who receive a meritorious appraisal.

8) Provide pro-rated costs for Health care benefits for part-time staff

9) Continue to explore concepts of wellness programs to reduce health care costs

10) Develop a Sick Leave Bank concept to be utilized in situations where catastrophic illness occurs for BGSU staff

11) Strive for an evaluation process for All administrative staff must be evaluated annually. Continue to catalog collect, review and evaluate all merit documents! Provide all employees with criteria for merit increases.

12) No administrative staff member should be without a pay grade for a period exceeding twelve months
Greetings,
At PWC Wed. Dave, Naomi and I selected the Mercer (plus Naomi's) slides we intend to show Council next Thursday in our compensation discussion. I have started to draft a text for whoever ends up discussing the slides to use. I am struggling here, so please edit away and reply to all if you will. If you need to see the slides they came as an attachment with an email from Naomi on Feb. 9 subject heading "RE: pwc yesterday". This ASC discussion is supposed to be brief.
Thanks,
Ann

Ann B. Jenks
Interim Head and University Archivist
Center for Archival Collections
5th Floor Jerome Library
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green OH 43403-0170
(419) 372-6936
PWC Presentation on 2005-2006 Compensation Goals to ASC March 2, 2006

At PWC Feb. 22, Dave, Naomi and I decided not to use Mercer slide #6 because we don’t have a market driven compensation plan, it is complex and we don’t have time to adequately cover the subject.

Introduction
Each fall and spring ASC chair and Chair-Elect and PWC Co-Chairs meet with the President’s Compensation group. The fall meeting is a preliminary exchange of ideas on where ASC stands on compensation priorities and where the administration stands on what is feasible. The spring meeting is ASC’s opportunity to present what we want in terms of compensation for all administrative staff for the next fiscal year. PWC and ASC Exec work on prioritizing the compensation goals and year after year we seem to make little or no headway with the administration in getting our requests approved. Looking at the historical record and seeing that Council was striving for the same goals in the 1980’s that we strive for today made us focus on a single goal with a high potential for success – pay equity.

Here is a brief background on Mercer and our compensation plan, the goal we have selected to pursue this year, and three proposals for achieving this goal. We need your view on dealing with compensation issues that will affect all administrative staff, knowing there will be differing opinions. We want to take these proposals on how the annual salary increase is distributed to your constituents, encourage them to join in the Blackboard discussion, and bring their input to the April meeting. We will hold a meeting of the whole to address this subject followed by a vote on how Administrative Staff wants to be compensated.

We met with two representatives of Mercer, Inc. who was hired by BGSU in the early 90’s to devise a compensation plan for Administrative Staff. Mercer came up with the Job Analysis Questionnaire, the pay grades, the quartiles and the item we talk about continuously – the midpoint aka the market value for a position. We are showing you a few of the slides from Mercer’s powerpoint presentation that Lona emailed to all ASC members on February 6 and the subject header was: February 2 Meeting Follow Up if you want to look at the entire presentation when you return to your offices. The only slide you won’t see in that email attachment is seen here as #17 and was created by Naomi Lee based on information from HR....

Text for presentation of Mercer Slide # 7 – Job Evaluation Methodology

Administrative Staff assumed our compensation plan was a market-drive one. The Mercer representatives informed us that it is internally driven. The administration set the weighting of the points in the JAQ, determining which criteria are worth more than others. The University “market analysis” for a position consisted of looking at all similar positions, finding the median salary and assigning that as mid-point for the position. This procedure was used to create internal equity as opposed to equity to market outside the institution.
Text for presentation of Mercer Slide #8 – Setting Starting Salaries

The starting salary is currently determined by the Contracting Officer who controls the budget for that area. Staff who are brought in at the minimum of their pay grade and get a 3% increase in the years it is available could possibly reach the mid-point of their grade in 20+ years. Other staff, particularly in the highest pay grades, are brought in above the mid-point and in some cases above the maximum. Looking at a 3% increase as a cost of living adjustment – 3% of $30,000 is a whole lot less than 3% of $110,000. The way to fix the compensation picture over the long term would be to ensure that consistent hiring practices be put in place and strictly adhered to across campus. Incoming salaries would be at the first quartile for meeting qualifications and higher for those with additional experience (and not above the grade maximum).

Text for presentation of Mercer Slide #13 – Range Penetration Analysis at BGSU by Grade

A cautionary note on this slide – Grade 7 consists of one staff member who has been in position for 23 years, resulting in high penetration. Same scenario in Grade 8. Grade 9 has 5 employees who have been in position for 21, 21, 1, 16, and 9 years. This anomaly aside, it is evident that success in range penetration comes to those in the highest pay grades, while half of Administrative Staff are in the mid level grades and stay below mid-point (aka market) for many years. Could it be that many employees are in the top quartiles due to longevity as opposed to outstanding sustained performance.

Text for presentation of Mercer slide #16 – Salary Administration

As far as equity is concerned this compensation method is the clear choice. The Mercer representative told us this mechanism is unattainable without a functioning performance evaluation system. We had a performance evaluation system in place for a short time in the Betsy Clark/Chuck Middleton eras because the faculty who supervise administrative staff were held accountable for evaluations. The Handbook of Commonly Held Policies and the HR website state that annual performance evaluations will be conducted for all faculty and staff, but it is no longer enforced. If there was a chance of success in achieving this, it is the best plan, but need I say more?

Text for presentation of Naomi’s Slide #17 – Fixed Dollar Amount Salary Adjustment

Rationale: A 3% salary increase is approved by the BOT. Rather than applying it as we have been since the Mercer compensation plan was implemented, we will take 3% of the entire Ad Staff salary pool, divide it by the number of staff and assign that flat dollar amount to everyone. This plan helps people at the lowest ranges at the expense of the people at the highest. Are we helping people who are here for a brief time and view BGSU as a stopping off
place on their career path? Or by helping these people a bit will we improve retention, reduce turnover?

Advantages:
--Starts to give people in the lower pay ranges a little nudge toward midpoint
--would be easy for the administration to implement

Disadvantages
--does not address performance – no reward for excellence
--will not be favorable to those in the highest pay grades who will now get a 1% increase

Conclusion

When we put the choices to a vote, we can propose that the new compensation plan chosen will be in effect on a trial basis for one budget biennium.

The three options will be mounted on ASC’s Blackboard community and we encourage discussion.
Hi Paul:

I agree with your points. The issue of turnover for certain positions is one that needs study as well as turnover costs [recruitment process costs etc] on a position by position basis if frequency of turnover is apparent for certain positions. One of my concerns is that higher level AS have been well served by higher hiring salaries, the JAQ review process and the market adjustment process, all of which contribute to their penetration. It is possible that lower lever ASC are not included in those processes. Please review the attached information for ranges 18-22.

Thanks Dave

At 01:20 PM 2/9/2006, Paul G. Lopez wrote:

Please forgive my continued inability to make our regular meetings but if I may input on this email -

I guess what I'm reading is that the "across-board-increase" would just be a dollar amount applied universally...making it more impactful on the lower salary ranges in terms of a percentage increase. I suspect we will find out which people are in the 1st quartile of higher salary ranges that also would like to make progress towards the midpoint??

I have not reviewed the mounts of data that has been supplied to determine if this is a significant population or not.

An argument I suspect that immediately will be made is that a "cost-of-living" increase could look very different to the "cost-of-living" those in higher salary ranges have built for themselves...

In my opinion an economic "cost-of-living" or inflation percentage increase needs to be the basis of any humanistic compensation plan. People shouldn't feel they cannot continue the "quality of life" they may have built for themselves.

I suspect if we could have the budget for more significant merit increases...this would be a way of making the "flat dollar amount" work to moving people thru their range. Make the merit amount a dollar amount not a percentage but make sure everyone floats at least even with the inflation index by making that a mandatory increase yearly...
It is an altruistic model that rewards those at the lower salary levels on the backs of those at the higher levels and only remains an altruistic model if those at the lower levels remain at the institution to in effect bear their burden...otherwise the system can be worked to the benefit of those looking to stay for just a short time.

We've done this a bit over here at the station but I think it works here because we have very little turn-over...I'm not so sure this is true University-wide.

Paul

"Ann B. Jenks" <annje@bgnet.bgsu.edu> on Thursday, February 9, 2006 at 9:06 AM -0500 wrote:
> Thanks for the slide Naomi, it illustrates the flat dollar amount raise.
> I
> will attempt to state what we talked about yesterday and please send
> corrections.
> The meeting with the President's compensation group is in March and we
> need
> to focus on a request with high potential for success.
> We need to find out if administrative staff are at BGSU as a stopping
> place
> in their career or spending their career here.
> The way to fix the compensation picture would be to change and enforce
> consistent hiring practices so that incoming salary would be at the first
> quartile for meeting qualifications and higher for those with additional
> experience. (And not above the top of the range)
> We don't have a market value for all positions because Mercer only rates
> benchmark positions commonly held across many like institutions.
> Why is there such high turnover?
> We can put three compensation choices before Council to get their input
> before going to Administrative Staff as a whole: 1) a flat dollar
> increase
> for everyone as a 'cost of living adjustment' as seen in Naomi's slide
> 17;
> 2) performance penetration seen in Mercer slide 8; 3) keep the same
> system
> we have.
> The flat dollar increase would bring staff in the lower ranges to the
> midpoint more quickly, but may be very unpopular to people in the higher
> ranges who count on a percentage increase in their retirement plan. It
> does
Here are a few bullets to describe our current status of compensation plan adequacy.

Thanks Dave

Dave Crooks
Sr. Assoc. Dir. Rec. Sports
BGSU Ice Arena
419-372-3225
Fax: 419-372-0303
dcrooks@bgnet.bgsu.edu
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
ASC SALARY ANALYSIS

1. ASC has asked for a process for moving constituents through their salary range for over 10 years. No process exists and ASC staff languishes close to their hire point in their pay range.

2. The university has not developed a consistent process for determining starting salaries based on the compensation consultants’ advice. The BGSU compensation consultant has advised the university that new staff can be hired at different points in their salary range based on the qualifications of the candidates. The BGSU salary data can be interpreted to reflect that only higher pay grade candidates are hired at and sometimes well above above the midpoint of the salary range. Many of these candidates have been hired above the 75% point in their pay range.

3. Analysis of the following groups of ASC pay grades shows the problem
   - 57 ASC staff in Paygrades 18-22 average $16,000 above the midpoint
   - 258 ASC staff in Paygrades 15-17 average $760 above the midpoint
   - 269 ASC staff in Paygrades 11-14 average $383 below the midpoint

4. The compensation consultant has suggested the goal of a compensation plan is to move staff through the pay range to the midpoint in 5-7 years. After the midpoint is reached outstanding performance and productivity are critical in continued salary range penetration.

5. The annual salary pool distribution process exacerbates inequity in salary pay grade penetration. The university should accept responsibility for the development of annual salary pool distribution processes that would help to address salary range penetration inequities.
Text for presentation of Mercer Slide #8 – Setting Starting Salaries

The starting salary is currently determined by the Contracting Officer who controls the budget for that area. Staff who are brought in at the minimum of their pay grade and get a 3% increase in the years it is available could possibly reach the mid-point of their grade in 20+ years. Other staff, particularly in the highest pay grades, are brought in above the mid-point and in some cases above the maximum. Looking at a 3% increase as a cost of living adjustment – 3% of $30,000 is a whole lot less than 3% of $110,000. The way to fix the compensation picture over the long term would be to ensure that consistent hiring practices be put in place and strictly adhered to across campus. Incoming salaries would be at the first quartile for meeting qualifications and higher for those with additional experience (and not above the grade maximum).

Text for presentation of Mercer Slide #13 – Range Penetration Analysis at BGSU by Grade

A cautionary note on this slide – Grade 7 consists of one staff member who has been in position for 23 years, resulting in high penetration. Same scenario in Grade 8. Grade 9 has 5 employees who have been in position for 21, 21, 1, 16, and 9 years. This anomaly aside, it is evident that success in range penetration comes to those in the highest pay grades, while half of Administrative Staff are in the mid-level grades and stay below midpoint (aka market) for many years. Could it be that many employees are in the top quartiles due to longevity as opposed to outstanding sustained performance?

Text for presentation of Mercer slide #16 – Salary Administration

As far as equity is concerned this compensation method is the clear choice. The Mercer representative told us this mechanism is unattainable without a functioning performance evaluation system. We had a performance evaluation system in place for a short time in the Betsy Clark/Chuck Middleton eras because the faculty who supervise administrative staff were held accountable for evaluations. The Handbook of Commonly Held Policies and the HR website state that annual performance evaluations will be conducted for all faculty and staff, but it is no longer enforced. If there was a chance of success in achieving this, it is the best plan, but need I say more?

Text for presentation of Naomi’s Slide #17 – Fixed Dollar Amount Salary Adjustment

Rationale: A 3% salary increase is approved by the BOT. Rather than applying it as we have been since the Mercer compensation plan was implemented, we will take 3% of the entire Ad Staff salary pool, divide it by the number of staff and assign that flat dollar amount to everyone. This plan helps people at the lowest ranges at the expense of the people at the highest. Are we helping people who are here for a brief time and view BGSU as a stopping off
place on their career path? Or by helping these people a bit will we improve retention, reduce turnover?

Advantages:
--Starts to give people in the lower pay ranges a little nudge toward midpoint
--would be easy for the administration to implement

Disadvantages
--does not address performance – no reward for excellence
--will not be favorable to those in the highest pay grades who will now get a 1% increase

Conclusion

When we put the choices to a vote, we can propose that the new compensation plan chosen will be in effect on a trial basis for one budget biennium.

The three options will be mounted on ASC’s Blackboard community and we encourage discussion.
Fixed Dollar Amount Salary Adjustment

BGSU Administrative Staff

- Total Salary $32,556,672
- Number of Staff 610
- Estimated 3% salary Adjustment $976,700
- Actual Amount per Person $1601
- Example Amount $1500/per Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Salary</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salary information based on BGSU Human Resources data October 2005

Mercer Human Resource Consulting
# Fixed Dollar Amount Salary Adjustment

**BGSU Administrative Staff**

- Total Salary $32,556,672
- Number of Staff 610
- Estimated 3% salary Adjustment $976,700
- Actual Amount per Person $1601
- Example Amount $1500 per Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Salary</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salary information based on BGSU Human Resources data October 2006

Mercer Human Resource Consulting
PWC Presentation on 2005-2006 Compensation Goals to ASC March 2, 2006

At PWC Feb. 22, Dave, Naomi and I decided not to use Mercer slide #6 because we don’t have a market driven compensation plan, it is complex and we don’t have time to adequately cover the subject.

Introduction
Each fall and spring ASC chair and Chair-Elect and PWC Co-Chairs meet with the President’s Compensation group. The fall meeting is a preliminary exchange of ideas on where ASC stands on compensation priorities and where the administration stands on what is feasible. The spring meeting is ASC’s opportunity to present what we want in terms of compensation for all administrative staff for the next fiscal year. PWC and ASC Exec work on prioritizing the compensation goals and year after year we seem to make little or no headway with the administration in getting our requests approved. Looking at the historical record and seeing that Council was striving for the same goals in the 1980’s that we strive for today made us focus on a single goal with a high potential for success – pay equity.

Here is a brief background on Mercer and our compensation plan, the goal we have selected to pursue this year, and three proposals for achieving this goal. We need your view on dealing with compensation issues that will affect all administrative staff, knowing there will be differing opinions. We want to take these proposals on how the annual salary increase is distributed to your constituents, encourage them to join in the Blackboard discussion, and bring their input to the April meeting. We will hold a meeting of the whole to address this subject followed by a vote on how Administrative Staff wants to be compensated.

We met with two representatives of Mercer, Inc. who was hired by BGSU in the early 90’s to devise a compensation plan for Administrative Staff. Mercer came up with the Job Analysis Questionnaire, the pay grades, the quartiles and the item we talk about continuously – the midpoint aka the market value for a position. We are showing you a few of the slides from Mercer’s powerpoint presentation that Lona emailed to all ASC members on February 6 and the subject header was: February 2 Meeting Follow Up if you want to look at the entire presentation when you return to your offices. The only slide you won’t see in that email attachment is seen here as #17 and was created by Naomi Lee based on information from HR....

Text for presentation of Mercer Slide # 7 – Job Evaluation Methodology

Administrative Staff assumed our compensation plan was a market-drive one. The Mercer representatives informed us that it is internally driven. The administration set the weighting of the points in the JAQ, determining which criteria are worth more than others. The University “market analysis” for a position consisted of looking at all similar positions, finding the median salary and assigning that as mid-point for the position. This procedure was used to create internal equity as opposed to equity to market outside the institution.
Dave Crooks, 11:48 AM 2/10/2006, Re: pwc yesterday

ASC Grades 22-18 Salary Range Penetration.xls

MARCH 2
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Build momentum of message to roll your
constituency

Consider: projections on how Annual Salary
increase is distributed - look at this
we read you
Hi Everyone:
I think the paragraph below is something we need to discuss further to see if we have any consensus on PWC for whether to try to move forward on compensation plan processes. I realize the serious non-financial goals need identification and clarity but I do want to continue to work on a compensation plan. The statement below is the description I gave to Kim as our committee report at the last ASC meeting. I think it describes the compensation plan challenge we face.

"Shared substance of meeting with Mercer representative and implications for PWC goals. Advised ASC that compensation plan can only work if the annual salary pool distribution is reviewed and possibly changed from the current "across the board" percentage to a different model of annual salary pool distribution. The establishment of a starting salary policy/process is also very important in creating a successful compensation plan that achieves salary range penetration to the 50th% point for all employees based on certain criteria of performance and years in position."

Thanks Dave

Dave Crooks
Sr. Assoc. Dir. Rec. Sports
BGSU Ice Arena
419-372-3225
Fax: 419-372-0303
dcrooks@bgnet.bgsu.edu
The performance penetration plan would require a performance evaluation system that works.

The current system of a percentage salary increase for all who meet expectations and an additional percentage increase for super merit compounds salary inequity and does not get people to the midpoint.

Depending on the ASC agenda we could take 15-20 minutes at the next three meetings to educate Council, showing the Mercer powerpoint slides 7, 8, 11, 16, 17, provide a brief history/background of the compensation/mercer plan, and ask Council for their input. This would be in preparation for putting the compensation plan to a vote at a meeting of all administrative staff. We expect resistance from some/many staff to the flat dollar increase and we would need a miracle to install the performance penetration model (even though it is the most equitable). Quarter, please.

Ann B. Jenks
Interim Head and University Archivist
Center for Archival Collections
5th Floor Jerome Library
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green OH 43403-0170
(419) 372-6936

Paul G. Lopez
Production Manager
Tucker Center for Telecommunications
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402
(419) 372-7027 - FAX (419) 372-7048
lopez@wbg.net.bgsu.edu
Web: www.wbg.net.org

Dave Crooks
Sr. Assoc. Dir. Rec. Sports
BGSU Ice Arena
419-372-3225
Fax: 419-372-0303
dcrooks@bgnet.bgsu.edu

Printed for "Ann B. Jenks" <annje@bgnet.bgsu.edu> 2/14/2006
Dave,
I have some handouts I brought to Exec today that I will bring tomorrow. I have attached a lengthy document with excerpts primarily from ASC minutes outlining some Mercer "moments".

Today I gave Steve a document which I think he still has regarding penetration in a salary range that showed it would take 26 years for an administrative staff person to reach midpoint if they were hired in at their range minimum.

Here are the burning questions Exec had for Mercer today:
1) How do other state universities treat Mercer recommendations, particularly in this current budget scenario?
2) What strategies have other institutions used to successfully bring as many administrative staff as possible to midpoint?
3) How do we ensure that salary raises mandated by the mercer Plan come out of a university-wide budget and not our of the individual areas?
4) What is our recourse if the University does not follow Mercer recommendations?
5) How common is it for employees to be at the top of their salary range due to longevity as opposed to "outstanding sustained performance"?
6) Where do BGSU administrative staff salaries fall in comparison to the other 10 institutions in the CUPA data? - and we want this to be broken down into ranges so the data is not skewed by the highest and lowest ranges.
7) There is a question about the validity of the numbers in the CUPA data - Connie Molnar spotted some errors. And there are many BGSU positions not listed.

Do you, Dave, have the CUPA figures for where BG fell each year among the 11 institutions? I was only able to find a few references to this in the ASC minutes from years past.

Thanks,
Ann

At 01:57 PM 1/10/2006, you wrote:

Hi Everyone:
Administrative Staff representatives have an opportunity to have a working session with a Mercer representative[s] on January 18 at about 1:30pm. Attached are some Mercer related goals we have developed together. I would like to discuss these tomorrow at our meeting, and other ideas for discussion with Mercer on January 18. Also, if you have any other suggestions, please e-mail them to me.

Thanks Dave

Dave Crooks
Sr. Assoc. Dir. Rec. Sports
BGSU Ice Arena
419-372-3225
- need a year by year report on CLEPA data - where Bosch has placed in 11 companies' Ohio institutions
- mid point retired within 4-7 years at machines
- adjustment of salary ranges documented at each time this has been done
- documents - quote for the Mercer Study 1995-
  Mercer Corporation Report 2001
ASC Exec and Personnel Welfare Committee request a working session with the representatives from Mercer to discuss and plan the full implementation of the Administrative Staff compensation plan. ASC representative will need adequate notice of the meeting time prior to this working session. Topics listed below, and others, would be discussed with Mercer representatives:

A. Understanding of the process to identify how marketplace salaries (Mercer) should be used to determine starting salary.

B. Understanding of how marketplace salaries (Mercer) are used to determine salary ranges.

C. Discuss criteria, processes, and funding options for administrative staff to:
   a. Progress through their salary range.
   b. Achieve midpoint of their salary range by the beginning of their sixth year of employment at BGSU.
   c. Identify funding options to allow Administrative Staff to maintain at least the midpoint of their salary range after the beginning of their sixth year through the use of annual merit raises and/or other adjustments.

D. Discuss how other employers utilize the JAQ evaluation process for both new and re-evaluated positions and address the absence of JAQs for some Administrative Staff. Identify the maximum period necessary to develop a JAQ for Administrative Staff members who are without a JAQ.

Where does BGSU stand in relation to market, and how salary is determined based on regional, state, national level?

- Does Mercer use CLUSA data?
- How are benchmark positions selected?
- University wants to be a competitive employer (Mercer)
  Mercer says what will make us competitive
  Goal: meeting the large % increase in years
  If we are aiming for market level, how do we maintain it?