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MEMORANDUM

TO: Administrative Staff Council Representatives

FROM: Judy Donald, ASC-PWC Subcommittee
       Duane Whitmire, ASC-PWC Subcommittee
       Jeanne Wright, ASC-PWC Subcommittee

RE: Survey on Distribution of Salary Pool Dollars via the Merit System

A subcommittee of the Administrative Staff Council Personnel Welfare Committee has been charged to "Review and make recommendations on distribution of next salary pool dollars via the merit system. Factors in this process include the combination of the past three fiscal years without any merit consideration with the current fiscal year".

One method to meet this charge is to survey Administrative Staff Council representatives in an attempt to gather information that will be used in the formulation of recommendations. Please complete and return the enclosed survey to Judy Donald in Continuing Education by November 12, 1993.

Thank you, in advance, for taking the few minutes to respond to the survey.
MEMORANDUM

December 2, 1993

TO: Norma Stickler, Chair
    Personnel Welfare Committee

FROM: Duane Whitmire, Member
       PWC Subcommittee on Merit Raises

RE: Status Report

Per your request, below please find a status report summarizing the work of the PWC Subcommittee on Merit Raises at this point in time.

Judy Donald, Jeanne, Wright, and myself have been serving on a subcommittee that is charged to "Review and make recommendations on distribution of next salary pool dollars via the merit system. Factors in this process include the combination of the past three fiscal years without any merit consideration with the current fiscal year".

On November 1, a Merit Raise Survey was sent to 38 administrative staff representatives as a pilot study in an attempt to gather information that will be used in the formulation of recommendations. By the November 12 deadline for survey returns, 19 (50%) responses had been received.

Although no concrete conclusions could be drawn from the small pilot study, some general observations were possible.

• There appears to be a lack of standard criteria to evaluate merit.
• There seems to be inconsistencies in awarding merit monies.
• Based on the few evaluation forms received, there are different forms used for the evaluation process.
• It may be difficult to award merit on a retroactive basis due to changes in supervisors, lack of documentation, etc.

The pilot study proved valuable in gathering preliminary information that can be used to obtain more extensive feedback to assist our subcommittee in making recommendations relative to merit raises. We will be meeting tomorrow to determine our next course of action.

If you need any additional information, please feel free to contact me.

pc: J. Donald
   G. Jordan
   J. Wright
MEMORANDUM

TO: Norma Stickler, Chair - Personnel Welfare Committee

FROM: Duane Whitmire, Chair - PWC Subcommittee on Merit Raises
Judy Donald, PWC Subcommittee on Merit Raises
Jeanne Wright, PWC Subcommittee on Merit Raises

RE: Final Report

January 14, 1994

As you know, the ASC - PWC Subcommittee on Merit Raises has been diligently working the last few months collecting information from Administrative Staff to meet our charge to "Review and make recommendations on distribution of next salary pool dollars via the merit system. Factors in this process include the combination of the past three fiscal years without any merit consideration with the current fiscal year".

An initial pilot Merit Raise Survey was sent to 38 Administrative Staff Council representatives to gather preliminary information that could be used to fine tune a survey instrument to send to a broader group of administrative staff. The 50% response rate to our pilot survey proved valuable in formulating the final instrument.

On December 7, 1993 the final version of the 1993 Merit Raise Survey was sent to a random sample of 200 administrative staff. A total of 48 usable surveys were returned (24% response rate) by the due date. The subcommittee then analyzed the returns on both a quantitative and qualitative basis which led to the formulation of conclusions and recommendations that are listed in the Executive Summary.

In an attempt to include all pertinent information in this report, the following items are presented for review by all administrative staff members or other interested parties: 1) 1 Page ASC-PWC Executive Summary 2) Copy of the 2 Page 1993 Merit Raise Survey, 3) 1 Page ASC-PWC Merit Raise Survey Quantitative Results, 4) 12 Page ASC-PWC Merit Raise Survey Qualitative Results, and 5) Appendix A - Samples of Evaluation Forms.

Hopefully, the work of the ASC-PWC Subcommittee on Merit Raises will prove valuable to both ASC and central administration as decisions on awarding merit are made. Both Judy Donald and Jeanne Wright should be commended for their efforts associated with the work of this subcommittee. If you need any additional information, please feel free to contact me.

pc: G. Jordan, Chair - Administrative Staff Council
R. Waddle, Chair - ASC Salary Committee
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL
PERSONNEL WELFARE COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON MERIT RAISES

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS
JUDY DONALD
DUANE WHITMIRE
JEANNE WRIGHT

COMPLETION DATE
JANUARY 14, 1994
1993 Merit Raise Survey

The purpose of this survey is to explore procedures for proper distribution of merit raise monies to administrative staff members when designated money is available. Thank you for completing the following questions. Please return this completed form with a copy of a standardized performance evaluation by Friday, December 17th.

1. In your area, who completes your employee performance evaluation?

Name: __________________________
Area: __________________________
Title: __________________________

1a. When was your last performance evaluation? ________ ______ (year)

1b. When were you first employed at BGSU? ________ ______ (month) (year)

2. What standardized form (if any) is used for your performance evaluation? (Please attach a blank evaluation form to this survey, if possible.)

3. Does the standardized form adequately reflect your performance evaluation?
   ______ yes ______ no

   3a. Please explain the reason for your answer:

4. How often is the employee performance evaluation process completed?
   ______ annually ______ twice a year ______ other ________ (please specify time frame)

5. If merit raises were to be distributed, would your performance evaluation be an objective measurement for the distribution of merit dollars?
   ______ yes ______ no

   5a. Please explain the reason for your answer:

5b. Does your performance evaluation list specific criteria to be achieved for merit dollar distribution?
   ______ yes ______ no
6. Would distribution of merit dollars boost morale?

______yes  ______no

6 a. Please explain the reason for your answer:

7. What percentage of the salary pool should be distributed for merit raises?
   (note previous formula 60% across the board + 40% merit):

______100% across the board + no merit

______100% merit + none across the board

______75% across the board + 25% merit

______60% across the board + 40% merit

______50% across the board + 50% merit

______40% across the board + 60% merit

______25% across the board + 75% merit

______other _____ (please specify)

8. If the approved monies for a potential raise in income, is less than the cost of living increase, should the entire percentage be distributed across the board with no merit consideration?

______yes  ______no

8 a. Please explain the reason for your answer.

9. When merit monies are available, should a portion of this merit be awarded, retroactively, as compensation for past years of performance, when merit was not available?

______yes  ______no

9 a. Please explain the reason for your answer:

Other comments concerning merit raises:

Please return to: Judy Donald
Continuing Education or Jeanne Wright
Student Health Service
Thank you for your consideration.
3. Does the standardized form adequately reflect your performance evaluation?

• Yes, because there is plenty of room to add detailed comments, and there are guidelines, but the guidelines are fairly general.

• My position deals more with day-to-day operational work load. The survey is geared toward an administrator.

• I may add information, as well as highlight certain points, as I wish, without the constraint of a form.

• Current evaluation form does not incorporate job duties but evaluation of overall performance - not job specific.

• We complete these forms ourselves. Supervisor will add their comments and that's that.

• Performance goals are developed by both supervisor and myself.

• No - doesn't reflect all that I do

• It's difficult to be evaluated when your supervisor really does not know what you do. It also adds difficulty to the evaluation when you have never received goals as expectations.

• I've never seen the form.

• Professor tries to survey the regular users of our services. Sometimes they do not reply. Other times the survey misses some special users who received alot of help in the past year.

• No standardized form.

• My director is very thorough on evaluations - however, the form is not very thorough. It could go the other way depending on the evaluator.

• Goes into details and goals.

• Inclusive of my responsibility.

• My supervisor summarizes significant critical incidents that occurred during the past year. We discuss this and add any items I think are appropriate.

• Mutually agreed upon goals are set. Evaluation is done on those goals.
• It gives strengths and areas of improvement.

• Every year we seem to use a different one, and I disagree with how they are written.

• The memo responds to information in my job description.

• I never saw one.

• I am able to develop full particulars which helps describe productivity objectively.

• I developed this format in conjunction with the committee responsible for direction and approval; however, when my job grew as a result of new facilities, the description did not change (only the amount of work necessary).

• I am not evaluated on "client satisfaction" for those I help, both inside and outside our department. The emphasis is on an appropriate quantity of work, rather than "going the extra mile" in working well with others.

• On the paper, all you see are the end results but not all the work that was put forth to get those end results.

• I don't feel it does, because it has never really been taken seriously.

• Covers three categories.

• My evaluation is more closely done with our annual report.

• She sees me once in the classroom and originally evaluated me on that visit. She sets goals (sometimes unreasonable) and then gives her criticism.

• It does for the most part, but no one evaluates me on the basis of student evaluations or teaching performance. I'm only evaluated on administrative duties.

• It really doesn't take into account extra work done or effort put forth.

• Needs to include a section perhaps, on supervision; although I usually include it under "assigned duties and responsibilities".

• Adequately-yes; however, it is long and contains ratings that most administrative types do not perform. Seven pages is a bit long.

• Many times other projects are assigned mid year and they are often not included in the evaluation.

• It is not objective. Rather, it is subjective based on the rater's personal feelings about the employee.
Could be better - it's the general standardized university form.

5. If merit raises were to be distributed, would your performance evaluation be an objective measurement for the distribution of merit dollars?

Ideally, that should be the standard - however, each supervisor treats evaluations somewhat differently - some have high expectations and may consider an 8 to be excellent while others are generous in giving out 10's. There is too much inconsistency from supervisor to supervisor for evaluations to be the only criterion.

It has always been used to determine merit.

Only if accurately completed by the supervisor. Also, only significant contributions can be accepted. Often we simply list all the tasks we complete, in some cases even those required of the job, and regardless of how important.

We have a list outlining and assigning point values to items for merit consideration.

Many performance evaluations are based on the evaluator's personal opinions of employee and therefore is not objective.

These evaluations would need to be done quarterly or semi-annually.

There are certain requirements that have to be met each fiscal year and they are clear cut and obtainable.

Sometimes right before evaluations are done something may go wrong and your evaluation isn't reflective of the job you have done all year or may have personal problems (not objective) brought into it.

Absolutely not.

The evaluation identifies strengths and weaknesses.

He really has no idea what we do.

Only if there was a good response to the survey and special users are included.

Performance evaluation does not well reflect cost savings and increased program demands.

I trust that my director would evaluate me accurately, but how do the vice presidents make these decisions? We have very little contact with them.

Not in the past based on other supervisors!
However, in our office we do have a point system - objective for merit dollars. This was established by staff themselves.

As objective as possible when my merit pool includes two part-time faculty members who are also program directors.

Because we look at set goals and evaluate against it as well as performance and responsibilities taken over and above set goals.

It's not how well you do your job, it's how many goals you can think of and accomplish.

I don't think being late for work, when I work hours after 5:00 is a clear indication of my performance.

It describes what I do.

I meet with the Dean at the beginning of August and develop goals for the year.

I don't believe that complex responsibilities can be measured very objectively, especially when the results of a performance are qualitative and not quantitative for the most part. It depends on the evaluator.

I believe the supervisor should be the person to distribute merit awards.

It is not a personal evaluation.

Since I've been here the VP has always distributed merit pay evenly, I believe at least I can say for sure I've always got exactly the average figure.

Too broad on the form - hard to objectively measure merit defining what should be done vs. what is expected.

The fact that as a full-time employee I work on average 70-80 hours per week, what I make doesn't reflect the hours I put in. Especially since I don't get paid overtime, I think a merit raise would be assumed without an evaluation.

Form is not objective in nature.

Initiative to go "above and beyond" is not taken into account on this evaluation.

It would give me merit in my area - However, I am not sure the format was objective or quantifiable.

I believe performance reports, on the whole, to be over rated. Everyone is in the top 5% of ratings.

Probably, but there is some subjectivity when evaluating others!
• It is basically a subjective evaluation form. Merit itself is always going to be distributed subjectively. With a set pool of money, a supervisor will always see that the people he/she determines to be meritorious are rewarded accordingly.

• The evaluation is too general and subjective.

• I would say the director favors me over other employees because I'm young and new, and because I teach in an area that is not her expertise, therefore she is not very critical in my evaluation.

• The evaluation is very subjective. Since she has a degree in reading, she is very critical of me.

6. Would distribution of merit dollars boost morale?

• Merit increases only add a few hundred dollars to my salary, it is not a motivator and there's too many other factors affecting morale for a few hundred dollars to make a difference.

• Since the cutbacks have been initiated, most of us have been given additional work loads with little or no reward. Anything would be viewed as a reward.

• Those individuals who continually exceed the duties outlined in their job descriptions should be compensated.

• Employees who give an extra effort to their jobs should be rewarded. If there is no recognition, many people will wonder why they shouldn't just do the minimum effort to get by.

• If based on objective performance indicators, overachievers would be rewarded.

• It's been too long that faculty have gotten more money than administrative staff.

• It depends on the individual and the work environment. For myself, I think it would boost morale to a certain extent.

• With budget and personnel cutbacks, we are asked to assume more and more responsibility for the same pay. It would be nice to receive a merit raise.

• Yes, because you are rewarded for your hard work. No, because if someone in the office gets merit pay then most likely everyone will get it or a discrimination lawsuit may come about. Criteria needs to be formulated for merit pay.

• Yes, if performance could be evaluated fairly and objectively.

• Individuals would be rewarded for going above and beyond - creative new ideas would be more likely to surface.

• Any positive measure would boost morale.
But I really do not like merit - trying to get merit takes away from your real job. The job you were hired to do!

I think that a little extra at times helps an employee to feel valued.

Despite significantly increased job duties and responsibilities, I have had negative salary growth. With little outside appreciation of work, merit would be a sign of appreciation.

The only thing that would concern me is consistency between areas. Do vice presidents make the same kind of decisions? Criteria?

Doing more than just the job.

The pools are typically so small that more problems are created with a merit pool than across the board raises. But some merit is good to reward truly meritorious people.

It helps in achieving goals and gives satisfaction for a job well done.

Morale boosts are short term.

There is too much subjectivity in the distribution of merit increases. Some supervisors give everyone the same percentage.

Sometimes I feel that we are not appreciated, and since it's too hard to tell someone how well they are doing I think monetary compensation would help.

There are many other factors besides the pittance used for merit raises that influence morale.

It is possible in my position to really put forth extra effort in development. Psychologically, I think merit reinforces performance. However, I am not dependant on it.

Maybe. It depends on the person distributing it. I have seen merit dollars used wisely, and I have seen it abused.

Although the merit dollars would be small, the mental feeling that someone appreciates your efforts goes a far distance.

No one on this campus (that I'm aware of) truly appreciates the work that gets done. By rewarding with merit, you feel you've done a good job.

Unless there were significant pools for a long period of time and merit were established to match that pool, it would be divisive and unfair to many of my staff.
• Anytime one receives an additional show of appreciation it’s a boost in morale.

• I am doing fine regardless. If you like your job and are doing your best that should be enough of a satisfaction.

• For me, yes. For other members of my area, no. Merit rewards those who work hard, however some people who evaluate employees have a different concept of working hard.

• It may well enhance performance, too.

• Usually, but it needs to be done fairly; otherwise morale can decrease. Research indicates that the merit system may detrimentally increase competition instead of teamwork within an office. What about team merit?

• Merit is normally expected. Getting it then is not a reward, but Not getting high merit is a punishment.

• One should be rewarded for a job well done.

• Yes, if given in a timely fashion and if everyone was evaluated equally.

• Those receiving less or no merit dollars may respond negatively if they perceive they deserve more.

• As I mentioned before, the hours I put in at night and on weekends without the extra pay. Knowing there would be a little extra money would help.

• Everyone should be doing their job.

• People appreciate recognition - Money is a very concrete way to recognize performance.

• Unless it was totally from the basic salary pool. As long as someone’s merit comes at the expense of other staff within an area, it will be viewed negatively.

8. If the approved monies for a potential raise in income is less than the cost of living increase, should the entire percentage be distributed across the board with no merit consideration?

• We should at least get cost of living increase annually.

• Cost of living is more important.

• Cost of living should be the minimum consideration for a raise. We should not have to go above and beyond our job duties just to get cost of living!

• Each employee regardless of merit should be given the opportunity to keep up with the cost of living increases.
• Unfortunately, we would have to be on the same level with the cost of living - how sad it would be if someone got a big fat merit increase while others would in essence be losing money.

• I have to say across the board, because a few do not ever deserve a raise - but that would be unfair to the majority of hard workers who may deserve a raise to the cost of living.

• Everyone needs the additional money to keep up with the cost of living. I don't like it when part-time people are discriminated against getting monies - full-time people were given money to compensate for the rise in health insurance and part-time were not.

• Even those who only "put in their time" should be given a raise - no one should go without.

• Too much trouble to break down a small percentage for an increase.

• A higher percentage could be across the board, but there are always special reasons why a few merit dollars are needed.

• I hate working here, but I am stuck here now with family and other concerns. I have had income loss while classified received steps and other administrators with less responsibility have been slotted into higher paying positions.

• It would be crazy to haggle over 5%.

• It is only fair.

• Across the board raises are appropriate when raises are less than the cost of living.

• Cost of living adjustments (if available) are basic rights of all employees and as much as possible employees should be guaranteed of that.

• The amount of merit is meaningless.

• There are a number of classified employees who are very highly paid, and there are a number of administrative employees who are not very highly paid.

• To be fair, everyone deserves at least cost of living.

• There are too many subjective aspects to merit raises to deny cost of living increases to all staff.

• Morale runs very low when raises do not meet the cost of living. Low morale impacts on efficiency and ability to work in the environment.

• Everyone needs a cost of living raise. Otherwise, morale would suffer.
• Not one person should be denied his/her cost of living adjustment; merit should be given out only when available.

• There wouldn't be enough to even realize merit.

• We should not penalize anyone if we can't guarantee they aren't losing money by working here another year.

• We should all share in adversity.

• I'm not sure merit money could be objectively distributed.

• As of now I barely live from month to month, so any raise would be nice.

• Employees need basic raises to meet cost of living increases.

• Merit is supposed to be an incentive to go above and beyond. If the incentive is not consistent, people get discouraged, causing negative effects on their performance.

• Everyone should at least get a cash and living raise.

• It's pretty obvious!

• Everyone should at least get COLA amount.

• For morale reasons.

• Some work harder than others, but everyone deserves some merit consideration.

• Goes back to taking food out of proper mouths.

9. When merit monies are available, should a portion of this merit be awarded, retroactively, as compensation for past years of performance when merit was not available?

• It would help.

• It would be nice, but is it feasible?

• The entire history of a person's University service should be considered. Consistency is important. One should not be hindered because of a "bad" financial year.

• I feel that it is unfair to have a staff member who has only been employed here for one or two years and has never had the opportunity to compete for merit in the same pool with someone who is including things from three years ago.
• This method would not take into consideration contributions of employees who have terminated their services with the University.

• That would be far too costly.

• It would boost morale and say thanks for all your hard work!

• Too hard to remember back 2 or 3 years plus "a portion" would once again be difficult to figure/calculate.

• It would depend on how much funding was available both across the board and for merit. There are some who deserve a retro merit for their extra work during lean times.

• So should market adjustments. If you stay here, are loyal and work hard your pay is static while high turn over jobs result in continuing increases in salary.

• Start fresh.

• I think the entire time period since the last merit should be used to decide and distribute the entire merit.

• A person may have two good meritorious years and one year that is not and should not lose merit because of this.

• If you want to do that, what about cost of living adjustments which were not given during financially difficult times.

• Too hard to remember what was "meritorious" - too subjective when you go back that far.

• I don't think there is any way past merit increases can be fairly distributed. Supervisors are not going to remember the good deeds.

• There are some years that your performance is based on circumstances and situations.

• Doing so would take more money away from people who currently deserve it.

• No. I say this simply because we have a major financial crunch at the moment. I don't think we could afford it.

• The reasons for merit or lack of it get too cloudy if they're over a year old.

• If this were the case, then everyone would at least have hope that their efforts would pay off eventually.

• I don't think there will ever be enough to make it worthwhile.
• It is not fair to penalize those who did great work when nothing was available and reward others just by chance when money is available.

• Any monetary awards would be appreciated by employees.

• Not more than two or three years.

• Good, hard work deserves reward.

• Of course, I have a biased opinion since I've never been eligible for merit (1st year on the job - not eligible, last three years - none available)

• I do not believe in retro-pay, besides, how will you measure performance on previous years, age, friendship, and how many years back?

• If monies were available, it would boost morale and help with administrative staff attitudes.

• Persons not achieving merit increases would be penalized even more.

• They should have gotten it then, so if it's available now, why not?

• Merit should reflect performance since the last merit distribution.

• If using a pool approach, maybe yes. If using % approach, no.

Other comments concerning merit raises:

• I was told that 30 hour, academic year administrative staff employees were not eligible for merit raises.

• All employees should be part of the pool and part-time should not be discriminated against, especially since they (BGSU) aren't hiring many full-time people anymore!

• People work so hard to get merit that they neglect what they were hired for.

• The other thing that concerns me is that some supervisors might "gloss" over evaluations when they don't want to hurt a staff member financially.

• A concern I have always had is that meritorious service has never been clearly defined. Merit raises should probably not be given until salary inequities are straightened out.

• If the salary pool is less than 4%, I think all the monies should be across the board. I also believe that merit monies should be based on a flat amount and not on percentages. This will help those employees whose base salary is low. I know I will start to lose but it will help new employees.
• It appears that there is a trend to treat classified and administrative employees alike in all situations. Which I think is great. I believe merit increases are one of those situations. If one group has - we all have.

• Merit pay should be used for merit only, and not for effecting a promotion, compensating for job market changes, etc. These situations should be acknowledged as such and dealt with outside the boundaries of the merit system.

• As professionals we're expected to do certain things. Some people are available to do more than others - should merit be given based upon availability?

• I do not believe in merit money. It is too political in nature and is handled unfairly in most cases. Everyone should share across the board increases. No one deserves to be singled out to receive as much percentage of raise as someone else.

• Do merit increases affect market adjustments? (take away from that pool)

• Why must they be distributed on the % system, allowing the rich to get richer and the poor, poorer. (widening the gap between top and bottom.) Information should be supplied so everyone knows how each v.p. area divides on merit - there should be more standardization across campus.

• I have received maximum merit for each pay raise provided to administrative staff since my hire in 1985. However, that has averaged out to be 3.4% per year. I have also received a market adjustment. However, I am still the lowest paid professional in my field of all state funded institutions in Ohio. My salary is 41% below the next higher paid person in my field in Ohio.

• I feel that I am treading water and merit is not a substantial "life preserver". I am not bitter, just feel forgotten. My best performance is expected daily, then why not expect total merit.

• Good luck!

• Will you consider rebuttals to evaluations? Will you consider an evaluation from another person given a history of conflict? Will the Firelands Dean sign and read the evaluations before giving to merit committee?

• Will the Dean see the evaluations prior to your committee? Will rebuttals be considered? When conflicts arise (as experienced the past 2 years in reg. evaluations), may an outside party write a letter?
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL
PERSONNEL WELFARE COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON MERIT RAISES

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE EVALUATION FORMS

Complex Coordinator/Hall Director
Firelands College
Instructional Media Services
Merit Evaluation Criteria Form (Unknown Source) - CAC
School of Art Gallery
Student Affairs - 90-91, 91-92, 92-93
Television Learning Services
Vice President for Planning and Budgeting
Vice President for Research & Dean of the Graduate College
COMPLEX COORDINATOR/HALL DIRECTOR
PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL
BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

This evaluation is designed to give information which can be used to enhance performance by assessing training needs and reinforcing quality performance. It is completed at the end of each academic semester in order to provide on-going feedback. A copy of this will be kept in the Staff Member’s personnel file in the Department of Residential Services.

Performance Appraisal Rating Scale

E=Exceptional  Performance consistently exceeds expected levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in most aspects of performance.

C=Commendable  Performance frequently exceeds expected levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in certain aspects of performance.

S=Satisfactory  Performance is consistently at expected levels. Meets basic job requirements.

DN=Development Needed  Some performance deficiencies exist. A plan for improvement should be developed and adapted.

U=Unsatisfactory  Performance is consistently below acceptable levels. A plan for improvement must be established and implemented immediately.

NO=Not Observable  Not observed and/or have knowledge of this in performance.

NA=Not Applicable  Not applicable to this individual’s area of responsibility.
Staff Supervision

1. Provides clear expectations of all staff members.
2. Plans, develops, and implements quality training for all staff members in regard to skill building and responsibilities.
3. Provides opportunities for staff development.
4. Provides all staff members with ongoing constructive feedback through one-on-one meetings, written documentation, etc.
5. Demonstrates consistency and fairness with all staff members.
6. Demonstrates assertiveness and holds all staff members accountable.
7. Is supportive of all staff members.
8. Delegates tasks and authority appropriately.
9. Demonstrates and encourages teamwork and cooperation from all staff members.
10. Understands, clearly interprets and supports institutional and departmental policies.
11. Conducts regular staff meetings.
12. Conducts regular one-on-one meetings with staff.
13. Solicits information and feedback regularly from all staff members.
14. Encourages and creates a positive atmosphere regarding cultural diversity among all staff members.
15. Communicates regularly with all staff members.

Comments:

Advising/Helping Skills

1. Identifies, offers assistance, and provides follow-up to students and staff who have personal, academic, career, health or other concerns.
2. Demonstrates sincere interest in staff and students needs and concerns.
3. Effectively deals with crisis intervention situations and provides written documentation and follow up.
4. Is aware of campus resources and services.
5. Maintains confidentiality.

Comments:

Administrative Skills

1. Performs administrative duties to maintain a functioning residence hall such as assigning rooms, controlling keys, and maintaining appropriate records
2. Completes all paperwork in an accurate, thorough, and timely manner. Policies and procedures are followed.
3. Reliable and dependable in accomplishing assigned tasks and commitments on time.
4. Organizes work and responsibilities, anticipates problems, sets priorities, and follows up.
5. Is punctual and attends required meetings.

Comments:
Communication/Information Sharing

1. Expresses self clearly, concisely, and appropriately, both verbally and in written form.
2. Disseminates information to staff in a timely manner.
3. Keeps supervisor informed, in a timely manner, of all issues, concerns, activities, etc.
4. Listens to and respects the opinions of others.
5. Is approachable, supportive, and pleasant.
6. Is prompt in communicating requested information.

Comments:

Professional Cooperation/Working Relationships

1. Works cooperatively with all Central Staff members.
2. Is supportive of other professional staff members.
3. Offers constructive feedback to other professional staff members.

Comments:

Professional Development/Progress Towards Goals

1. Actively works toward meeting own professional goals for the year.
2. Attends required departmental and hall in-services.
3. Actively participates in the committee(s) set forth by the department.
4. Demonstrates commitment to the position.
5. Actively works toward meeting departmental goals for the year.

Comments:

Relationships with Students

1. Acts as a role model for students through positive actions and interactions.
2. Makes attempts to develop positive relationships with students in the hall.
3. Has awareness and sensitivity to the needs of culturally diverse students and culturally diverse groups.
4. Is available and visible to students (e.g., visible in the office, attends hall activities, etc.)
5. Provides an environment where students may express concerns or discuss issues.

Comments:
PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SUMMARY

This staff member's strengths are:

Areas needing improvement:

Summary of overall performance:

Coordinator's/Director's Reflections:

_________________________________________  ______________
Complex Coordinator/Hall Director Signature  Date

_________________________________________
Supervisor Signature
Private and Confidential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Period:</th>
<th>/ / to / /</th>
<th>Completed and Returned By:</th>
<th>/ /</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Employee Name: ___________________________________________

2. Supervisor's Name: _________________________________________

3. Signatures: 
   - Supervisor ___________________________ / /
   - Date
   - Next Level Manager ___________________________ / /
   - Date

4. Overall Performance Category Rating: (Supervisor's Initials)
   - Conditional
   - Good
   - Developmental
   - Very Good
   - Superior
   - Exceptional

5. Summary of overall employee performance:
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

6. Employee comments regarding this WDS Review and performance category rating:
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

Employee H.R. Initials ___________________________ / /

Next Level Manager Date

Employee Date

Completed and Returned By: ___________________________ / /
7. Key Tasks and Measures (this reporting period):

8. Key Task Results:

9. Key Tasks and Measures (next reporting period): ___/___/_____ to ___/___/_____
This worksheet is to help you prepare for a discussion with your manager about your job responsibilities and your performance. Completing this Worksheet (or any section of it) is optional — but highly recommended.

Return by: __/__/__ Employee Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________

I have elected: ☐ To complete ☐ Not to complete this form. Please file with my review forms: ☐ Yes ☐ No

I. Identify the accomplishments you have achieved in your job since your last annual review. You will want to refer to the Key Tasks you and your manager identified at your last review.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Which ones do you think you performed exceptionally well, satisfactorily, less than you or your manager would have liked?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

How satisfied are you with your performance?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

How satisfied do you think your manager is?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

II. As you thought about what you accomplished in your job, you probably recalled obstacles which interfered with your ability to do the job as well as you may have liked. What were those obstacles?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

What ideas do you have to overcome them?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

III. Your manager will discuss ways for you to find satisfaction in your present job, and possible career opportunities that interest you. What kinds of work assignments, etc., do you like most?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Are there jobs or areas in the company you would like to learn more about — if so, what are they?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

What special talents do you possess?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________
Do you have any special career plans? (Please remember, you are not required to have "career plans" and it is perfectly acceptable to be happy with your present position).

What type of activities would help you to become even more effective on your job? i.e. on-the-job-training, seminars, college courses, etc.

IV. Think ahead to the Key Tasks you will be expected to perform in the next 12 months. What are the most important responsibilities you will have? What is deleted from last year's Key Tasks: what has been or should be added.

V. Your manager will discuss with you not only your job responsibilities, performance and development plans, but also some of the ways in which you accomplish your job. These are listed below so that you can think about them before your discussion. Please evaluate where you feel you are within each category by checking the appropriate space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Related:</th>
<th>Need Improvement</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Need Improvement</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning/organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meeting priorities/deadlines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinating/follow-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Control: budget, time, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Problem solving/decision judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Communications/written &amp; oral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Job knowledge/self-development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Innovation/creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Initiative/need for direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Handling uncertainty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Adjustment to change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Stress tolerance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Health/energy level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Attendance/punctuality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Safety practices/housekeeping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Related:</td>
<td>Need Improvement</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Listening/sensitivity to others' feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Providing support/recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Soliciting input/suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Giving/accepting criticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Emotional control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Maintaining working relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Other job related work factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Instructional Media Services Annual Evaluation

Period of Review: From _______________ to _______________

Name ____________________________
Area ____________________________
Job Title _________________________
Supervisor ____________________________

1. Overall Performance Rating
   Please circle the point on the line below which to your knowledge best describes the employee's overall job performance over the evaluation period.

   Above Outstanding Fully Standard Satisfactory Needs Some Improvement Inferior
   10-----9------8------7------6------5------4------3------2------1------0

2. (Supervisor) In the space below please provide a narrative evaluation of the employee in regard to the employee's quality of work, quantity of work, job knowledge, dependability, co-operation with IMS's customers and IMS staff, personal initiative, attendance, and any other areas that you feel are important in evaluating the employee's performance. Please cite specific examples whenever possible. Use back of form or add extra pages if extra space is needed for narrative.
3. Employee’s comments on overall and narrative evaluation.

4. My signature below attests that I have reviewed and discussed this evaluation with my supervisor.

Employee’s Signature ____________________________ Date ____________

5. My signature below attests that I have reviewed and discussed this evaluation with the above-signed employee.

Supervisor’s Signature ____________________________ Date ____________
MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA
(Calendar Year 1992)

PROCEDURE:

All staff members’ points are added together. This total point figure is divided into the total merit amount ($) to arrive at how much each point is worth. This is then multiplied by each member’s individual points to arrive at the merit amount.

I. PUBLICATIONS (Year Accepted)
   A. Book
   B. Article
      a. Jarred
      b. Non-Juried
   C. Review
   D. Published Finding Aid - External

II. GRANTSMANSHIP (Year Submitted)
   A. External
   B. Review (written, serve on panel, etc.)
   C. Grant Management/Administration

III. RESEARCH
   A. Deliver Major Papers
   B. Participate in Seminars/Workshops (preparation)
   C. CAC Speeches (all types - non-University)
   D. Participate on Panels/Roundtables (no preparation)

IV. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
   A. Attendance at Professional Meetings
   B. Attendance at Seminars/Workshops
   C. Professional Organization - Officer
   D. Editing

V. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
   A. CAC/LLR/University
   B. Outside - Professional
   C. Administering Independent/Internship Students
      (at least one semester)

VI. HONORS AND AWARDS
   A. Professional

VII. EXCELLENCE IN JOB PERFORMANCE
   A. To Be Awarded By Director
      -7 to +7
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
SCHOOL OF ART GALLERY EXHIBITIONS ADMINISTRATOR

Scoring Criterion: 1-7 (1 = unsatisfactory, 7 = outstanding)

I. Performance of Designated Duties Related to the Internal Operation of the Gallery (35%)

A. To work with the Gallery Committee to develop long-and-short-range objectives for the Gallery.
   1. Develop a three-year plan for the Gallery.
   2. Plan a detailed, yearly schedule of exhibitions and related special events (including all student and outside exhibitions as determined by the Committee).
   3. Work with student committees and faculty to establish procedures for student and faculty shows.
   4. Develop implementation schedules.

B. To carry out the administrative operation of the Gallery.
   1. Budget allocation, administration and records.
   2. Recruit and supervise student employees and assistant(s) assigned to the Gallery.
   3. Maintain exhibition records and operations files.
   4. Work with student committees and faculty to implement student and faculty shows.

C. To be responsible for the physical operation, maintenance, and care of the Gallery.
   1. Unpacking, installation, removal, and packing of outside shows.
   2. Supervision of students working on student shows.

AVERAGE TOTAL

\[ \text{Score} \times 3.5 \]

SCORE
II. Performance of Designated Duties Related to External Contacts (35%)

A. To accomplish all necessary research and development activities.

1. To perform all necessary research, contacts, travel, and meetings required to organize and implement Gallery exhibitions and programs.

2. Prepare grant and fundraising proposals.

B. To develop positive public relations for the Gallery and School and to coordinate publicity for exhibitions and other related special events.

1. Schedule media coverage.

2. Work with designers on invitations, announcements, posters, and flyers for exhibitions and programs.

3. Publish a newsletter each semester describing gallery events.

4. Receptions.

AVERAGE TOTAL

\[ \text{Score} \times 3.5 \]

SCORE
Performance Evaluation/Gallery

III. Success in Achieving School of Art Gallery Goals and Objectives (20%)

A. To introduce innovative and significant achievements in Arts that will stimulate and challenge thinking.

1. To bring outside exhibitions that will meet one or more of the following criteria.
   a. Stimulate interest and expose students to new and alternate directions.
   b. Complement and reinforce curriculum.
   c. Represent current trends in contemporary art.

2. To provide programs and resources that extend and develop the concepts of the exhibitions.

3. To provide exposure to artists as well as art.

B. To increase awareness, involvement, and support for the activities of the School of Art Gallery, the School of Art, and the University.

1. To showcase the achievements of the students and faculty of the School of Art.

2. To increase publicity and public relations activities.

3. Work cooperatively with other BGSU departments.

C. To enhance the cultural life of the University and area communities.

1. To be accessible to the public.

2. To share our resources and encourage community linkage through educational programs.

AVERAGE TOTAL

\[ X \times 2 \]

SCORE
Performance Evaluation/Gallery

IV. Professional Development (10%)

A. Travel and research.

B. Conferences, professional organizations.

C. Learning new skills/coursework.

AVERAGE TOTAL

\[ \text{Score} \times 1 \]

SCORE
DIVISION OF STUDENT AFFAIRS
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
1990-91

Name ________________________________
Evaluator ________________________________

1. Assigned Duties and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Marginally Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria

- Formulates plan(s) to meet assigned duties and responsibilities
  - Establishes goals, objectives, plan of action
  - Establishes priorities
  - Plans/schedules use of time
  - Other (list)

- Executes position duties and responsibilities
  - Understands position duties and responsibilities
  - Implements and follows through on plans formulated to meet position duties and responsibilities
  - Utilizes resources in carrying out duties and responsibilities; e.g. - time, staff, professional expertise/knowledge
  - Demonstrates accuracy and thoroughness in performing tasks related to duties and responsibilities

- Demonstrates productivity in performing tasks related to duties and responsibilities
  - Demonstrates flexibility in meeting position duties and responsibilities; e.g. - adjusts plans to meet changing circumstances.
  - Commits additional time when needed to meet position duties and responsibilities
  - Commits additional time when needed to meet additional job assignments
  - Other (list)
11. Service to Department, Division, University and/or Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Marginally</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities included in this category:

- Participates in University and/or division committees
- Participates in special assignments; e.g. task force, special projects
- Responds to requests from others for assistance/participation
- Involved with department, division or University in a way that furthers the interests of the University
- Teachers' courses, workshops, seminars
- Gives presentations to classes, groups
- Provides in-service training opportunities; e.g. workshops, in-service training, speaker
- Serves as a resource to others in department, division, University or community
- Participates in student-related activities; e.g. advises and/or counsels students, attends student-sponsored programs, maintains contact with students
- Recognized for service through honors, awards or commendations
- Commits additional time beyond assigned duties and responsibilities for service to department, division and/or University
- Other (list)
III. Professional and Educational Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Marginally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities included in this category:

- Attends department, division and/or University sponsored professional and educational activities; e.g. - workshops, lectures, in-service programs
- Attends state, regional and/or national conferences and/or workshops
- Participates in the development and/or presentation of conferences, workshops, in-service programs
- Serves on committees of professional association(s)
- Serves as officer of professional association(s)
- Participates in self-enhancement, development and educational activities; e.g. - coursework, readings, self-instruction, skill development
- Applies skills/knowledge attained through professional and educational activities
- Serves as consultant
- Authors, edits and presents for publication articles, reviews, monographs, textbooks or other scholarly writings
- Conducts evaluative research and/or develops reports for department, division or University use; e.g. - student surveys, program evaluation, data collection, analysis of data, written reports
- Makes presentations based on knowledge/expertise
- Utilizes available research/information
- Other (list)
Staff evaluation for Student Affairs provides two sets of forms to be completed. The purpose and use of each form are described below.

**Annual Performance Evaluation**

The purpose of the annual performance evaluation is to determine the extent to which an administrative staff member has met standards of performance related to job expectations and goals. The outcome of a decision that the standards of performance have been met is a consideration of eligibility for merit. The outcome of a decision that standards of performance have not been met is a consideration of appropriate remedies.

Annual performance will be evaluated on three factors: Execution of Assigned Duties and Responsibilities; Service to Department, Division, University and/or Community; and Professional and Educational Activities. Each of these factors will employ a 10-point numerical rating. A rating sheet for each factor is provided which includes a non-exhaustive list of possible criteria/activities to be considered in the assigning of a point value. The comment portion of each rating sheet is to be used for the purpose of listing the efforts of the individual in relationship to each factor and, in general, provide supportive information for each rating.

The enclosed definition sheet should be consulted when completing the Assigned Duties and Responsibilities rating sheet (Section I) and the remaining sections (II and III).

**Annual Merit Evaluation**

Merit evaluation follows from a decision that an administrative staff member has met standards of performance related to job expectations and goals. The purpose of the merit evaluation then is to determine the extent to which an administrative staff member has exceeded standards of performance. The outcome of a decision that the standards of performance have been exceeded is a consideration of an appropriate monetary award commensurate with the extent to which the standards of performance have been exceeded.

This Statement of Merit form is designed to provide information about those factors of performance that are relevant to the consideration of merit. The comment section of the form should be used to indicate the nature of meritorious conduct under each factor. The item score is the score listed on each of the rating sheets. Performance of Assigned Duties (I) will carry a weighting of 6. Employees need to choose one of the last two factors (II and III) to be weighted as a 2.5. The remaining factor will be weighted as 1.5. Total score for each factor is determined by multiplying the weighting factor by the item score. The composite score is determined by adding the factor totals. The highest possible composite score is 100. Merit is to be based on the composite score of which a minimum of 42 points must come from Assigned Duties and Responsibilities, category I.

**Procedure**

The administrative staff member should meet with his/her immediate supervisor no later than September 1 of each year to discuss job expectations and set goals and priority weighting of II and III. At least twice a year the employee will be rated by the immediate
supervisor to whom he/she is regularly assigned. The supervisor prepares for the evaluation by: giving the employee a copy of both forms; scheduling a date and time for the evaluation discussion; and by ensuring the employee understands the use of the forms and the evaluation procedures.

The employee completes the forms prior to the evaluation interview. During the interview, the supervisor and the employee should discuss the employee's performance as indicated by the three rating sheets, and, when appropriate, the consideration of merit as indicated by the Statement of Merit form. Upon completion of the interview, the supervisor prepares a final copy of both forms, makes a recommendation for merit pay, when appropriate, and submits the completed forms to the next immediate supervisor.

The annual performance evaluation is completed in December. This date is selected because of policies governing renewal and non-renewal of administrative contracts that require timely notification of non-renewal of contracts as follows:

a. not later than March 1 of the first, second and third year of service if the appointment is to expire at the end of the fiscal year, and

b. not later than January 1 of any subsequent fiscal year of service.

In addition to consideration of renewal or non-renewal of contracts, the annual performance evaluation involves a consideration of expectations leading to improved performance when necessary.

The merit evaluation is completed in April. This date is selected because the merit evaluation involves consideration of a monetary award commensurate with the extent to which the standards of performance have been exceeded. Merit awards are reflected in salary decisions for the contract immediately following the merit evaluation.
I. Assigned Duties and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Marginally</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria**

**Formulates plan(s) to meet assigned duties and responsibilities**
- Establishes goals, objectives, plan of action
- Establishes priorities
- Plans/schedules use of time
- Other (list)

**Executes position duties and responsibilities**
- Understands position duties and responsibilities
- Implements and follows through on plans formulated to meet position duties and responsibilities
- Utilizes resources in carrying out duties and responsibilities; e.g. - time, staff, professional expertise/knowledge
- Demonstrates accuracy and thoroughness in performing tasks related to duties and responsibilities
- Demonstrates accuracy and thoroughness in performing tasks related to duties and responsibilities
- Demonstrates productivity in performing tasks related to duties and responsibilities
- Demonstrates flexibility in meeting position duties and responsibilities; e.g. - adjusts plans to meet changing circumstances.
- Commits additional time when needed to meet position duties and responsibilities
- Commits additional time when needed to meet additional job assignments
- Other (list)
II. Service to Department, Division, University and/or Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Marginally Meets</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities included in this category:

- Participates in University and/or division committees
- Participates in special assignments; e.g. - task force, special projects
- Responds to requests from others for assistance/participation
- Involved with department, division or University in a way that furthers the interests of the University
- Teachers courses, workshops, seminars
- Gives Presentations to classes, groups
- Provides in-service training opportunities; e.g. - workshops, in-service training, speaker
- Serves as a resource to others in department, division, University or community
- Participates in student-related activities; e.g. - advises and/or counsels students, attends student-sponsored programs, maintains contact with students
- Recognized for service through honors, awards or commendations
- Commits additional time beyond assigned duties and responsibilities for service to department, division and/or University
- Other (list)

List/Explain Involvement:
Name

III. Professional and Educational Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Marginally</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities included in this category:

Attends department, division and/or University sponsored professional and educational activities; e.g. - workshops, lectures, in-service programs
Attends state, regional and/or national conferences and/or workshops
Participates in the development and/or presentation of conferences, workshops, in-service programs
Serves on committees of professional association(s)
Serves as officer of professional association(s)
Participates in self-enhancement, development and educational activities; e.g. - coursework, readings, self-instruction, skill development
Applies skills/knowledge attained through professional and educational activities
Serves as consultant
Authors, edits and presents for publication articles, reviews, monographs, textbooks or other scholarly writings
Conducts evaluative research and/or develops reports for department, division or University use; e.g. - student surveys, program evaluation, data collection, analysis of data, written reports
Makes presentations based on knowledge/expertise
Utilizes available research/information
Other (list)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Performance of Assigned Duties (60%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Service (15-25%)</td>
<td>1.5 or 2.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Professional-Educational Activities (15-25%)</td>
<td>1.5 or 2.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composite Score =

Employee Signature
Evaluator Signature
### Definitions

**Assigned Duties and Responsibilities (I)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Consistently does not meet expectations in the planning for and execution of assigned duties and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginally Meets</td>
<td>Occasionally does not meet expectations in the planning for and execution of assigned duties and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Consistently meets expectations in the planning for and execution of assigned duties and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Exceeds expectations in the planning and execution of assigned duties and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Definitions

**Service (II) and Educational Activities (III)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Indicates a low level of participation in the activities included in the category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Indicates a high level of participation in the activities included in the category.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assigned Duties and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Marginally</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria**

- Formulates plan(s) to meet assigned duties and responsibilities
  - Establishes goals, objectives, plan of action
  - Establishes priorities
  - Plans/schedules use of time
  - Other (list)

- Executes position duties and responsibilities
  - Understands position duties and responsibilities
  - Implements and follows through on plans formulated to meet position duties and responsibilities
  - Utilizes resources in carrying out duties and responsibilities; e.g. - time, staff, professional expertise/knowledge
  - Demonstrates accuracy and thoroughness in performing tasks related to duties and responsibilities
  - Demonstrates flexibility in meeting position duties and responsibilities; e.g. - adjusts plans to meet changing circumstances.
  - Commits additional time when needed to meet position duties and responsibilities
  - Commits additional time when needed to meet additional job assignments
  - Other (list)
II. Service to Department, Division, University and/or Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Marginally</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities included in this category:

- Participates in University and/or division committees
- Participates in special assignments; e.g. task force, special projects
- Responds to requests from others for assistance/participation
- Involved with department, division, or University in a way that furthers the interests of the University
- Teachers courses, workshops, seminars
- Gives Presentations to classes, groups
- Provides in-service training opportunities; e.g. workshops, in-service training, speaker
- Serves as a resource to others in department, division, University or community
- Participates in student-related activities; e.g. advises and/or counsels students, attends student-sponsored programs, maintains contact with students
- Recognized for service through honors, awards or commendations
- Commits additional time beyond assigned duties and responsibilities for service to department, division and/or University
- Other (list)
III. Professional and Educational Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>List/Explain Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Marginally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities included in this category:

Attends department, division and/or University sponsored professional and educational activities; e.g. workshops, lectures, in-service programs
Attends state, regional and/or national conferences and/or workshops
Participates in the development and/or presentation of conferences, workshops, in-service programs
Serves on committees of professional association(s)
Serves as officer of professional association(s)
Participates in self-enhancement, development and educational activities; e.g. coursework, readings, self-instruction, skill development
Applies skills/knowledge attained through professional and educational activities
Serves as consultant
Authors, edits and presents for publication articles, reviews, monographs, textbooks or other scholarly writings
Conducts evaluative research and/or develops reports for department, division or University use; e.g. student surveys, program evaluation, data collection, analysis of data, written reports
Makes presentations based on knowledge/expertise
Utilizes available research/information
Other (list)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Weighting Factor</th>
<th>X Score</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Performance of Assigned Duties (60%) (comments)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Service (15-25%)</td>
<td>1.5 or 2.5</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Professional-Educational Activities (15-25%)</td>
<td>1.5 or 2.5</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composite Score = ____

Employee Signature: ________________________
Evaluator Signature: ________________________
# Evaluation of Specific Areas of Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Areas of Responsibility</th>
<th>Responsibility Unfulfilled</th>
<th>Responsibility Fulfilled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily operation of the 7 channel closed circuit system, 4 channel Wood TV system, the two channel TITS and WTV cable channel 24.</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train, schedule, and supervise part-time student employees who handle the operation of the system during the evening and weekend hours.</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise faculty on the suitability and availability of instructional videotape programs from the CCTV library or from other distributors through rental and purchase.</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain videotape library including blank tape inventory and new program descriptions.</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain records and compile semester and annual reports for Learning Services playbacks, recordings, and acquisitions.</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle and solve together with engineering staff any problems caused by transmission or receivers on the CCTV system.</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for duplication and nonbroadcast distribution of Learning Services productions.</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare material for CCTV Videotape catalogue.</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain computerized inventory of television receivers and receiver locations on campus.</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently update electronic message systems.</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION OF GENERAL QUALITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Appearance</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Relationship with</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subordinates/support staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Ability to instill</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperation and motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in subordinates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ability to direct,</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manage,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and delegate effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Ability to develop</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff member to full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TELEVISON LEARNING SERVICES
## GOALS 1991-92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>ACCOMPLISHED</th>
<th>NOT ACCOMPLISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archive tapes in CCIV Library that have not been used, in order to provide badly needed space for new acquisitions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve TLS billing procedures to assure billing within 10 days of project completion.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research TLS fax wear/personnel accounting and its accuracy in showing the real cost of a program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce two (one each semester) TLS Newsletters, describing newly acquired programs, upcoming teleconferences and detailing services provided by TLS ** Not accomplished due to budget limitations.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish programming, test market, and demonstrate American Sign Language videotape</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute TLS catalog on floppy disk and via the Library computer system ** We are experiencing some difficulty in completing this task because of the varying computer systems being used on campus.</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↑

*These goals are determined at the beginning of the year.*
This form should be completed by each administrative staff member reporting to the Vice President for Planning and Budgeting. Completed forms are to be returned to the Vice President.

**SECTION I.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Objectives - past year</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Evaluation

Name_________________________ Date____________________

1. Regular duties:

( ) a. Prepares work of high quality with accuracy and thoroughness.

( ) b. Produces an appropriate quantity of work.

( ) c. Exhibits creative/innovative approaches.

( ) d. Displays motivation.

( ) e. Serves on committees, teaches and performs other related duties.

( ) f. Communicates effectively.
( ) g. Works effectively with other areas.

( ) h. Maintains a good working relationship with peers, subordinates, supervisor, students, or clients.

( ) i. Plans effectively.

( ) j. Organizes effectively.

( ) k. Performs occasional assigned duties.

( ) l. Overall rating on regular duties
2. Professional Activities:
   ( ) a. Continues own professional development, etc.
   
   ( ) b. Develops additional skills and improvements in job performance.
   
   ( ) c. Authors, edits, and/or presents publications, presentations, research, etc. (please describe).
   
   ( ) d. Submits and/or obtains grants, awards, etc.
   
   ( ) e. Overall rating of professional activities.
   
3. Special Activities:
   ( ) a. Serves University/community.
4. Performance of Staff Supervision:

( ) a. Instills cooperation and motivation in staff members.

( ) b. Manages and delegates effectively.

( ) c. Encourages and supports professional development of staff members.

( ) d. Treats staff members in a non-discriminatory manner.

( ) e. Overall rating on performance of staff supervision.
SUMMARY OF EVALUATION
(To be completed by supervisor.)

Signature of Supervisor: ____________________________

Date: ____________________________________________

Employee Comments:

Signature of Employee: ____________________________

Date Discussed: _____________________________
SECTION III.

Goals/Objectives - next year
These Guidelines are based upon the Evaluation Procedures contained in the Administrative Staff Handbook (pp. 9.1-9.2). Questions should be directed to the Associate Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate College or the Director of Administrative Staff Personnel Services.

Self-Evaluation

Each staff member submits to his/her supervisor a written self-evaluation which includes the following items:

1. A photocopy of the current job description for the position.

2. A photocopy of the goals established for the staff member for the current year.

3. An evaluation by the staff member of the extent to which those goals have been met. This should include an account of any new goals that were set during the year and evaluation of the extent to which they have been met.

(In the event that no goals were set for the current year, items 2 and 3 should be replaced by a statement of the staff member's accomplishments.)

4. Recommendations by the staff member of goals for the coming year.

5. Any suggestions the staff member has to offer concerning how performance might be improved.

Supervisor's Evaluation

Supervisors review each staff member's self-evaluation and then prepare an evaluation of the staff member's work. This evaluation is composed of a narrative evaluative review of the staff member's activities for the year and a translation of that review into a quantitative evaluation using the form provided for this purpose. The narrative evaluative review should also contain a section on goals for the coming year.

Forwarding of Evaluation

Once the supervisor's evaluation is prepared, it is discussed with the staff member, signed by both the staff member and the supervisor, and sent to the Associate Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate College for review and forwarding to the Office of Administrative Staff Personnel Services.
OFFICE OF ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH
AND DEAN OF THE GRADUATE COLLEGE
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION GUIDELINES
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Name ________________________________________________ Year ____________

Rate on a scale 1 - 7 in each category
(1 = unsatisfactory, 4 = average, 7 = outstanding)

1. **Performance of Assigned Duties**
   - Quality and quantity of work
   - Administration, planning, decision-making
   - Initiative, adaptability, communication skills
   - Other

2. **Professional and Interpersonal Relationships**
   - Supervisory skills
   - Attitude
   - Peer relationships
   - Service to University constituency
   - Other

3. **Professional Development**
   - Conferences
   - Coursework
   - Learning new skills
   - Other

4. **University Service**
   - Participation on committees
   - Participation with professional organizations
   - Service on governance bodies
   - Other

____________________________________________________
Supervisor

____________________________________________________
Staff Member
ASC-PWC Merit Raise Survey Results - 11/18/93

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #1</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question #2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #4</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Twice Yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75/25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Summary of Survey Comments**

There is a lack of standard criteria to evaluate merit.
There are inconsistencies in awarding merit monies.
It is difficult to award merit on a retroactive basis. e.g. changes in supervisor, lack of documentation, etc.
There were various opinions on appropriate merit distribution; keeping it the same at 60/40 was mentioned most.
There was no consensus that merit raises would boost morale.

ASC-PWC Subcommittee-Judy Donald, Jeanne Wright, Duane Whitmire
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #1</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question #2</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #3</td>
<td>Yes 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #4</td>
<td>Annually 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #5</td>
<td>Yes 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #5b</td>
<td>Yes 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #6</td>
<td>Yes 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #7</td>
<td>Yes 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #8</td>
<td>Yes 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #9</td>
<td>Yes 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASC-PWC Merit Raise Survey - Executive Summary

Based on feedback from respondents to the survey, the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the data resulted in the following conclusions and recommendations.

Conclusions

- More standardization in the evaluation process across the University is needed (e.g. 11 different evaluation forms were received)
- The evaluation process is too subjective
- There are too many inconsistencies in the current evaluation process
- Although most persons indicated that evaluations were conducted on an annual basis, there were some individuals who had never received an evaluation (e.g. one person had been employed since 1979 and had never been seen an evaluation form)
- Recent budgetary and personnel cutbacks have added to workloads without appropriate compensation
- Evaluations should have merit criteria built into them if merit is going to be distributed
- Since the amount of merit monies are so small, the process appears to be more negative than positive
- Merit dollars should not be used for market adjustments
- A larger percentage should be distributed across the board and a smaller percentage should be distributed for merit as opposed to the current 60/40% distribution
- When the dollars available do not meet the cost of living, the large majority of administrative staff responding to the survey believe the distribution should be 100% across the board
- There is no consensus on awarding merit on a retroactive basis for the past three years, but there are strong feelings that it would be very difficult to do on a fair, objective basis
- Merit is only one aspect of morale, and other factors for improving morale should be considered

Recommendations

- Develop one standard evaluation form to be used by all vice presidential areas
- Build objective criteria into a new standard evaluation form
- Implement methods to increase consistency in the evaluation process
- Require annual evaluations by each supervisor at the University
- Develop a mechanism to reward those affected by increased workloads
- Include merit criteria as part of the evaluation process on a University-wide standard evaluation form
- Improve the positive aspect of the evaluation process by making more merit monies available
- Eliminate the use of merit monies for market adjustments
- Change the current percentage breakdown between across the board and merit from 60/40% to 75/25%
- Distribute 100% across the board if the dollars available for raises do not meet the cost of living
- Award on the previous year's performance unless a fair, objective mechanism can be developed for awarding merit based on the last three years
- Develop cost effective University-wide incentives and perks to improve morale and productivity (e.g. flex time)
Merit Raise Survey

The purpose of this survey is to explore procedures for proper distribution of merit raise monies to administrative staff members when designated money is available. Thank you for completing the following questions. Please return this completed form with a copy of a standardized performance evaluation by Friday, November 12th.

1. In your area, who completes your employee performance evaluation?
   Name: __________________________
   Area: __________________________
   Title: __________________________

2. What standardized form (if any) is used for your performance evaluation? (please attach a blank evaluation form to this survey)

3. Does the standardized form adequately reflect your performance evaluation?
   ______ yes  ______ no  ______ unsure
   3 a. Please explain the reason for your answer:

4. How often is the employee performance evaluation process completed?
   __________________________________________

5. If merit raises were to be distributed, would your performance evaluation be an objective measurement for the distribution of merit dollars?
   ______ yes  ______ no  ______ unsure
   5 a. Please explain the reason for your answer:

6. Would distribution of merit dollars boost morale?
7. What percentage of the salary pool should be distributed for merit raises? (note previous formula 60% across the board + 40% merit.): ______

8. If the approved percentage of the salary pool is less than the cost of living increase, should the entire percentage be distributed across the board as merit consideration? ______

Please explain the reason for your answer:

9. When merit monies are available, should a portion of this merit be awarded, retroactively, as compensation for past years of performance, when merit was not available? ______

Please explain the reason for your answer:

Other comments concerning merit raises:

Please return to: Judy Donald in Continuing Education

Thank you for your consideration.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Norma J. Stickler
Chair, ASC Personnel Welfare Committee

SUBJECT: Survey on Merit Evaluations

The Personnel Welfare Committee was charged with examining the distribution of any salary pool that might be designated as merit. Duane Whitmire chaired a subcommittee of PWC to examine the question and was assisted by Jeanne Wright and Judy Donald. The subcommittee conducted a survey by first testing the survey with members of the Administrative Staff Council and then by sending the final survey to a random sample of 200 administrative staff. Attached is a copy of the cover letter to their final report and an executive summary of their findings.

The survey results indicate administrative staff members feel that when merit dollars become available, they should be awarded based on the previous year's performance unless a fair, objective mechanism can be developed for awarding merit. Further, respondents expressed a preference for a 75%/25% split between the across the board portion and the merit portion. Our current split is 60%/40%, and the preference for a lesser percent for merit is undoubtedly due to the lack of confidence in the subjective and inconsistent methods used to allocate merit.

There is clearly a need for more standardization, objectivity, and consistency in the manner in which evaluations are conducted. While it is very difficult to define merit, and the definition seems to vary by departments, it was the consensus of PWC that at a minimum, administrative staff members should be asked to list their accomplishments for the prior year and have these accomplishments considered in the determination of merit, irrespective of other evaluation criteria that might be used by a unit. Evaluations should be taking place on a yearly basis even if there is no merit money to distribute.

attachments
MEMORANDUM

TO: Norma Stickler, Chair - Personnel Welfare Committee
FROM: Duane Whitmire, Chair - PWC Subcommittee on Merit Raises
       Judy Donald, PWC Subcommittee on Merit Raises
       Jeanne Wright, PWC Subcommittee on Merit Raises

RE: Final Report

As you know, the ASC - PWC Subcommittee on Merit Raises has been diligently working the last few months collecting information from Administrative Staff to meet our charge to "Review and make recommendations on distribution of next salary pool dollars via the merit system. Factors in this process include the combination of the past three fiscal years without any merit consideration with the current fiscal year".

An initial pilot Merit Raise Survey was sent to 38 Administrative Staff Council representatives to gather preliminary information that could be used to fine tune a survey instrument to send to a broader group of administrative staff. The 50% response rate to our pilot survey proved valuable in formulating the final instrument.

On December 7, 1993 the final version of the 1993 Merit Raise Survey was sent to a random sample of 200 administrative staff. A total of 48 usable surveys were returned (24% response rate) by the due date. The subcommittee then analyzed the returns on both a quantitative and qualitative basis which led to the formulation of conclusions and recommendations that are listed in the Executive Summary.

In an attempt to include all pertinent information in this report, the following items are presented for review by all administrative staff members or other interested parties: 1) 1 Page ASC-PWC Executive Summary 2) Copy of the 2 Page 1993 Merit Raise Survey, 3) 1 Page ASC-PWC Merit Raise Survey Quantitative Results, 4) 12 Page ASC-PWC Merit Raise Survey Qualitative Results, and 5) Appendix A - Samples of Evaluation Forms.

Hopefully, the work of the ASC-PWC Subcommittee on Merit Raises will prove valuable to both ASC and central administration as decisions on awarding merit are made. Both Judy Donald and Jeanne Wright should be commended for their efforts associated with the work of this subcommittee. If you need any additional information, please feel free to contact me.

pc: G. Jordan, Chair - Administrative Staff Council
    R. Waddle, Chair - ASC Salary Committee
ASC-PWC Merit Raise Survey - Executive Summary

Based on feedback from respondents to the survey, the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the data resulted in the following conclusions and recommendations.

Conclusions

- More standardization in the evaluation process across the University is needed (e.g. 11 different evaluation forms were received)
- The evaluation process is too subjective
- There are too many inconsistencies in the current evaluation process
- Although most persons indicated that evaluations were conducted on an annual basis, there were some individuals who had never received an evaluation (e.g. one person had been employed since 1979 and had never been seen an evaluation form)
- Recent budgetary and personnel cutbacks have added to workloads without appropriate compensation
- Evaluations should have merit criteria built into them if merit is going to be distributed
- Since the amount of merit monies are so small, the process appears to be more negative than positive
- Merit dollars should not be used for market adjustments
- A larger percentage should be distributed across the board and a smaller percentage should be distributed for merit as opposed to the current 60/40% distribution
- When the dollars available do not meet the cost of living, the large majority of administrative staff responding to the survey believe the distribution should be 100% across the board
- There is no consensus on awarding merit on a retroactive basis for the past three years, but there are strong feelings that it would be very difficult to do on a fair, objective basis
- Merit is only one aspect of morale, and other factors for improving morale should be considered

Recommendations

- Develop one standard evaluation form to be used by all vice presidential areas
- Build objective criteria into a new standard evaluation form
- Implement methods to increase consistency in the evaluation process
- Require annual evaluations by each supervisor at the University
- Develop a mechanism to reward those affected by increased workloads
- Include merit criteria as part of the evaluation process on a University-wide standard evaluation form
- Improve the positive aspect of the evaluation process by making more merit monies available
- Eliminate the use of merit monies for market adjustments
- Change the current percentage breakdown between across the board and merit from 60/40% to 75/25%
- Distribute 100% across the board if the dollars available for raises do not meet the cost of living
- Award on the previous year's performance unless a fair, objective mechanism can be developed for awarding merit based on the last three years
- Develop cost effective University-wide incentives and perks to improve morale and productivity (e.g. flex time)
MEMORANDUM

TO: President Olscamp
    Vice Presidents

FROM: Greg Jordan, Chair
      Administrative Staff Council
      John Moore, Executive Director
      Personnel Services

The Personnel Welfare Committee recently surveyed a random sample of approximately half of the administrative staff of the University asking for recommendations on the timeframe that should be used for evaluation when merit increases are next awarded. The consensus was that only the previous year's performance should be considered unless there was a fair and objective method of awarding merit based on more than one year's accomplishments.

We would like to draw to your attention several other findings from that survey and propose an approach to resolving the problems identified.

1. Although annual evaluations are called for in the Administrative Staff Handbook, they are not being done. Records in the Personnel Services Office confirm this fact. Annual evaluations and reassessment of the job description should be occurring, irrespective of evaluations for merit increases.

2. The Handbook sets forth three basic criteria by which an Administrative Staff member should be evaluated, with options for additional criteria. These options have been implemented in such a manner that there is no longer sufficient basic similarity among the many evaluation forms being used; consequently, the very definition of merit is so various across campus that it leads to frustration.
We propose that a committee be established with representation from each of the Vice Presidential areas, the President's area, and the Administrative Staff Council that will be charged with:

1. Developing a plan to assure there is an annual evaluation of all administrative staff and an annual assessment of goals and expectations, whether there are merit dollars or not.

2. Develop a common definition of merit to be used across all vice presidential areas.

3. Develop a component of evaluation forms that would be common across all vice presidential areas. Preferably this common component will be written in such a way that it will serve as a guide to supervisors as well as to staff.

4. Make further recommendations on evaluation forms.
February 14, 1994

MEMORANDUM

TO: PWC
FROM: Norma J. Stickler
SUBJECT: Meeting

I do not believe it is necessary for us to meet this week. Let me bring you up to date, however, on what is happening with our proposals. The letter regarding opportunities for advancement has been sent to John Moore and Marshall Rose. John, Marshall, and Sue Crawford have already set up a meeting to discuss establishment of an institute for staff, and they have in mind potentially working with other universities to share resources and participants. The remaining portions of that letter have been shared with the hiring area of Personnel Services for review and implementation as appropriate.

The report on merit increases, etc. has been presented to the Executive Committee and will be on the agenda of the full ASC meeting in March. There will be two motions for action, one dealing with the idea of considering only the past year for merit unless there is a fair, objective way of going back more years, and the other motion will be on the issue of 75%/25% split on across-the-board/merit.

The merit subcommittee's report presented many concerns about the absence of evaluations, and the lack of objectivity and consistency when they are done. I spoke with the Executive Committee about these issues and also spoke with John Moore. I asked him if he would co-sign with Greg Jordan a memo to establish a committee with representatives from each vice presidential area to develop a plan to assure that evaluations take place and that there is some common component across campus and a common definition of merit. When the memo is signed by John and Greg Jordan, I'll send you all a copy. Sounds like a LONG project, but John is enthusiastic about helping us and is himself sending out a memo to the vice presidents reminding them of the need to do annual evaluations and listing those that still have not been done.

I have also talked to Bill Balzer about our idea of using the evaluation process as a "pilot project." He is reluctant to become involved with evaluations as it has been his experience that it can be viewed as threatening to employees—even if we were just working on the process, so I think we will need to take the approach outlined above instead.

Again, thanks to all of you. You are a great committee to work with.
TO: Dr. Chris Dalton  
Vice-President for Planning and Budgeting  

FROM: Greg Jordan, Chair  
Administrative Staff Council  

RE: Merit Increases  
February 23, 1994  

Thank you for your response on February 17 to the February 10 memo that John Moore and I sent to Dr. Olscamp and the Vice-Presidents. We appreciate your support of the concepts in the memo.

Your question in your response regarding what consensus, if any is there on what % should be merit if raises continue in the 3% range can be answered as follows:

First, for the past four or five years, it has been the recommendation of the ASC Salary Committee, and thus ASC, that if the salary pool level falls below the cost of living inflationary figure, then all salary increase dollars should be distributed across the board. There is every indication that this recommendation will remain in any salary proposal that is forwarded to your office.

Second, a motion will be put on the floor of the March ASC meeting that will propose that any merit distribution will be based on a 75/25% rather than the current 60/40 split. I will inform you if that motion passes.

Thank you for your attention in this matter. I would be happy to discuss this topic with you in greater detail.

pc: Pat Green  
John Moore
BGSU Administrative Staff Survey: 
Performance Appraisal Process

DATE: March 1, 1996

TO: Administrative Staff

FROM: Performance Appraisal Process Committee
       Judy Donald, Continuing Education
       Shirley Colaner, Human Resources
       Robert Graham, Institute for Great Lakes Research
       Joann Kroll, Career Services
       Karen Woods, Human Resources

       Bryan Benner, Physical Plant
       Lori Schumacher, Payroll
       Judy Paschalidis, WBGU-TV
       Shelley Appelbaum, Athletics
       John Moore, Human Resources

As you are no doubt aware, the Performance Appraisal Process Committee is charged with putting in place a process that will be used uniformly to gauge the performance of Administrative Staff. It is important to note that Dr. Sidney Ribeau has given his complete support for this work.

Historically, for some BGSU Administrative Staff, evaluations have been sporadic at best. Likewise, the process was not based on any method that would lead to career development or to positive communication between management and staff about goals and work plans. The time for change is now.

Thus, our Committee needs your input to develop a more definitive performance process for Administrative Staff. Attached you will find a survey that has been constructed to gather as much information as possible and yet only take about 10 minutes from your busy schedule. Please complete the survey and return to Judy Donald in the campus envelope provided by Friday, March 8, 1996. All responses will be confidential.

Thank you in advance for giving us your thoughtful feedback on this important issue. This is only one of many important changes coming about on our campus that will lead to positive growth for not only the University but for each of us as professionals.
Section A. General Information. The following information will be used to aggregate survey responses.

1. In which vice presidential area are you employed?

☐ Academic Affairs (1) ☐ Operations (4)
☐ Student Services (2) ☐ University Relations (3)
☐ Planning & Budgeting (3) ☐ Other (e.g., President's Office, Athletics, etc.) (6)

2. How long have you held your current job? _____ years

3. Does your department or division have a process in place for evaluating administrative staff annually?

☐ Yes, a formal process (1) ☐ Yes, an informal process (2) ☐ No (3) ☐ Not sure (4)

4. If you answered "YES" to Question #3, what are the current reason(s) or purpose(s) for evaluating performance? (Check as many as apply)

☐ To provide me with feedback on my past year's performance (1)
☐ To set goals/objectives for my next year's performance (2)
☐ To enhance my professional development for future positions at the university (3)
☐ To administer rewards (e.g., merit pay, promotions) and punishments (e.g., disciplinary actions) (4)
☐ To discuss and review my position description (5)
☐ Not sure (6)

5. Did your direct supervisor/manager prepare a written evaluation of your job performance at the end of the 1994-95 fiscal year?

☐ Yes (1) ☐ No (2) ☐ Not sure (3)

6. Did your direct supervisor/manager sit down with you at the end of the 1994-95 fiscal year and conduct a personal performance appraisal interview?

☐ Yes (1) ☐ No (2) ☐ Not sure (3)

7. Have you ever received training in how to evaluate job performance and/or conduct a personal performance appraisal interview?

☐ Yes (1) ☐ No (2) ☐ Not sure (3)

8. Do you currently evaluate the performance of other BGSU employees? (Check as many as apply)

☐ Yes, I evaluate Classified Staff (1)
☐ Yes, I evaluate other Administrative Staff (2)
☐ Yes, I evaluate student employees (3)
☐ No (4)

9. Overall, how would you evaluate the effectiveness of the current performance evaluation system for Administrative Staff?

☐ Very Effective (1) ☐ Effective (2) ☐ Neither Effective Nor Ineffective (3) ☐ Ineffective (4) ☐ Very Ineffective (5)
Section B. Reactions to the Current BGSU Performance Appraisal System for Administrative Staff. Please rate the level to which each of the following items best describes your most recent performance appraisal at BGSU. If you have not received a performance appraisal in the past 24 months, please skip to Section C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Poorly (1)</th>
<th>Very Well (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. The appraisal helped me learn how I can do my job better</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I learned a lot from the appraisal</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The appraisal helped me understand my strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I have a clearer idea of what the boss expects of me because of the appraisal</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I was satisfied with my review</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I feel good about the way the appraisal was conducted</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. There are many ways in which I would have liked the appraisal to be different</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My appraisal made me angry</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The appraisal interview was upsetting</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I was tense during the appraisal interview</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I was at ease during most of the appraisal</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My boss did not really have enough information about my performance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My boss overlooked important parts of my past performance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My boss seemed to be too emotional</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My appraisal seemed arbitrary</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide any comments regarding the current appraisal system for evaluating Administrative Staff.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Section C. Future Performance Appraisal System. Please provide any suggestions about how to improve the appraisal system for evaluating Administrative Staff in the future.

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following items by checking the most appropriate response.

25. A new performance appraisal system is needed

26. A new performance appraisal system has a good chance of being successful

27. There is enough trust at BGSU for a new performance appraisal system to be effective

Thank you!

Please return to Judy Donald (Continuing Education) in the envelope provided by Friday, March 8, 1996.
The Administrative Compensation Plan
Feedback for Les Barber
6/18/96

Page 2, Paragraph 2

"It is obvious" - Why is it obvious on 6/17 when the exact opposite appeared to be obvious on 10/12?

Page 2, Paragraph 3

This paragraph needs to be clarified

"...are a host of other possibilities." THAT NEED TO BE DISCUSSED

In the last sentence, delete "It is obviously premature to discuss them, but they are available to the imagination, and" Start this sentence with "Some"

If some of the caps options "...were even outlined for us long ago by our consultant the Mercer Company.,", why didn’t we discuss them back then?

Regarding "Many options are open to us...", is one of the options grandfathering current employees?

Page 2, Paragraph 4

In line 3, "were" should be WE

Regarding the first sentence, it will be hard for some administrative staff to believe that the Department of Labor is being that specific with the University, because the Compensation Plan issue is 9 years old and the University never did anything

In line 5, why is the central administration "... in a different mode of thought..."

Page 3, Paragraph 1

"...we have hired experienced legal counsel...." Why wasn’t internal legal counsel sufficient?

"Counsel’s advice is compelling." Why, the central administration hasn’t dealt with it for 9 years? Why wasn’t it compelling when classified staff reviewed their compensation plan a few years ago - caps were not imposed on classified staff.

Page 3, Paragraph 4

"We met with your Administrative Staff Council EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE...."

In line 2, delete “Council’s” and insert EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE’S

In line 4, “discussion” should be DISCUSSIONS

Overall

Inform Les that the ASC Executive Committee is the small group that met with the vice presidents on June 12, and ASC is the large group of representatives.
MEMORANDUM

TO: All Administrative Staff Members

FROM: Sidney A. Ribeau, President and University Vice Presidents

DATE: June 24, 1996

RE: The Administrative Staff Compensation Plan

As we approach the June 1996 meeting of the Board of Trustees, there is information which we wish to convey to each of you directly. That information is organized below under several headings.

THE APPEALS PROCESS

The vice presidents group has completed its review of the approximately 140 appeals submitted. Job factor ratings and grade levels have been determined for each of the affected positions. The results will now be sent to Human Resources and subsequently to the individual administrative staff members and their supervisors. This process has taken us a long time, but our goals of accuracy and fairness required maximum participation by administrative staff and extensive review. The Appeals Committee, composed of administrative staff members, did its work in a thoughtful, careful manner. The vice presidents group accepted the appropriateness of the Committee's recommendations in the great majority of cases. In some instances, however, adjustments of the factor ratings and grade were made, either upward or downward, with the goal being equity across the organizational spectrum of the University.

THE JUNE BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

A detailed report on the compensation plan—its theoretical basis and background history, our progress to date, as well as key issues for the future—will be made at the June 27th meeting of the Board. It has been the Board's desire that important issues, especially critical and complex ones, be brought to them in two steps: for information at one meeting and for action at a subsequent meeting. That is what we plan to do in this case. The presentation on June 27th will be informational only. The first 1996-97 meeting in the fall will be the appropriate time to request Trustee action on the plan.
A second reason why we think it prudent to delay a request for Trustee action until the fall is that we have not yet reached closure on several key policy issues. It will be best to complete all the essential, broad policy components of our plan before submitting it for official review and action. The next section of this letter will address a critical policy component which is not yet complete.

**SALARY SCALE MINIMUMS, MAXIMUMS AND CURRENT EMPLOYEES**

An effective compensation plan must have both minimum and maximum salaries for each grade. Moreover, in order for the plan to effectively maintain equity across the divisional lines of the University, minimum and maximum salary levels must be appropriately enforced.

Obviously, minimum salaries are easier to enforce than maximum salaries. Salaries of current employees which fall below the minimum in their grades will be moved to the minimum. Even though formal Trustee action on the plan will not occur until the fall, we are still fully committed to recommending that all staff members who completed job analysis forms when the process was initiated in 1994-95 and whose current salaries fall below the minimums for their respective grades should have their salaries raised to the minimum, retroactive to January 1, 1996. Once these individuals' salaries have been raised to the minimum, their 1996-97 salary increments--across-the-board and merit together--will be recalculated using the new, higher base salary. Also, **new employees will not be hired at salaries below the minimum, absent extraordinary circumstances.** It is the question of enforcing maximum salaries, however, which presents us with a much more complex situation.

From the very beginning, continuing employees whose current salaries fall outside their salary range have presented a special challenge for the project teams which have worked on implementation of our plan. Closure has been reached on a method for handling those employees below the minimums, as indicated above. At an earlier stage of the process, when we were less aware of certain constraints on our freedom to act we indicated that we were committed to an approach which would have no impact on future salary increases for individuals above the maximums. We stated our intention in good faith at the time, but circumstances now dictate that we re-consider this position.

No decisions of any sort have been made, except the one to begin talking about the subject again. Many options are open to us, but in examining the various mechanisms which may be available for enforcing maximum salaries, we must consider the possibility, among others, that administrative staff salaries will have to be capped. Mercer consultants have already provided several options which we will consider. At
one end of the spectrum is still the possibility of refusing to implement caps of any type. At the other extreme would be absolute caps on salaries above the maximum. There are several options between these extremes, such as awarding bonuses to employees above the maximum while leaving salary base unchanged. We expect to examine all reasonable options in the coming weeks, and as we do so, we will always have as our goal the creation of the most equitable possible system for our administrative staff, consistent with principles of sound personnel and financial management.

As you think about the issues being raised in this letter, please remember that salary minimums, midpoints, and maximums will move upward on a regular basis. We anticipate determining how often the plan will be adjusted during the second phase of the project. Also, please remember that, even if a decision to implement maximum salary levels of some sort is made, they will not take effect until July 1, 1997 at the earliest. Raises for the coming year are being assigned without regard to this issue.

You should also be assured that no salary will be reduced to create compliance with maximums, should such eventually be adopted. Those of you (fewer than 30) whose salaries are currently above the maximum will continue to earn that base salary. In addition, we also plan, as part of our consideration of this matter, to investigate the possibility that some of those currently above the maximum hold positions which are affected by market factors which do not impact on other positions in the same salary grade. If that proves to be the case, consideration will be given to liberating those positions from current maximum limitations. Finally, we are also considering whether to provide any supplemental appeal opportunities should it ultimately be decided that limitations of some sort must be placed on salary growth for those above the grade maximums. At the very least, once the compensation plan has been adopted by the Board of Trustees, employees will have the opportunity to file grievances, using the process in the Administrative Staff Handbook.

A key reason why this issue of maximums must be confronted openly and investigated at this time involves the scrutiny which the compensation plan will face from the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP). In 1986, the university signed a letter of commitment to OFCCP pledging to adopt a compensation plan for administrative staff. This commitment, which has gone unfulfilled for 10 years, must now be completed. It is also worth remembering that the leadership of administrative staff has advocated the implementation of a compensation plan for many years. The University's progress on the development of a specific plan is under considerable and careful review by OFCCP. As we have studied the issue of maximum salaries more carefully, and with an eye toward OFCCP's possible posture, it has become apparent to us that a compensation plan without an effective mechanism to appropriately enforce maximum salary levels may not pass muster. As you might
Imagine, this presents us with a compelling reason to re-consider our position on this issue very carefully. We are in active consultation with legal counsel experienced in these matters and their advice will guide us as we come to a decision on this important policy issue.

We very much regret the need to change direction on this matter of maximum salaries. We understand that some staff will have sharp feelings in reaction to our decision, but for the reasons stated above, we feel that our only responsible course of action is to revisit the issue of "caps" at this time.

CONCLUSION

As soon as we recognized the need to reexamine the issue of above-maximum salaries, we decided that such discussion would necessarily have to be conducted publicly as well as internally within the administration of the University. And, we further decided that we simply must be up front with our constituencies by announcing our decision to you directly and as soon as possible.

We met with Administrative Staff Council's Executive Committee on June 12 to give the members this essential information in person. It was decided that direct and immediate communication with administrative staff members was crucial. This letter is the result of that decision. We will be in regular touch with Administrative Staff Council's leadership throughout this process, and we thoroughly expect to receive advice and suggestions from that group and from the executive committee. We pledge to keep you informed of all important steps in the discussion process. And, as always, we hope for your understanding about our decision and for your patience.

XC: University Community, including Board of Trustees Members
Administrative Staff Compensation Plan: Recommendations on Some Outstanding Policy Issues

At and following its meeting on August 27, 1996 the "Council of Vice Presidents" or "Mercer Group" further refined the following policy statements.

1. Administrative staff members whose salaries are below minimum for grade will have their salaries brought up to minimum. The process by which that will be done is as follows.
   (a) 1995-96 salaries for all individuals below the minimum for grade, based on the 1995-96 salary table, will be adjusted upward to the minimum, retroactive from January 1, 1996. Salary raises for 1996-97 will then be recalculated and moved upward, based on the adjusted '95-96 salary.
   (b) A second salary table, time-adjusted for 1996-97, has now been constructed, based on recommendations from Mercer Inc. Individuals whose '96-97 salaries are still below minimum for grade on this new table will be brought up to the grade minimum, retroactive from July 1, 1996.

2. In general, Position Request and Authorization forms for administrative staff new hires will specify salaries with a range from the grade minimum to the midpoint. Listing a salary level higher than the midpoint for grade will require prior approval by the area vice president, after consultation with the offices of Human Resources and Affirmative Action.

3. In the event that a higher grade placement for an administrative staff member results from a new position analysis, that person is guaranteed at least a 5% increase in salary OR the minimum salary for the new grade, whichever is greater.

4. If an administrative staff member is promoted to a different position in a higher grade, that person is guaranteed at least a 5% increase in salary OR the minimum salary for the new grade, whichever is greater.

5. When an administrative staff member is assigned to a position in a higher grade on an interim/temporary/acting basis, the following salary adjustment policy will apply. If the person's service in the new position is longer than 30 calendar days, s/he will receive a premium for the time served equal to at least a 5% increase in salary OR the minimum salary for the new grade, whichever is greater.

   In cases where an administrative staff member is demoted to a position in a lower grade, the person's salary will be lowered to a level in the new grade equivalent to
his/her level in the original one.

7. In cases where an administrative staff member is transferred, in a lateral move, to another position at the same grade level and requiring approximately the same degree of skill, effort and responsibility, normally the individual's salary will not be adjusted.

8. A special market premium may be established for a particular job title when market conditions exist causing excessive turnover, when a salary level midpoint is well below market average for the job and/or when there is a failure of a current salary range to attract qualified candidates.

9. Beginning in 1997-98, the ranges for each grade will be adjusted in a three-year, recurring cycle. In the first two years of each cycle, the ranges for each grade will move up annually by an amount which is 1% less than the average salary increment paid to administrative staff that year. Every third year, beginning with 1999-2000, the University will conduct a reevaluation of the ranges in light of current market conditions, as well as other relevant factors, and adjust the ranges in light of that reevaluation.

10. BGSU will enforce salary maximums for all administrative staff positions, but it will exempt from the caps for a period of three years those administrative staff employees whose salaries are already above the maximums for their grades. Effective July 1, 2000, the salaries of any staff members still above their maximums will be frozen until such time as those salaries are within range. If at any time during the three years a staff member's salary should fall within range, the exemption ceases to apply to that individual and the maximum will be enforced.
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</td>
<td>Do you have merit?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What % of pay raise is merit/across the board?</td>
<td>100% Merit</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>What is the process used for negotiating this %?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Is % of merit/across board same every year?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>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>
</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>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Is merit tied to performance evaluations?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Each does own. Have form, not used.</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>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>1977</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>Is OK; functional, needs to be updated.</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>Job families, not grades Can move to Sr. level Dept. recommendation</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.</td>
<td>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>
</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>Doesn't know; has never tracked information</td>
<td>No set time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>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>
</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>24.</td>
<td>How is amt &amp; frequency determined?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</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>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>Ohio State</td>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Do you have merit?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>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 &quot;microboxes&quot; 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>How long has merit been in place?</td>
<td>Since 1977</td>
<td>Since 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>What is the process used for negotiating this %?</td>
<td>Administrative Senate recommends % but BOT rarely agrees</td>
<td>Personnel Office makes salary % increase recommendation to the President and the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Is % of merit/across board same every year?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>100%</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>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>9.</td>
<td>Is merit tied to performance evaluations?</td>
<td>Tied to performance, peer equity, market surveys for position</td>
<td>Yes</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>11.</td>
<td>Is there classification system for contract staff?</td>
<td>Moving into broad banding - away from classification mechanism</td>
<td>Yes</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. Generally satisfied</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 “red-lined”</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) Assumption is an individual will be at the mid-point of their salary grade when performing at the “fully competent” level as specified on the position analysis questionnaire (the amount of time needed to learn and do the job)</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. No rules built into system for further advancement beyond midpoint</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>18.</td>
<td>Does pay range move with each across board increase?</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.</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>What external groups are assessments compared against?</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.</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Is there cost-of-living adjustment?</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 amount &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>
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

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, 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 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 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 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.

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 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.

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
TO: Dr. Middleton
FROM: PWC (ASC)

Here is an updated draft of the merit pay document, dated 5/1/1997. Changes are in uppercase. One type of change reflects a modification of the connection between meritorious assessment and progression through a salary grade. We now state this as a principle, without any specific dollar or percentage increase recommendation. The other change is that we have adopted faculty language with respect to the allocation of varying amounts of merit raise percentages.

There is an explanation of recommendation (2b) included at the end of the document. We believe this version to be a compromise that is a win-win situation for both administrative staff and the central administration.
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; 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 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 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 ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF 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.
Recommendation (2b) Defense

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.

The premise here is that good things happen when consistently meritorious staff are rewarded with an extra measure of security.

The five year protection can only be broken by a year in which a staff person does not receive a meritorious rating. At this point, the five year contract becomes null and void, replaced by a one-year contract. Only after five more consecutive years of meritorious ratings could an administrative employee obtain another five year contract.

What this clause does is to attach a heavy penalty to a bad year. Any one year in which an employee does not receive a meritorious rating results in, at best, a sequence of five one-year contracts. At worst, assuming the performance remains poor, the first one year contract may be the employee's last.

It is worth noting here that health issues, or extended family problems can make even stellar employees go through periods of relatively poor performance. One should not assume that the absence of meritorious ratings for one year is always due to free will mediocrity.
### BGSU Administrative Staff Salary Average and Distribution 1992-93

#### BGSU Administrative Staff Salary Summary

**FOR SPRING 1992-93**

(Main + Firelands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRIBUTION</th>
<th>COUNT IN RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>253 - 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNT IN RANGE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20,000</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 - 24,999</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 - 29,999</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 - 34,999</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000 - 39,999</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 - 44,999</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 54,999</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,000 - 59,999</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000 - 64,999</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65,000 - 69,999</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70,000 - 74,999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000 - 79,999</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,000 - 84,999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85,000 - 89,999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90,000 - 94,999</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95,000 - 99,999</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 &amp; above</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: June, 1993 Salary uses 1993-94 base (92-93*1.033 + 1040) except where adjustments were reported to BOT personnel changes.

Source: FACSTAFF 9293; "Personnel Changes", Board of Trustees.


1992-3 average salary 35,632
BGSU ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF SALARIES: 1994-95

DISTRIBUTION BY RANGE AND AVERAGE SALARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1994-95 Salary Range</th>
<th>Number in Range</th>
<th>Cumulative Number Down</th>
<th>Cumulative Number Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below $16,000 per year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $34,999</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $44,999</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $54,999</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55,000 - $59,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 - $64,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$65,000 - $69,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $79,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 - $84,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$85,000 - $89,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000 &amp; Above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Admin Staff: 449

Average Salary for All 449 Administrative Staff: $37,621
Number With Salary Higher Than Average: 136 (41.9%)
Number With Salary Lower Than Average: 263 (58.1%)

Average Salary for 438 Administrative Staff (excl. $15,000): $36,215
Number With Salary Higher Than Average: 177 (40.9%)
Number With Salary Lower Than Average: 261 (59.1%)

OPF: JCD 5/195 (admin staff sal 94-95)
SURVEY

Only 10% of all ASC members (N = 496) teach (N = 52)

5% of all ASC members are not compensated (N = 26) or 50% of those who do teach are not compensated.
SURVEY ON ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF TEACHING COMPENSATION
SURVEY RESULTS

496 surveys were sent -- 318 administrative staff did not return their surveys 36% response rate (N = 178)

1. Do you teach for BGSU? □ Yes □ No
   
   Response 29% teach (N = 52)
   71% do not teach (N = 126)

Of the 29% who teach the following questions were asked:

2. Do you teach □ credit classes, □ summer workshops/seminars, □ noncredit classes for Continuing Education. Check all that apply.

   Response 81% teach credit course and summer credit workshops and seminars (N = 52)
   19% teach noncredit classes (N = 9)

3. Do you teach each semester? □ Yes □ No  If No, how frequently do you teach?__________

   Response 46% teach each semester (N = 24)
   51% teach with less frequency (N = 27)

4. How many credit hours do you teach each semester?__________

   Response Frequency not consistent -- see responses on the survey

5. Are you compensated for teaching credit classes? □ Yes □ No

   Response 50% are compensated (N = 26)
   50% are not compensated (N = 26)
6. Are you compensated at the □ overload teaching rate, □ part-time faculty/teaching rate, □ the assignment is part of my administrative contract, □ I am not compensated to teach, □ my compensation situation is individualized and does not fit the aforementioned.

Response 13.4% of those who teach are compensated at the overload rate (N = 7)
17.3% are given pt faculty compensation (N = 9) but only .09% hold faculty rank, 90.3% don't hold faculty rank
32.7% are compensated as part of the administrative contract
25.0% are not paid
88% subtotal
8% are “Other” compensation is individualized (N = 4)
4% didn't respond (N = 2)
100% Total

7. My administrative contract is a □ 12 month contract, □ 10 month contract, □ 9 month contract.

Response 75% are on a 12 month administrative contract (N = 40)
8% are on a 10 month administrative contract (N = 4)
17% are on a 9 month administrative contract (N = 9)
100% total (N = 53)

8. Do you hold faculty rank? □ Yes □ No

Response 10% do hold faculty rank (N = 5)
90% do not hold faculty rank (N = 47)

9. What department and college do you teach in? ________________________

Response varies -- see survey comments

10. Do you teach at the □ undergraduate level, □ graduate level, □ both levels.

Response 73% teach exclusively undergraduate courses (N = 38)
5.8% teach exclusively graduate courses (N = 3)
9.6% teach both undergraduate and graduate courses (N = 5)
88.4% subtotal
11.5% didn’t respond to the question (N = 6)
99.9% total respondents (N = 52)
11. Does your teaching assignment take place □ before your customary work hours, □ during your customary work hours, □ after your customary work hours, □ weekends □ combination of before customary work hours/during customary work hours/after customary work hours/weekends.

Response
- 0% teach before customary work hours (N = 0)
- 44.23% teach during customary work hours (N = 23)
- 19.23% teach after customary work hours (N = 10)
- 0% teach weekends (N = 0)
- 36.5% teach combination of during customary work hours/after/weekends (N = 19)

12. Additional information/comments/opinions:

See survey
### Survey on Administrative Staff Teaching Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Teach for DGSU</th>
<th>Types of Classes Taught</th>
<th>Teach each Semester?</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Compensated?</th>
<th>Compensation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>credit</td>
<td>summer/ weights</td>
<td>noncredit/ CE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey on Administrative Staff Teaching Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Teach for PGSU</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>credit/summer/vis/sp</th>
<th>noncredit/CE</th>
<th>Teach each Semester?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>1 hr/frequency</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Compensated?</th>
<th>Compensation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>not summer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>every other semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>usually spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 seminars/yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>infrequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 to 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 or 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>begin Spring '98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Every other year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Every few years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 to 4 classes</td>
<td></td>
<td>varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 2
### Survey on Administrative Staff Teaching Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>12 mo.</th>
<th>10 mo.</th>
<th>9 mo.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Level Taught</th>
<th>Teaching Assignment is</th>
<th>UG</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>before wd</th>
<th>during wd</th>
<th>after wd</th>
<th>weekends</th>
<th>combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business/AMIS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Science/Firelands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities/Firelands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Science/Firelands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A &amp; S - ACS &amp; Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A &amp; S - English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>HPER KNS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNIV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Svcs. - Med. Tech.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNIV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Svcs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Svcs. - Computer Sci.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>H &amp; H Svc., UNIV 100, HFT, Soc., Journalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Health related</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Health Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEISP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEISP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEISP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEISP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNIV 100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey on Administrative Staff Teaching Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Administrative Contract</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Level Taught</th>
<th>Teaching Assignment is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>12 mo. 10 mo. 9 mo. Yes No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Music/Performance Studies</td>
<td>UG GP Both before wh during wh after wh weekends combination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of Musical Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of Musical Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of Musical Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>University Computer Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accounting, Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HESA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDCI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDCI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDCI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UNIV 100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dept. of Business Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Applied Sciences/Firelands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family &amp; Consumer Sci. ED &amp; HD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A &amp; S/ Geography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Natural/Social Sciences - Firelands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Firelands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Continuing Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** 40 1 9 5 47 26 5 5 0 23 10 0 19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Compensation lowered from 2,500/som. to 2,000 to 1,500. Not due to performance, with 20 yrs of excellent evaluations, but to bring salary for PT teaching &quot;in line.&quot; Owens pays over $2000 for same course for P/T Instructor and it would be over $3,000 if I had taught P/T at Owens for as many years as I have at BGSU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I conduct training for various personnel in a variety of areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(Admin. contract is half-time.) Thank you for looking into this! Other issues (besides compensation) also need to be examined. For example, I've run into some situations in which graduate students wanted to take independent readings courses from me, or wanted me to serve on their thesis committees. And, of course, the informal mentoring continues after classes end. Yet I have no formal relationships with the departments whose students I serve grants and on my own time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teaching is connected to the administrative work - always been part of the job - but it makes for a 50 hour week! It's unusual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I receive great reviews from my student and the faculty in the department third. I'm doing a great job. So why does the current system keep me from earning more dollars for doing great job? I can make more money doing something else and probably will if the department does not pay me more for the services rendered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>My duties are varied. I will prepare/set up labs, teach in the lab, manage the Med. Tech. lab as well as visit training sites (hosp.) for our students in the clinical phase of their studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>This is based on how it would have been, had my section of UT IV 100 filled up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>My teaching contract identifies me as an Associate Professor. If I teach between 8 am &amp; 5 pm, I take vacation which I thought was a University requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>MANY guest lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I'm just asked to talk to various groups, classes, or staff - on an ad hoc basis, on a health topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Guest lecture at other classes or occasionally do seminars, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Adjunct faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>When Admin teach credit classes should be std. basis - across the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Teaches within 20 hr work week schedule. Would it be better for &quot;Crossroads&quot; class to be taught independent of my overload and paid a separate amount? Feels it is reasonable and fair as is - within 20 hr. workload. Revenue $25/person Public Service to Community class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I teach session of CEISP per credit career development classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I taught for the History Dept. on an overload rate for several years. Finally with the support of my supervisors and the chair for the Hist. Dept., the overload was made part of my contract (5% is paid via the History Dept.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>My teaching compensation is included in my annual contract (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I am very reluctant to ever teach UT IV 100 again. That is unfortunate because it was a GREAT enjoyment and I received very positive student feedback. However, those intrinsic regards are not enough motivation to take on this task when my regular duties demand so much attention. If I was compensated to teach it, I would gladly arrange my work schedule to accommodate 40 hrs. on my &quot;regular&quot; job, plus the extra hrs. of teaching, grading, etc. I feel strongly that anyone who teaches a course ought to be compensated for it (in the form of money).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case #</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>I am compensated in the amount of $1,650/class each semester. I normally teach over the lunch hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Preparation of materials requires overtime. Teach CUTS training, software application. Probably is irrelevant but filled out the survey regardless. Main reason to reply is my belief that all training should be the responsibility of UCS since they do all other staff application training, e.g., ACCESS, Word, EXCEL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>UCS pays at the rate of $50/semester hour; however, I must take vacation time if during normal work hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Any teaching during working hours should not be compensated for unless explicit additional work time is performed. Earned approx. $1,200-10 years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Will be compensated; do not know under what terms. Faculty rank to be determined. Happy to discuss survey response if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Adjunct faculty appt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>I am not compensated for classes taught for the Math Dept; ACEH 100/025 part of administrative contract. If I do a MATH 120 that has evening common exam I work after hours; other hours are during work hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Personnel teaching for a department (if they are not part of that dept. and do not have faculty rank) should be compensated by that dept. and receive adjunct faculty rank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Compensated at P/T fac rate for summer; part of admin. contract for F &amp; S. Any administrative staff member who teaches consistently semester after semester should have the faculty rank of lecturer or adjunct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>I teach because faculty don't want to teach a low enrollment summer class for only a fraction of the pay. It's extra $ for me so I don't care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>If an overload class is needed, I will teach at the overload rate in addition to my regular 40 hr. work schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>My compensation situation is individualized and does not fit the aforementioned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 following principles underlie an effective performance-based 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 by and subject to review and approval of the President or area Vice President.

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 account for a variety of ways that an employee may support these missions and goals.

5. A performance-based merit system needs to establish a clear connection between employee performance and reward. Meritorious performance should be rewarded in tangible ways. 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 for 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 make improvements in performance.

7. A performance-based 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 spread 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 individuals for collaborative efforts 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, which will make recommendations for modification as appropriate.

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. Funds should be made available on a regular, on-going basis to correct salary inequities, make market adjustments and salary adjustments deemed appropriate following comprehensive reviews of employee performance and salary, and to support raises for promotions. These funds should not be considered part of the annual merit pool.

2. To establish a clear connection between employee performance and reward, meritorious performance should be rewarded in tangible ways. Each employee will have a performance appraisal form plan which specified performance indicators to be rewarded.

3. A performance-based 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. Evaluations must be completed and results shared with staff member by May 31.

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

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 appraisal form which is falling below the satisfactory level. The supervisor will be expected to continue to engage in on-going dialogue with the employee to improve employee performance.

4. A supervisor's merit evaluation will include an assessment of the completion of performance evaluations and merit pay recommendations for their staff on time. Failure to do so will be deemed performance below expectations.

5. The Office of 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 allocations should be based upon the meritorious accomplishments over the most 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. 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 administrative staff 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 or exceed 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.

Approved by Administrative Staff Council - June 5, 1997
Amended by Central Administration - June 16 1997