

2005

## Personnel Welfare Committee presentation to President's Compensation Committee Meeting Fall 2005

Bowling Green State University. Administrative Staff Council

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/asc>

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

---

### Repository Citation

Bowling Green State University. Administrative Staff Council, "Personnel Welfare Committee presentation to President's Compensation Committee Meeting Fall 2005" (2005). *Administrative Staff Council*. 208.  
<https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/asc/208>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Publications at ScholarWorks@BGSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Administrative Staff Council by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@BGSU.

**Pre-Microfilm Inventory**

**Collection:** Bowling Green State University  
Administrative Staff Council, UA-022

**Location:** Bowling Green, Ohio

**Title of Series:** President's Compensation Committee meeting

**Inclusive Dates:** Fall 2005

**Format:**  Bound  Loose

**Order:**  Alpha  Chronological  Numerical

**Index:**  Included  Separate  None

---

*Notes*

## **DRAFT!!!**

Administrative Staff Council  
Personnel Welfare Committee  
Compensation Meeting talking points Fall 2005

### **Context:**

The ASC spring presentation to the Compensation Committee was formal, using documents and slides to compliment the face to face delivery. The list of requests was basically turned down so we would like to try a more give and take approach this time and ask Dr. Dalton:

- In light of the budget situation versus what ASC asks for in terms of compensation would be the reasonable approach; and
- Would you elaborate on why we are turned down year after year and how he thinks we can successfully on compensation issues involving dollars.

### **Goals:**

- 1) ASC Exec and Personnel Welfare Committee want a working session with the representatives from Mercer to discuss the compensation plan. Adequate lead time must be given prior to this working session.
- 2) All administrative staff must be evaluated annually. Continue to collect, review and evaluate all merit documents. Provide all employees with criteria for merit increases.
- 3) Increase the accrued maximum number of vacation days from 44 to 60 days. This would provide equity with Classified Staff who are eligible for payment for 60 days. The increase would only be available to Administrative Staff members while employed at the University. Monetary payment for the time accrued over 44 days would NOT be made at retirement. Replacement of vacant administrative staff positions would give current staff the opportunity to utilize earned vacation time.
- 4) Develop guidelines for utilization of flexible scheduling for administrative staff who consistently work more than 40 hours. Clarification is needed in the AS Handbook reference to the opportunity to use flexible scheduling when departmental needs require perpetual/consistent work in excess of 40 hours per week.

Ongoing Concerns:

- 1) Develop guidelines for consistency in summer hours work schedule. In order for University offices to maintain regular business hours, staff should be allowed to take advantage of summer hours through flexible scheduling.
- 2) Provide an extra 8 hours of Personal Leave for all staff who receive a meritorious appraisal.
- 3) Develop a sick leave bank concept to be utilized in situations where catastrophic illness occurs for BGSU staff.
- 4) Continue to explore concepts of wellness programs to reduce health care costs.
- 5) Provide pro-rated costs for health care benefits for part-time staff.
- 6) Continue overall review and analysis of compensation including benefits package at BGSU.

## ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COMPENSATION SPRING 2006

- A. Performance-Based Merit System – BOT Resolution #57-97  
NO LONGER FUNCTIONS
  
- B. Mercer, Inc. Performance/Penetration Matrix  
REQUIRES FUNCTIONAL PERFORMANCE-BASED MERIT  
SYSTEM
  
- C. How do we make it work?
  - 1. mandate from the President
  - 2. support from VPs
  - 3. cooperation between HR, Provost, ASC
    - a) approval of process: unit-level merit criteria, goal-setting, mid-year and year-end performance reviews conducted between supervisors/employees
    - b) letters to appropriate VP, supervisor, employee when no paperwork is filed by deadline
    - c) supervisor does not meet expectations if evaluations are not completed, employee automatically receives merit increase (faculty whose PT documents are not addressed in the 7 year timeframe are automatically awarded tenure or promotion)

In June 1997 the Board of Trustees approved resolution 57-97, **Principles and Recommendations for a Performance-Based Merit System for Administrative Staff**. This plan, which also appears in the Administrative Staff Handbook, was developed to be equitable and to reward performance that exceeded expectations. A performance evaluation document for all administrative staff was distributed and performance appraisal training was provided for all administrative staff and supervisors of administrative staff.

*A Handbook of Commonly Shared Employment Policies for BGSU Faculty, Administrative and Classified Staff* states: "All employees at BGSU are expected to participate in annual performance reviews. Because evaluations provide for a systematic review and evaluation of the work of each employee, they are to be conducted on an annual basis regardless of whether or not merit dollars are available."

Despite all of these policies being in place, the system has not functioned for years. Many administrative staff are not evaluated annually, have no process for goal setting, mid-year review or understanding allocation of merit in years when the salary increase is greater than 3%.

In January 2006 Administrative Staff Executive Committee and Personnel Welfare Committee met with representatives from Mercer, Inc. to discuss the compensation plan. A perennial problem for administrative staff is movement through the pay grade in a reasonable period of time. One of the Mercer power point slides illustrates an equitable solution to this problem based upon performance. However, this method cannot be implemented with the currently dysfunctional performance appraisal system.

In order for the performance-based merit system to work, all administrative staff and supervisors of administrative staff must be made accountable to fully participate. Neither HR, nor the Provost alone can enforce the system. Mandate for full implementation of this system must come from the President. Administrative Staff Council is willing to partner with HR and the Provost to make the system work.

The 1997 performance appraisal form was "cumbersome" and did not address the work of all areas. Currently functioning appraisal systems are used in Finance and Administration and University Libraries and possibly in other areas as well, illustrating that the documents do not have to be uniform.

"Annual evaluations of administrative staff ought not to be an option. They should be required. We need to develop a form very quickly so that we can see to it that the evaluation itself is designed to address such matters as career development, job performance, etc. These evaluations, in my judgment, should be reviewed by the supervisors of the supervisors. They should be used as part of the annual evaluation of supervisory personnel with regard to their effectiveness in their positions." – Charles R. Middleton, August 1996