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December 16, 1992

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Christopher Dalton
    Vice President for Planning and Budgeting

FROM: Ann Bowers
    Chair, Administrative Staff Council

RE: Salary Adjustment Proposal

The ASC Executive Committee discussed the salary adjustment proposal presented last week and approved on December 11, 1992 by the Board of Trustees. We also had an open meeting for all administrative staff on December 15, 1992 for the purpose of distributing information on the proposal and responding to questions and concerns. The requested comments on the salary adjustment proposal therefore are reflective of a large sampling of all administrative staff.

First, we are pleased with the salary adjustment proposal and believe it to be a very thoughtful and fair plan. The combination of a flat dollar adjustment along with a percentage-based cost of living adjustment provides more equitable salary benefits for everyone. We also are pleased that all part-time employees are being included in this plan. We firmly support merit pay, but agree that it should be temporarily suspended to maximize the total pool of monies available for all staff.

Questions that have been raised by administrative staff fall into two categories. The first category includes procedural questions. How will this plan affect those people hired during the 1992/93 fiscal year? Will any salary adjustment be given those who may be leaving BGSU, for example, someone who will leave in January? Will this plan include grant-funded personnel?

The second category pertains to the issue of market adjustments and salary inequity adjustments for administrative staff. Although we do support the use of the entire $4.4 million for salary adjustments for all staff at this point in time, we do not want to lose sight of the fact that many administrative staff have been waiting for some time for market adjustments. In addition, over the past few years, Administrative Staff Council has completed salary inequity studies which have illustrated the existence of salary inequities largely based on gender; inequities which still exist and may have increased. We strongly recommend that planning for a market/equity adjustment pool for administrative staff begin now so that we may have the ability to address these inequities with the start of the 1993/94 fiscal year.
One concern raised (and not by those people directly involved) pertains to the paperwork and computer work that will be mandated with these salary adjustments in order to start them in January. We hope that this increased workload will not result in staff in personnel and payroll being denied planned vacation time over the holidays.

Thank you for proposing not only a salary adjustment for all staff, but one that is equitable and reasonable. We appreciate the ability to provide comments on the plan and look forward to good news from the State Legislature and the Governor and then to the successful implementation of this plan in January.
GUIDELINES REGARDING MIDYEAR SALARY INCREASES

GENERAL ISSUES - FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES

Flat Increases Effective January 1993. Full-time faculty and administrative staff will receive an increase of $1040 in their annual salary base effective January 1, 1993. For 1992-93, half of this annual increase ($520) for faculty and administrative staff will be paid over the remaining months of the fiscal/academic year. Classified staff will receive a $0.50 per hour increase in hourly wages effective January 3, 1993, the beginning of the first pay period in 1993. An additional $520 lump-sum payment will be made in early February 1993 to full-time faculty, administrative and classified staff as specified below.

Retrospective Portion of Flat Increases. All current full-time employees who have been in a regular full-time paid status since the beginning of the fiscal/academic year will receive a $520 one-time payment (gross amount prior to deductions for taxes, etc.) in early February 1993. This payment will have the effect of making the $1040 per year or $0.50 per hour flat salary increases retroactive to July 1, 1992.

Cost-of-Living Increases Effective January 1993. Administrative staff and faculty will also receive a 3.3% cost-of-living increase in their salary base effective January 1, 1993. Classified staff will receive a 2.5% cost-of-living increase in their hourly rate effective January 3, 1993. These percentage cost-of-living increases, which for 1992-93 will only apply for the second half of the academic/fiscal year, will be calculated on the salary base or hourly rate before the $1040 or $0.50/hour increase is applied. Eligible classified staff members will also receive step and longevity increases.

New Employees. New full-time employees will receive a pro-rated retroactive increase based on the number of hours/days paid prior to December 31, 1992. In addition, new full-time faculty and administrative staff who were on paid status prior to January 1, 1993, will receive the mid-year cost-of-living and $1040 increases.

Employees No Longer at BGSU. Employees who retired or were laid off after July 1 will receive the retroactive increase pro-rated for the number of paid hours/days between July 1 and December 31. Employees who terminated their paid status at BGSU prior to January 1 for reasons other than retirement or lay off will not receive any retroactive pay increase.

Grant- and Externally-Funded Employees. Employees whose compensation is funded from grants or other externally-generated funds will receive the same increases as employees whose compensation is funded by educational or auxiliary budgets.

Base Salary for 1993-94. The base annual salary from which any increase for 1993-94 will be calculated will include both the flat and the cost-of-living increases.
MEMORANDUM

To: Ann Bowers, Chair
   Administrative Staff Council

From: Bob Waddle, Chair
       ASC Salary Committee

Re: 1993-94 Administrative Staff Salary Recommendations

March 30, 1993

The Salary Committee of Administrative Staff Council, as requested by the President and Vice President of Planning and Budgeting, has developed salary recommendations for the 1993-94 contract year. These recommendations are largely based on information obtained from the 1992-93 Ohio College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) salary survey. The CUPA survey is considered to be the best information available for purposes of staff salary comparisons. It is very important to note that BGSU did not submit an updated report to CUPA for this year. This is important as the salary committee was forced to take last year's submittal and adjust the salaries to reflect the mid-year increase. This also moved the committee closer to a role of being responsible for the comparative figures, rather than as an advisory group who would review and help tighten the comparisons. With that in mind, we feel that the council overall should be careful to keep all parties aware that there were changes made by the committee which represented our interpretation of some of the positions, as well as our best attempt to update the status of personnel whose positions were included in the CUPA comparisons.

While many of the concerns of the ASC Salary Committees for the past two years were addressed by the mid-year raises (particularly as shown by the gains reflected in the back up material, specifically Appendix B.1), there remain many advances that can still be made. Specifically with President Olscamp's pledged support to bring faculty salaries to the 60th percentile of Category-I Universities, it remains our goal to reach the status of 4th out of 11 Ohio comparable institutions considered in our analysis. BGSU currently ranks 8th out of 11 (Appendix B), even following some substantial gains on the four institutions ranked directly above us (Appendix B.1).

While this is a positive trend that we would like to see continued, we must still be aware of the concerns expressed by previous salary committees. These committees correctly pointed out the stress and workload increases which have fallen on the administrative personnel. Administrative Staff has also been asked to deal with these increases without the benefit of overtime or comp time, or even the compensation that a faculty member would get for an overload teaching schedule. While the current State budget situation has continued to hit all facets of higher education, it remains imperative that the administration continue to support the excellent staff of this campus by striving to make administrative staff salaries 4th out of 11 statewide. We must not let the quality of the applicants that we are able to draw diminish due to salaries that rank near the bottom of the list of our fellow Ohio institutions.

As we proceed with the recommendations, we have not gone into the extensive rationale provided by the past committees. We feel that the previous descriptions and rationale are adequate.
and have been supported by the Council as a whole, and also the administration. However, please note that each version is fully described in the individual spreadsheet provided as backup. Also, please note that Modified Version 3.1 still remains the version that both the committee and Planning and Budgeting feel presents the most accurate comparison, and thus serves as the basis for our recommendations.

**Recommendation One:**

Salaries should increase 6% for the next year. This would include the 1.65% increase which is already reflected in our salary for the 93-94 fiscal year, leaving a needed increase of 4.35% for FY 93-94.

This recommendation is based upon our goal of reaching the 4th position in the State, and reflects a projected rate of inflation of 3.5% (Appendix C).

**Recommendation Two:**

If the 6% increase for one year is not attainable, then salaries should increase at the rate of 5% for each of the next 2 years. This should include the 1.65% which is already reflected in our salary for the 93-94 fiscal year (this would reflect an additional 3.35% for FY 93-94 and the full 5% for FY 94-95).

Again, this recommendation is based upon our goal of reaching the 4th position in the State, and reflects a projected rate of inflation of 3.5% for 1993 and 4% for 1994 (Appendix D).

**Recommendation Three:**

A separate pool of money should be established, reviewed and maintained yearly to allow for market adjustments and salary differences by gender.

With more than one third of the 56 positions eligible in the MV 3.1 analysis more than 10% below the state average for that position, this remains a serious situation.

**Recommendation Four:**

Any salary pool less than 3.5% should be awarded entirely on an across the board basis, and any salary pool available greater than 3.5% should be distributed based on 60% across the board and 40% merit.

This recommendation is based upon the idea that every member of the administrative staff should have an opportunity to reach the projected Consumer Price Increase of 3.5%.

**Recommendation Five:**

Salary increases for merit should be announced as a dollar figure not a percentage increase. Also, merit should be distributed in a systematic and consistent manner University-wide.

Consistent with past recommendations, we feel that an announcement of a total percentage divided for across the board and merit creates a false expectation of the increase in individual salaries. Also, ASC remains deeply concerned with the inconsistency between vice presidential
area's in the manner in which merit is distributed. It is recommended that all administrative employees be informed in writing, prior to their contracts being issued, of their percentage across the board and their merit percentage.
April 8, 1993

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Christopher Dalton  
   Vice President for Planning and Budgeting

FROM: Ann Bowers  
       Chair, Administrative Staff Council

RE: Salary Request, 1993/94

The Administrative Staff Council's 1993/94 salary recommendations for all administrative staff are listed below with supporting charts attached. The ASC Salary Committee has been requested by Council to work on another recommendation regarding market adjustments which will be presented at the May 6th Council meeting. Thank you for your consideration of this salary request.

The recommendations are largely based on information obtained from the 1992-93 Ohio College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) salary survey. The CUPA survey is considered to be the best information available for purposes of staff salary comparisons. It is important to note that BGSU did not submit an updated report of CUPA for this year. This is important as the ASC Salary Committee was forced to take last year's submittal and adjust the salaries to reflect the mid-year increase. This also moved the Committee closer to a role of being responsible for the comparative figures, rather than as an advisory group who would review and help tighten the comparisons. With that in mind, please note that the changes made represented the Committee's interpretation of some of the positions as well as an attempt to update the status of personnel whose positions were included in the CUPA comparisons.

While many of the concerns of the ASC Salary Committees for the past two years were addressed by the mid-year raises (particularly as shown by the gains reflected in the supporting documentation, specifically Appendix B.1), there remain many advances that still can be made. Specifically with President Olscamp's pledged support to bring faculty salaries to the 60th percentile of Category-I Universities, it remains our goal to reach the status of 4th out of 11 Ohio comparable institutions considered in our analysis. BGSU currently ranks 8th out of 11 (Appendix B), even following some substantial gains on the four institutions ranked directly above us (Appendix B.1).
While this is a positive trend that we would like to see continued, we must still be aware of the concerns expressed by previous salary committees. These committees correctly pointed out the stress and workload increases which have fallen on the administrative personnel. Administrative staff also have been asked to deal with these increases without the benefit of overtime or comp time, or even the compensation that a faculty member would receive for an overload teaching schedule. While the current State budget situation has continued to hit all facets of higher education, it remains imperative that the administration continue to support the excellent staff of this campus by striving to make administrative staff salaries 4th out of 11 statewide. We must not let the quality of applicants that we are able to draw diminish due to salaries that rank near the bottom of the list of our fellow Ohio institutions.

Last, please note that Modified Version 3.1 still remains the version that both the Salary Committee and Planning and Budgeting feel presents the most accurate comparison, and thus serves as the basis for our recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION ONE

Salaries should increase 6% for the next year. This would include the 1.65% increase which already is reflected in our salary for the 93-94 fiscal year, leaving a needed increase of 4.35% for FY 93-94.

This recommendation is based upon our goal of reaching the 4th position in the State, and reflects a projected rate of inflation of 3.5% (Appendix C).

RECOMMENDATION TWO

Any salary pool less than 3.5% should be awarded entirely on an across the board basis, and any salary pool available greater than 3.5% should be distributed based on 60% across the board and 40% merit.

This recommendation is based upon the idea that every member of the administrative staff should have an opportunity to reach the projected Consumer Price Increase of 3.5%.
Dalton
April 8, 1993
Page three

RECOMMENDATION THREE

Salary increases for merit should be announced as a dollar figure not a percentage increase. Also, merit should be distributed in a systematic and consistent manner University-wide.

Consistent with past recommendations, we believe that an announcement of a total percentage divided for across the board and merit creates a false expectation of the increase in individual salaries. Also, ASC remains deeply concerned with the inconsistency among vice presidential areas in the manner in which merit is distributed. It is recommended that all administrative employees be informed in writing, prior to their contracts being issued, of their percentage across the board and their merit amounts.
NOTES ON ASC SALARY REQUEST

1. Based on Appendix A, BGSU is currently in 8th place, 4.04% below the mean. If the other schools get an increase of 3.5%, and BGSU gets 6.0%, we will then rank 4th, but will still be below the mean by 1.8%.

2. Version MV4.1 compares BGSU with Toledo, Kent, Miami, and Ohio Universities, for positions at all 5 institutions. Within this group, BGSU is currently in 4th place, 4.7% below the mean. If the others each get an increase of 3.5%, and BGSU gets 6.0%, we will then rank 3rd, but will still be below the mean by 2.3%.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. J. Christopher Dalton, Vice-President
    Planning and Budgeting

FROM: Administrative Staff Council Executive Committee

RE: Recommendation on Proposal for 93-94 Salary Distribution

DATE: June 29, 1993

Thank you for taking the time to meet with us yesterday and explain the rationale regarding the proposal for the 93-94 salary distribution. As a result of our meeting, you will find below the comments and recommendation of ASC Executive Committee. The Executive Committee would like to first take a moment to express appreciation to the Board of Trustees and the Administrative Council for the opportunity to provide input and feedback in this most important topic. We also recognize the fact that every effort has been made to allocate the maximum amount of dollars to the salary pool. All employees of Bowling Green State University appreciate that effort.

Given the fact that 59.8% of Administrative Staff's salaries fall below the average salary for our employee classification, we concur with the concept that we are still feeling the effects of the two and one half years without a salary increase and that it was more severe to those at the lower end of the salary scale. It is with that thought in mind that the ASC Executive Committee endorses the concept of combining a constant dollar amount and an across the board distribution of the salary pool allocation.

However, we are deeply concerned about the precedent of separating the salary pools among constituent groups in a way that leads to a differential in the constant dollar figure. Although we recognize that the average salary percentage increase is the same for each group, we should point out that employees from different constituent groups with identical salaries will not have equitable increases. We ask that a clear and concise explanation be distributed to all employees to clarify the rationale and logic for this approach.

In addition, the net result of this action will increase the gap between the constituent groups' average salaries. We note that the gap is even wider than perceived since the faculty average is a nine-month salary, while administrative and classified staff average salaries are for twelve months.
Given the time constraints for the immediate problem, we feel this distribution is more appropriate than basing a distribution with merit consideration, especially over the past three years. Since this is the repeat of the one-time exception to the merit concept, we would ask that through the shared governance philosophy a clear direction be developed regarding the philosophy and procedures for merit consideration for the upcoming year.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide input. We look forward to working with you throughout the year.

pc: ASC Executive Committee
PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF 1993-94 SALARY POOLS FOR FULL-TIME CONTRACT STAFF

RATIONALE

A 40% merit/60% across-the-board distribution would yield too small a merit pool (1.2% - 1.6%) for three years performance. The usual 40% merit/60% across-the-board distribution yields higher average increases at lower ranks, e.g. assistant professors. The impact of going from Fall 1990 to January 1993 without raises was more severe on staff at lower salary levels. A straight 6% across-the-board distribution does not provide higher 6% increases at lower ranks as seen with a merit component.

PROPOSAL

The increase for each contract staff member would be a constant dollar amount plus an across-the-board percentage increase. The constant dollar amounts would be different for faculty and administrative staff, reflecting the difference in average salaries. The constant dollar amounts and across-the-board 6% increases would depend on the final subsidy and fee increases as shown below. The average percentage increases for continuing faculty and administrative staff would be identical. Lower-salaried faculty and staff would receive higher percentage increases than higher-salaried faculty and staff. Higher-salaried faculty and staff would receive larger increases in dollar terms than lower-salaried faculty and staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsidy Increase</th>
<th>Fee Increase</th>
<th>Salary Pool Increase</th>
<th>% Increases A-T-B</th>
<th>Constant $ Admin Staff</th>
<th>Constant $ Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>$615</td>
<td>$805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>$947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>$832</td>
<td>$1,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>$869</td>
<td>$1,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPB: JCD 6/27/93 (sal increases 6/27/93)
### BGSU Administrative Staff Salary Average and Distribution 1992-93

**BGSU Administrative Staff Salary Summary for Spring 1992-93**

(Main + Firelands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count in Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20,000</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 - 24,999</td>
<td>43</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>8</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><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>423</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: June 1993 Salary uses 1992-94 base (92-93*1.033 + 1040) except where adjustments were reported to BOT personnel changes.

Source: FACSTAFF 9293; "Personnel Changes", Board of Trustees.
VPPE/OIPR:TI:6/29/93; Admin Salary 9293 SUMRY (6/93)
**PROPOSALS FOR SALARY INCREASES FOR CONTINUING FACULTY FOR 1993-94**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCREASE</th>
<th>1992-93 Ave. Salary</th>
<th>Current Ave. Salary Rate</th>
<th>Prop. Increase $805 + 1.3% 1993-94</th>
<th>% Increase from Current</th>
<th>% Increase from 92-3 Ave.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>Professor $59,582</td>
<td>$60,532</td>
<td>$1,592</td>
<td>$62,124</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate $45,502</td>
<td>$46,224</td>
<td>$1,406</td>
<td>$47,630</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant $37,964</td>
<td>$38,563</td>
<td>$1,306</td>
<td>$39,870</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor $26,202</td>
<td>$26,610</td>
<td>$1,151</td>
<td>$27,761</td>
<td>4.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer $26,877</td>
<td>$27,296</td>
<td>$1,160</td>
<td>$28,456</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All-Rank $46,627</td>
<td>$47,367</td>
<td>$1,421</td>
<td>$48,788</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCREASE</th>
<th>1992-93 Ave. Salary</th>
<th>Current Ave. Salary Rate</th>
<th>Prop. Increase $947 + 1.5% 1993-94</th>
<th>% Increase from Current</th>
<th>% Increase from 92-3 Ave.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>Professor $59,582</td>
<td>$60,532</td>
<td>$1,855</td>
<td>$62,387</td>
<td>3.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate $45,502</td>
<td>$46,224</td>
<td>$1,640</td>
<td>$47,864</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant $37,964</td>
<td>$38,563</td>
<td>$1,525</td>
<td>$40,089</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor $26,202</td>
<td>$26,610</td>
<td>$1,346</td>
<td>$27,957</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer $26,877</td>
<td>$27,296</td>
<td>$1,356</td>
<td>$28,653</td>
<td>4.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All-Rank $46,627</td>
<td>$47,367</td>
<td>$1,658</td>
<td>$49,024</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCREASE</th>
<th>1992-93 Ave. Salary</th>
<th>Current Ave. Salary Rate</th>
<th>Prop. Increase $1089 + 1.75% 1993-94</th>
<th>% Increase from Current</th>
<th>% Increase from 92-3 Ave.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.05%</td>
<td>Professor $59,582</td>
<td>$60,532</td>
<td>$2,148</td>
<td>$62,681</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate $45,502</td>
<td>$46,224</td>
<td>$1,898</td>
<td>$48,122</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant $37,964</td>
<td>$38,563</td>
<td>$1,764</td>
<td>$40,327</td>
<td>4.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor $26,202</td>
<td>$26,610</td>
<td>$1,555</td>
<td>$28,165</td>
<td>5.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer $26,877</td>
<td>$27,296</td>
<td>$1,567</td>
<td>$28,463</td>
<td>5.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All-Rank $46,627</td>
<td>$47,367</td>
<td>$1,916</td>
<td>$49,285</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reflects Full-Year's Worth of January 1993 Increase

OPB: JCD 6/23/93 (fac sal option e 6/23/93)
### PROPOSALS FOR SALARY INCREASES FOR CONTINUING ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF FOR 1993-94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Pool</th>
<th>1992-93 Current Ave.</th>
<th>1993-94 Contract</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Salary</td>
<td>Salary Rate*</td>
<td>$ Amount</td>
<td>A-T-B</td>
<td>from Current vs 92-3 Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>$35,632</td>
<td>$36,193</td>
<td>$615</td>
<td>1.300%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$35,632</td>
<td>$36,193</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>1.500%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.05%</td>
<td>$35,632</td>
<td>$36,193</td>
<td>$832</td>
<td>1.750%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>$35,632</td>
<td>$36,193</td>
<td>$869</td>
<td>1.800%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reflects Full-Year's Worth of January 1993 Increase

### NOTE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsidy Increase</th>
<th>Fee Increase</th>
<th>Salary Pool Increase</th>
<th>% Increases A-T-B</th>
<th>Constant $ Admin Staff</th>
<th>Constant $ Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>$615</td>
<td>$805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>$947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>$832</td>
<td>$1,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>$869</td>
<td>$1,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPB: JCD 6/23/93 (admin staff sal option 6/23/93)
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO SURVEY SENT WITH JUNE MINUTES

17 responses on form; 1 memo; 1 telephone call

1. issue of representation in VP areas by one department (phone call and memo)

2. study of reciprocal fee waivers with corner Ohio schools.

3. study university council concept that combines interests of ASC, CSC, and FS. (building bridges)

4. personnel position for AS

5. concern over effect of IAPC and Managing for the Future Task Force report

6. grievence procedure

7. job description format

8. work load (2)

9. inadequate funding of ASC

10. staff morale and recognition (2)

11. day care (2)

12. Health care, keep chiropractics and counseling as present

13. succession planning/cross trainging

14. compensation and benefits

15. committee on non-academic functions (monitor the process, including findings, analysis and recommendations.)

16. salary inequities based on gender

17. Question on SRP

18. New ID's--keep SSN instead of new University ID #.

19. Grant funded employee statuse.

20. Name change of ASC and our classification

21. ratio of CS to AS (relates to work load and who is doing what
D. **FINANCE COMMITTEE** (continued)

6. Proposed Long-term Goals and Objectives on Faculty and Staff Salaries and Compensation

MOTION: ____________ moved and ____________ seconded that the Board of Trustees adopt the following resolution on faculty and staff salaries and compensation:

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees believes that the highest goal of a public university is to provide the best education for its students; and

WHEREAS, the Board has long believed that quality education can only be afforded to students by a university attracting and retaining qualified and talented individuals to its faculty and staff; and

WHEREAS, the Board further believes that the maintenance of competitive salaries and benefits for faculty and staff is necessary to attract and retain qualified individuals; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has regularly in the past expressed its long-term goals for faculty and staff salaries and compensation in informal terms,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board states its long-term goals for BGSU as follows:

That the highest priority of the Board of Trustees, after ensuring that student academic needs are met, is providing competitive salaries and benefits for BGSU faculty and staff.

(ROLL CALL VOTE)
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL

SALARY COMMITTEE

1992-93 RECOMMENDATIONS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The ASC Salary Committee has consistently analyzed data from the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) salary survey for the past three years. Based upon the data, the following five factual statements can be made.

1) In terms of ranking, BGSU average salaries when compared to average salaries at similar institutions (Modified Version 3.1) remained 6th in 89-90 and 90-91 but dropped to 9th out of 11 in 91-92 (see Appendix B on page 7). It should be noted that the drop to 9th was predicted by the 1990-91 ASC Salary Committee.

2) BGSU average salaries when compared to average salaries at similar institutions (Modified Version 3.1) has progressively declined from -2.83% in 89-90 to -3.83% in 90-91 to -5.35% in 91-92 (see Appendix A.1 on page 6).

3) The percentage increase needed to achieve the goal of making BGSU average salaries 4th in a single year has remained stable: 12.5% in 89-90 and 12.0% in both 90-91 and 91-92 (see Appendix C on page 9).

4) The percentage increase required to obtain the objective of making BGSU average salaries 4th over two years has also remained stable: 8.5% in 89-90 and 8.0% in both 90-91 and 91-92 (see Appendix D on page 10).

5) The percentage of BGSU salaries that were more than 10% below the state average for that position has steadily increased from 27.08% in 89-90 to 30.36% in 90-91 to 38.98% in 91-92 (see Appendix E on page 11).

The data speaks for itself. The University's administration needs to react to the data in the most positive way possible under the current budget situation.
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COUNCIL

SALARY COMMITTEE

1991-92 MEMBERSHIP

Greg Jordan
Ice Arena

Greg MacVarish
Student Activities

Penny Nemitz
Firelands

Barry Piersol
Technology

Jan Ruma
Alumni

Bob Waddle
Capital Planning

Duane Whitmire
Computer Services
MEMORANDUM

TO: Joshua Kaplan
Chairperson, Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Duane Whitmire
Chairperson, Salary Committee, Administrative Staff Council

DATE: March 5, 1992

RE: 1992-93 Administrative Staff Salary Recommendations

The Salary Committee of Administrative Staff Council, as requested by the President and Vice President of Planning and Budgeting, has developed salary recommendations for the 1992-93 contract year. These recommendations are largely based on information obtained from the 1991-92 Ohio College and University Personnel Association (CUPA*) salary survey. The CUPA survey is considered to be the best information available for purposes of staff salary comparisons. Each recommendation is followed by the rationale for the recommendation. Supportive information is contained in Appendixes that are attached.

The ASC Salary Committee strongly recommends that the University's administration devote special attention to the proposals for administrative staff salaries this year. Within the past five years, the administration has made commitments to both faculty and classified staff concerning enhancements to their salaries. President Olscamp has pledged support to bring faculty salaries to the 60th percentile of Category 1 Universities, and the administration has approved and implemented part of a two-phase market adjustment plan for classified staff.

During the past two years there has been a hiring freeze on campus which has had far reaching affects on all university staff. Although the numbers of staff have diminished, the work load has not. During a period of staff reduction, many staff members increase their workload without compensation. When a classified staff employee is required, due to workload, to work overtime, the employee is paid either overtime at the rate of one and one half times the normal salary or is permitted to "comp" the time. When a faculty member is asked to take on an "overload" teaching schedule, the faculty member is compensated accordingly. Administrative staff are not permitted to "comp" time nor are they compensated in overtime pay.

Administrative staff have conscientiously increased their workload to meet the needs of the University. Furthermore, these needs have been accomplished without a permanent salary increase. The ASC Salary Committee feels that compensation for the increased workload is an important issue in considering salary recommendations for the 1992-93 contract year, and believes the time has come for the administration to show its support for the administrative staff by endorsing a plan that will bring these employees' salaries out of 9th place among Ohio state universities (Appendix B).

Bowling Green is an excellent institution and BGSU deserves a qualified professional staff. As the faculty feel justified in reaching the 60th percentile of Category 1 Universities, ASC feels justified in seeking the status of 4th out of the 11 Ohio comparable institutions considered in our analysis. Currently BGSU ranks 9 out of 11 (Appendix B, 6 out of 11 in 1989-90 and 6 out of 11 in 1990-91). When comparing like groups, (see Appendix A.1 version MV.3.1 comparing 1989-90 to 1990-91 to 1991-92), Bowling Green is moving backwards, going from -2.83% in 1989-90, to -3.83% in 1990-91 to -5.35% in 1991-92 below the state average.

*CUPA - the CUPA report referenced here is a report submitted by the Directors of Personnel at all Ohio state schools. It consists of 159 specific job titles and descriptions. Where multiple positions exist for a specific title, an average salary is submitted. Also submitted is the number of years a person has been in the listed positions. The report is compiled and then returned to each school with actual salaries for each school listed by position as well as summary information for each position.
In order to obtain our goal this year, ASC would require a 12% salary increase assuming the Ohio average salary increase to be 3.5%. However, understanding the current budget situation, we view 12% as being unreasonable and therefore make the following recommendations:

**Recommendation One:**

Salaries should increase at the rate of 8% for each of the next 2 years (once $315 has been added to base salaries for 1991-92).

**Rationale:**

1. CUPA survey information considers a total of 159 positions at 15 different state supported institutions. However, only 94 of these positions are occupied on the BGSU Campus. Consequently only these 94 positions were initially considered for this analysis. In addition; Shawnee State, Central State, Medical College of Ohio and Northeast Ohio Universities College of Medicine were excluded from the analysis at the suggestion of Planning and Budgeting due to the nature of each school and the small number of comparable positions.

2. From this base of 94 positions, all executive administration positions (president, vice presidents and deans) were removed. This left 78 positions that were then utilized in the initial comparison of salaries. These positions were analyzed six different ways as shown in Appendix A. Each analysis compared BGSU’s average salary to the average of all schools average salaries and showed a percentage difference from the state average.

Version MV.1.1 compared all 78 base positions, MV.2.1 made a comparison after removing 9 positions (4 faculty and 5 classified staff) that are not held by administrative staff persons at BGSU (ASC believes that since these people are not affected by administrative staff salary increases they should not be included), MV.3.1 compares all the positions in MV.2.1 that are at 5 or more schools, MV.4.1 looks at only those positions common to the “Four Corner Institutions” (Ohio, Miami, Kent and BGSU) and Toledo, MV.5.1 looks at all MV.1.1 positions minus just 5 classified staff positions and MV.6.1 looks at all MV.1.1 positions that occur at 5 or more schools. The range of differences from the state average was -4.70% to -5.69%.

3. It was felt that MV.3.1 was composed of the most accurate set of positions for comparison purposes and thus it was used as a base from which additional analysis was conducted.

4. To get a more accurate indication of BGSU’s position relative to other state schools, a comparative analysis of BGSU individually to the other 10 schools, using only common positions, was performed (Appendix B). This analysis showed BGSU to be at the ninth position in terms of rank (9 out of 11).

5. The analysis of the four corner institutions and Toledo is of special importance in that the comparison of these 5 schools is common practice because of similarity of size, student profile, goals and competition for students. Looking at the analysis shown in Appendix B, BGSU ranks 5 out of 5 (last position).

6. Bowling Green is not a below average institution. In many respects, we are looked upon as being a leader among Ohio state supported colleges and universities. It is felt that compensation of employees at all levels should reflect our status within the state as an academic institution. Administrative staff salaries which are currently 8.02% below the fourth place school (Appendix B) should be increased to a level that would place us among the upper four institutions.

7. Based on The Kiplinger Washington Letter, January 24, 1992 (Appendix F), the ASC Salary Committee projected a 3.5% average salary increase this year and a 4% average salary increase next year. If we consider a salary increase at all other state schools for 1992-93 to be 3.5%, then in order for BGSU to achieve a goal of being in the top four in the state, we would need an increase of 12% (Appendix C). Understanding the budget situation that exists, we suggest a realizable increase of 8% each of the next
two years, assuming that the other schools average 3.5% in 1992-1993 and 4.0% in 1993-1994 (Appendix D). Such an increase would only move BGSU into the fourth position behind Ohio State, Cincinnati, and, Ohio University and also places BGSU second in regard to the four corner institutions and Toledo.

8. Since the $315 was added to the base salaries included in the CUPA survey of state-supported universities in Ohio, the recommendation of increasing salaries at 8% for each of the next two years should be preceded by the addition of $315 to the base salaries for 1991-92.

Recommendation Two:

A separate pool of money in the amount of $44,760 be established to allow for market adjustments and salary differences by gender.

Rationale:

1. In reviewing salary information both from CUPA and from a separate ASC Salary Committee study, it is apparent that there are numerous positions at BGSU that could meet the established criteria of being eligible for market adjustment (ASC guidelines cite a deficiency from the market average of 10% as a basis for market adjustment consideration). Looking at salary amounts only, of the 59 positions in the MV 3.1 analysis, BGSU had 23 (an increase of 8.62% from 1990-91-Appendix E) positions that were more than 10% below the state average for that position. While some of these differences may be explained by differences in education and/or years on the job, there are clearly a number of positions that are in need of further review. The ASC Salary Committee believes that the number of positions in need of market adjustment at lower levels of the administrative hierarchy is greater than what is seen in those positions included as a part of the CUPA study.

Recommendation Three:

Salary increases for merit should be announced as a dollar figure not a percent increase. Also, merit should be distributed in a systematic and consistent manner University-wide.

Rationale:

Past salary increases when announced as a total percent divided 60/40 for across the board and merit, creates a false expectation of the increase in individual salaries. Merit should be an increase earned on the basis of performance above the ordinary, and thus is more appropriately suited to originate from a pool structure.

ASC is deeply concerned with the inconsistency between vice presidential area’s in the manner in which merit is distributed. It is recommended that all administrative employees be informed in writing, prior to their contracts being issued, of their percentage across the board and their merit percentage.

Recommendation Four:

Any salary pool less than 6.7% should be awarded entirely on an across the board basis, and any salary pool greater than 6.7% should be distributed based on 60% across the board and 40% merit.

Rationale:

Since the net increase of the Consumer Price Index for the past two years was 6.7% (Kiplinger Letter stated 3.1% for 1991 and projected 3.5% for 1992), then salaries should be distributed entirely across the board until the CPI has been met.
Recommendation Five:


Rationale

Since raises were not granted for 1991-92, any merit distribution that may be forthcoming in 1992-93 should be based on two years of performance (1990-91 and 1991-92). Evaluation of merit performance over a two year time frame would be the most equitable.
# APPENDIX A

1991-92

SUMMARY OF CUPA - BGSU AVERAGE SALARY COMPARED TO STATE AVERAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>BGSU # of Cases</th>
<th>BGSU Average</th>
<th>CUPA Average</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MV.1.1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>$46476</td>
<td>$49067</td>
<td>($2591)</td>
<td>-5.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV.2.1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>$46413</td>
<td>$49213</td>
<td>($2800)</td>
<td>-5.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV.3.1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$47874</td>
<td>$50580</td>
<td>($2706)</td>
<td>-5.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV.4.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$48166</td>
<td>$50543</td>
<td>($2377)</td>
<td>-4.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV.5.1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$47334</td>
<td>$49729</td>
<td>($2395)</td>
<td>-4.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV.6.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$47753</td>
<td>$50232</td>
<td>($2479)</td>
<td>-4.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation based on MV.3.1
APPENDIX A.1

SUMMARY OF CUPA-S/3SU AVERAGE SALARY COMPARED TO STATE AVERAGE
SIX MODIFIED VERSIONS
THREE YEAR COMPARISONS

MV.1.1  MV.2.1  MV.3.1  MV.4.1  MV.5.1  MV.6.1
**APPENDIX B**  
**1991-92**  
**SUMMARY OF COMPARISON OF BGSU SALARIES TO OTHER STATE SCHOOLS USING COMMON POSITIONS**  
(MV.3.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># of Positions</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>BGSU Average Salary</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Difference from BGSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$56667</td>
<td>$45700</td>
<td>$10967</td>
<td>23.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$53982</td>
<td>$47400</td>
<td>$6582</td>
<td>13.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$55883</td>
<td>$50602</td>
<td>$5281</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$51730</td>
<td>$47968</td>
<td>$3762</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$53391</td>
<td>$51410</td>
<td>$1971</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$49695</td>
<td>$48181</td>
<td>$1514</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$45069</td>
<td>$46641</td>
<td>$1422</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$48963</td>
<td>$48666</td>
<td>$297</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$46321</td>
<td>$47963</td>
<td>($147)</td>
<td>-0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$47424</td>
<td>$49571</td>
<td>($2547)</td>
<td>-5.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph:**

The graph shows the percentage differences in average salaries between BGSU and other state schools. The bars represent different schools, with the height indicating the percentage difference. For example, Ohio State shows a 23.67% difference, and Wright shows a -5.10% difference.
APPENDIX B.1

SUMMARY OF COMPARISON OF BSU SALARIES TO OTHER STATE SCHOOLS USING COMMON POSITIONS (MV.3.1) - THREE YEAR COMPARISONS

- 83-84
- 84-85
- 85-86

CS UC CU MU CS UT KS UA BS YS WS

23.07%
19.50%
18.00%
15.00%
12.67%
12.00%
9.00%
7.20%
7.00%
5.00%
5.00%
3.00%
3.00%
0.50%
0.02%
0.00%
-0.25%
-0.50%
-1.25%
-1.50%
-2.50%
-5.00%
-5.67%
-2.87%
-5.10%
### APPENDIX C

**1991-92**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th># of Positions</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>BG SU Average</th>
<th>Diff. from BG SU</th>
<th>% Diff. from BG SU</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>BG SU Average</th>
<th>Diff. from BG SU</th>
<th>% Diff. from BG SU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$56983</td>
<td>$51184</td>
<td>$580</td>
<td>14.47%</td>
<td>$56987</td>
<td>$51184</td>
<td>$580</td>
<td>14.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$55768</td>
<td>$53088</td>
<td>$2680</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
<td>$55582</td>
<td>$53088</td>
<td>$2680</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$57809</td>
<td>$56993</td>
<td>$816</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>$57903</td>
<td>$56993</td>
<td>$816</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$53841</td>
<td>$53395</td>
<td>$446</td>
<td>-0.84%</td>
<td>$53739</td>
<td>$53395</td>
<td>$446</td>
<td>-0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$59243</td>
<td>$57579</td>
<td>$1664</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>$59331</td>
<td>$57579</td>
<td>$1664</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$51841</td>
<td>$50903</td>
<td>$938</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
<td>$51939</td>
<td>$50903</td>
<td>$938</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$42711</td>
<td>$42235</td>
<td>$476</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>$42669</td>
<td>$42235</td>
<td>$476</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$56666</td>
<td>$56906</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>-0.42%</td>
<td>$56423</td>
<td>$56906</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>-0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$42950</td>
<td>$43362</td>
<td>$412</td>
<td>-0.95%</td>
<td>$43021</td>
<td>$43362</td>
<td>$412</td>
<td>-0.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$48004</td>
<td>$46963</td>
<td>$1041</td>
<td>-2.26%</td>
<td>$47241</td>
<td>$46963</td>
<td>$1041</td>
<td>-2.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph: Comparison of BGSU to Other Schools by Common Positions**

- CS: 14.47%
- UC: 5.05%
- CU: 1.65%
- BS: 0.00%
- MJ: -0.18%
- CS: -4.05%
- UT: -4.30%
- KS: -4.76%
- UA: -7.04%
- WS: -8.46%
- YS: -12.30%
APPENDIX D
1991-92
COMPARISON OF BGSU TO OTHER SCHOOLS BY COMMON POSITIONS IF ALL OTHER SCHOOLS INCREASED BY 3.5% IN 1992-93 AND 4.0% IN 1993-94 AND BGSU INCREASED BY 8.0% FOR EACH OF 2 YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th># of Positions</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>BGSU Average</th>
<th>Diff. from BGSU</th>
<th>% Diff. from BGSU</th>
<th>1991-92 Appendix B Average Salary</th>
<th>1992-93 Appendix B Average Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$92682</td>
<td>$53694</td>
<td>$3892</td>
<td>14.31%</td>
<td>$51598</td>
<td>$51719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$55585</td>
<td>$51562</td>
<td>$4023</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>$53956</td>
<td>$47940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$57839</td>
<td>$54856</td>
<td>$2983</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
<td>$55826</td>
<td>$56303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$53541</td>
<td>$51719</td>
<td>$1822</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>$51790</td>
<td>$47883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$55249</td>
<td>$55523</td>
<td>($274)</td>
<td>-0.48%</td>
<td>$55581</td>
<td>$51410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$51641</td>
<td>$50085</td>
<td>$1556</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>$55565</td>
<td>$48181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$49751</td>
<td>$50372</td>
<td>($621)</td>
<td>-1.23%</td>
<td>$49669</td>
<td>$49666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$59995</td>
<td>$52896</td>
<td>$7100</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>$53953</td>
<td>$49966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$43653</td>
<td>$51187</td>
<td>($1534)</td>
<td>-5.07%</td>
<td>$45621</td>
<td>$47968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wight</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$49064</td>
<td>$59939</td>
<td>($10895)</td>
<td>-20.86%</td>
<td>$47424</td>
<td>$49571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th># of Positions</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>BGSU Average</th>
<th>Diff. from BGSU</th>
<th>% Diff. from BGSU</th>
<th>1991-92 Appendix B Average Salary</th>
<th>1992-93 Appendix B Average Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$92682</td>
<td>$53694</td>
<td>$3892</td>
<td>14.31%</td>
<td>$51598</td>
<td>$51719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$55585</td>
<td>$51562</td>
<td>$4023</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>$53956</td>
<td>$47940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$57839</td>
<td>$54856</td>
<td>$2983</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
<td>$55826</td>
<td>$56303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$53541</td>
<td>$51719</td>
<td>$1822</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>$51790</td>
<td>$47883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$55249</td>
<td>$55523</td>
<td>($274)</td>
<td>-0.48%</td>
<td>$55581</td>
<td>$51410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$51641</td>
<td>$50085</td>
<td>$1556</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>$55565</td>
<td>$48181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$49751</td>
<td>$50372</td>
<td>($621)</td>
<td>-1.23%</td>
<td>$49669</td>
<td>$49666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$59995</td>
<td>$52896</td>
<td>$7100</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>$53953</td>
<td>$49966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$43653</td>
<td>$51187</td>
<td>($1534)</td>
<td>-5.07%</td>
<td>$45621</td>
<td>$47968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wight</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$49064</td>
<td>$59939</td>
<td>($10895)</td>
<td>-20.86%</td>
<td>$47424</td>
<td>$49571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Increase 1.04

% Increase 1.08
APPENDIX E
PERCENTAGE OF BOSU SALARIES GREATER THAN 10% BELOW THE STATE AVERAGE FOR THAT POSITION THREE YEAR COMPARISON
Dear Client: Washington, Jan. 24, 1992

If things don't turn around soon, Bush may get licked in Nov. He will need more than just a few upward wiggles in gov't statistics. Ordinary voters will have to feel better about their own well-being... their jobs, their incomes, their future and how their kids are doing. They'll have to believe that things are headed in the right direction.

It's the DIRECTION that counts, more than the level of business. If the economy is still weak but pointed up, Bush will probably make it. But if it's drifting downward, chances are it will be a Democratic year. Rightly or wrongly, Presidents get the credit or blame for the economy.

The President is staking a lot on his State of the Union talk. Probably too much, by raising high expectations for solutions that he doesn't have. Gov't remedies won't turn the economy around... that will require action by millions of consumers and business people. But it's a chance to deliver a clear message, what he stands for and why...to show that he really DOES have convictions he'll fight for. That he will stick his neck out on matters other than foreign affairs... showing the same decisiveness and leadership he did before the Gulf War. Since then, he has drifted...reacting to problems, not anticipating them. That's why Democrats are cleaning his clock on the economy... pinning the blame on him for layoffs, falling home prices, hard times.

Pessimism over the economy is deeper than justified by the facts. White-collar workers have been hit hard...managers, engineers, bankers, real estate agents, gov't workers, sales people and journalists. They do a lot of talking and are more visible than blue-collar workers. When they're out of work or their incomes slip, EVERYONE hears about it. And the East Coast and southern Calif. are the weakest areas... big media centers trumpeting gloom. They also account for a large share of the electoral votes needed to win next Nov...more bad news for Bush.

Odds are that the economy will brighten in time to save him... housing, retailing and business spending improving enough to be noticed. Thus, bucking up confidence and encouraging more spending and investment. The current refinancing spree will give companies and consumers more cash. And exports will continue strong, as they have throughout the recession.

Many current business changes will make the economy healthier in the long haul...cost cutting, downsizing, automating, restructuring. Focusing on quality, productivity, sharper management and new technology. Bush's problem is that short term, they mean disruption and unemployment.

Democrats have a fighting chance this year...a FIGHTING chance. But their nominee will probably be an underdog to the sitting President, who will use the powers of the White House to make sure he's reelected. Besides, even state party leaders are only lukewarm on Clinton, Kerrey and the rest...figure it may take more than the economy to put them over.
Another brouhaha shaping up over parental-leave legislation...
up to 12 weeks of unpaid time off for birth, adoption or family illness. Congress will pass a bill covering those who work over 1250 hours a year but letting firms refuse leave for the highest-paid 10% of their workers. It will also exempt small companies...those with 50 employees or less.
Bush will veto, thinks leave policy should be left to employers. That will cause a fuss, but there aren't enough votes to override him.

Retailers will keep angling for flexibility in what they sell and how they sell it, shifting more inventory and distribution headaches to their suppliers. In many cases, having them ship direct to customers.
New computer linkups will make this possible for retailers... store headquarters staying in touch with designers, clothing producers and textile manufacturers to let them know what's selling and what's not. Makes stores quicker on their feet and avoids profit-killing markdowns.
Means LESS flexibility for suppliers carrying large inventories and expected to deliver on a moment's notice whenever a retailer beckons.

Merchants are using instant photos to help sales of pricey items. Jewelers, furniture and antique dealers, for example, snap color photos that customers can take home when they're considering major purchases. The stores also give pictures to customers for their insurance files.

Fewer EKGs at hospitals. Medicare will no longer pay extra for interpretation of electrocardiograms...considers that part of test. So EKGs for Medicare patients may be limited to the most serious cases. Congress is catching an earful on this...may restore separate payments.
More light will be shed on executive pay in the next year or so. Securities & Exchange Comm. wants to make companies value stock options offered to top executives in a clear and uniform way to make it easier for investors to understand and compare pay plans at different companies.

"How to Protect Your Business," a 200-page handbook describing invoice and bankruptcy schemes, credit card frauds, computer crime, etc. Plus tips on legal recourse and where to get help. $7.95 per copy from: Council of Better Business Bureaus, Dep't 023, Wash., D.C. 20042-0023.

Community efforts to get rid of illegal drugs will be stepped up by the Office of Nat'l Drug Control Policy. The idea is to get parents, teachers, the clergy, business people and law enforcers working together on everything from after-school activities to helping high-risk dropouts.
Drug use by adolescents has dropped 25% in the past four years. But heroin and cocaine use remain high among those 17 & older.

No surge of inflation this year. It will run right around 3.5%, up from 3.1% in '91, measured by Consumer Price Index from Dec. to Dec. The big difference, energy. Last year it dropped...this year it'll rise. The CPI increased an average 4% a year during the past ten years. There's a good chance that it will come in a bit lower in the next ten.

Changes in the CPI from one year to the next:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3.5% (est.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a table showing the CPI from month to month and how to figure percentage gains, send a stamped, self-addressed, business-size envelope to Joan McGee at our address. There's no charge...glad to help you.
MEMORANDUM

To: Greg Jordan, Chair
   Administrative Staff Council

From: ASC Salary Committee

Re: 1994-1995 Administrative Staff Salary Recommendations

The Salary Committee of the Administrative Staff Council, as requested by the President and Vice President of Planning and Budgeting, has developed salary recommendations for the 1994-95 contract year. These recommendations are largely based on information obtained from the 1993-94 Ohio College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) salary survey. The CUPA survey is considered to be the best information available for purposes of staff salary comparisons.

With President Olscamp's pledged support to bring faculty salaries to the 60th percentile of Category-I Universities, it remains our goal to reach the status of 4th out of 11 Ohio comparable institutions considered in our analysis. BGSU currently ranks 5th out of 11 (Appendix B), but we are as closer in percentage terms to the school in 11th place than we are to getting to the 4th position. While the jump from 8th in 92-93 to 5th this year is very encouraging, the attainment of the 4th position should remain the emphasis in our goals, particularly in light of the large disparity in salaries between the top four schools and the rest of the State. Also, the gains that have been made over the past two years have taken some pressures off of increases in general, and may allow for the return of some emphasis to merit increases.

1. The committee recommends that the emphasis for all increased monies should go towards increases in salaries.

2. The committee recommends that the salary increases should be distributed on a 60/40 percent split between across the board and merit. If the 60% does not meet the projected rate of inflation (3.0% in 1994), then more than 60% should be used to bring the across the board salary increases up to the projected rate of inflation.

For example:
A. With the available salary pool of 4%, the recommended breakout by 60/40 is equal to 2.4% to 1.6%, but since the projected rate of inflation is equal to 3.0%, then the recommendation would be 3.0% across the board and 1% for the merit pool, as the ATB should be as a minimum equal to no less than the projected rate of inflation.

B. With the available salary pool of 5%, the recommended breakout by 60/40 is equal to 3% and 2%, which matches the projected rate of inflation, and would be the recommendation.
C. With the available salary pool of 6%, the recommended breakout by 60/40 is equal to 3.6% and 2.4%, which would put the across the board above the projected rate of inflation, and would again be the recommendation.

3. The committee recommends that merit raises be distributed to individuals according to standard and consistent work evaluations, as being recommended by the Personnel Welfare Committee. The committee also recommends that merit monies will be distributed to Department across the board. Also, salary increases for merit should be announced as a dollar figure and not a percentage increase.

4. A separate pool of money should be established, reviewed and maintained yearly to allow for market adjustments and salary differences by gender.

The salary committee feels that these recommendations remain consistent with those of the past, specifically that BGSU obtain the ranking of 4th in the State, that every member of the administrative staff should have the opportunity to cover the projected rate of inflation, that announcements of total percentage increases divided across the board and merit creates a false expectation of the increase in individual salaries, and that the number of positions more than 10% below the state average for that position is still serious and must be addressed in some fashion. However, the committee is also realistic about the state of budgets for Higher Education within the State budget. We are also aware that salary is only one item in the employee compensation package, but we felt that the charge of the committee has been to review salaries throughout the state, and therefore it is certainly the emphasis of our recommendation.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

1) In terms of ranking, BGSU average salaries when compared to average salaries at similar institutions (Modified Version 3.1) moved from 8th in 92-93 to 5th in 93-94 (see Appendix B). This follows a ranking of 9th in 91-92 and 6th in both 89-90 and 90-91.

2) BGSU average salaries, when compared to average salaries at similar institutions (MV 3.1) gained slightly to -3.20% from -4.04% in 92-93 and -5.35% in 91-92, which had progressed downward from -2.83% in 89-90 and -3.83% in 90-91 (see Appendix A.1).

3) The percentage of BGSU salaries that were more than 10% below the state average for that position dropped further to 30.91% from 35.71% in 92-93 and 38.98% in 91-92. These numbers were up from 30.36% in 90-91 and 27.08% in 89-90 (see Appendix E). It should be noted that BGSU has 25.45% of its positions greater than 10% above the state average for that position, which is up from 19.64% in 92-93.
### Appendix A
1993-94

**Summary of CUPA - BGSU Average Salary Compared to State Average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>BGSU # of Cases</th>
<th>BGSU Average</th>
<th>CUPA Average</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MV 1.1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$51,078</td>
<td>$51,947</td>
<td>($869)</td>
<td>-1.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV 2.1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$50,058</td>
<td>$51,552</td>
<td>($1,494)</td>
<td>-2.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV 3.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$51,165</td>
<td>$52,856</td>
<td>($1,691)</td>
<td>-3.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV 4.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$54,462</td>
<td>$56,164</td>
<td>($1,702)</td>
<td>-3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV 5.1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$51,449</td>
<td>$52,494</td>
<td>($1,045)</td>
<td>-1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV 6.1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$52,239</td>
<td>$52,161</td>
<td>($922)</td>
<td>-1.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation based upon MV 3.1
Appendix A.1
Summary of CUPA - BGSU Average Salary
Compared to State Average
Six Modified Versions
Five Year Comparisons
Appendix B
1993-94
Summary of Comparison of BGSU Salaries
to Other State Schools Using Common Positions
(MV 3.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>% of Positions</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>BGSU Average Salary</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Difference from BGSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$52,811</td>
<td>$50,297</td>
<td>$12,514</td>
<td>24.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$59,955</td>
<td>$53,369</td>
<td>$6,586</td>
<td>12.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$59,205</td>
<td>$53,043</td>
<td>$6,157</td>
<td>11.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$55,015</td>
<td>$51,599</td>
<td>$3,416</td>
<td>6.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$49,022</td>
<td>$49,383</td>
<td>($361)</td>
<td>-0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$47,443</td>
<td>$47,931</td>
<td>($488)</td>
<td>-1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$51,532</td>
<td>$53,135</td>
<td>($1,603)</td>
<td>-2.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$49,355</td>
<td>$51,238</td>
<td>($1,883)</td>
<td>-3.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$49,444</td>
<td>$52,346</td>
<td>($2,892)</td>
<td>-5.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$51,983</td>
<td>$55,446</td>
<td>($3,463)</td>
<td>-6.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Difference from BGSU
Appendix B.1
Summary of Comparison of BGSU Salaries to Other State Schools Using Common Positions (MV 3.1)
Four Year Comparisons
Appendix E
Percentage of BGSU Salaries
Greater than 10% Below the State Average
for that Position
Five Year Comparison
April 13, 1994

Memorandum

To: Dr. J. C. Dalton, Vice President
Planning and Budgeting

From: Greg Jordan, Chair
Administrative Staff Council

Re: 1994-95 Administrative Staff Salary Recommendation

Enclosed are the salary recommendations for 1994-95 which were endorsed by the Administrative Staff Council. These recommendations are based on information obtained from the 1993-94 Ohio College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) salary survey.

It remains the goal of the Administrative Staff Council to reach the status of 4th out of 11 Ohio comparable institutions considered in our analysis. Bowling Green has moved from 8th position (92-93) to 5th. While this jump is very positive, it is important to note that we are closer in percentage to the school in 11th place than we are to the school in 4th place.

Please note that for the first time the Administrative Staff Council has not recommended a percentage increase in salary. We are aware that state budget money is limited and the recommendation of a specific increase is unrealistic. Rather, we have chosen to focus on the distribution of any salary increase.

If you have any questions, or would like to discuss this, please feel free to call.
Salary Recommendations
Administrative Staff Council- 1994-95

1. The salary committee recommends that the emphasis for University budget increases should go towards increases in salaries.

2. The salary committee recommends that the salary increases should be distributed on a 60/40 percent split between across the board and merit. If the 60 percent does not meet the projected rate of inflation (3 percent in 1994), then more than 60 percent should be used to bring the across the board salary increases up to the projected rate of inflation.

For example:

A. With the available salary pool of 4%, the recommended breakout by 60/40 is equal to 2.4% to 1.6%, but since the projected rate of inflation is equal to 3.0%, then the recommendation would be 3.0% across the board and 1% for the merit pool, as the ATB should be as a minimum equal to no less than the projected rate of inflation.

B. With the available salary pool of 5%, the recommended breakout by 60/40 is equal to 3% and 2%, which matches the projected rate of inflation, and would be the recommendation.

C. With the available salary pool of 6%, the recommended breakout by 60/40 is equal to 3.6% and 2.4%, which would put the across the board above the projected rate of inflation, and would again be the recommendation.

3. The salary committee recommends that merit raises be distributed to individuals according to standard and consistent work evaluations.

4. The salary committee also recommends that merit moneys will be distributed to departments across the board. Also, salary increases for merit should be announced as a dollar figure and not a percentage increase.

5. A separate pool of money should be established, reviewed and maintained yearly to allow for market adjustments and salary differences by gender.