MINUTES
COMMISSION ON CLASSIFIED STAFF AFFAIRS
DECEMBER 9, 1986

Present: Pat Padgett (Presiding), Mary Ann Eddy, Martin Fowler, Hank Goodman, Ron Herrin, Gail Jameson, Pat Seitz and Ray Thompson

Absent: Paul Gable, Tom Kasperek, Mickey Lewis, Gary McCombs, Judith McNinch and Deborah Slice of the Newsletter

The December 9 meeting was called to order by Pat Padgett at 1:00 p.m. The minutes of the November 11 meeting were discussed and approved. The meeting continued as follows:

Old Business

Survey - Copies of the preliminary report (Attachment 1) were distributed and areas of most interest were discussed and ranked. There were 675 respondents (approximately 25% of the classified staff) when the report was made, and others from the Physical Plant turned in during the meeting. There seemed to be a good amount of interest in the child day care program, which was encouraging. Also, sexual harrassment was very high on the not interested list which is a good indication that that is not a problem here at Clemson. Reduced tuition rates for employees' children as an added benefit was discussed and will be looked into. It was agreed that the surveys that were returned with detailed comments and signed should be answered. The information from the survey will be used in several ways as listed:

1. The report to the President's Cabinet in January on plans for the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs during the next year will include some of these topics.

2. The question/answer column in the Newsletter should be reestablished, using the report to get questions from.

It was decided that Pat would meet with the executive committee to assign the projects to the individual committees. The committees will then report to the Commission as they work on them and will get the materials to Deborah Slice for publication when approved.

Followup on Letters - everything received has been distributed. Mary Ann distributed copies of pending letters to discuss for approval as listed below:

1. HMO - (Attachment 2) the letter was approved with a minor change.

2. Benches on Strode Tower lawn - (Attachment 3) the letter was approved with two changes.
3. Longevity - (Attachment 4) this letter was approved with one change.

4. Military Days - (Attachment 5) the letter was approved as written.

Pay Plan - The new draft of the pay plan was attached to the December 11 agenda sent to all commission members. Pat explained that she and Ray Thompson had met with David Larson about the first pay plan. There were several suggestions as stated below:

1. Don't change what you want from year to year, stick to the same target.

2. The budget may not allow a bonus year after year, which may cause problems. He explained a longevity program (see item 2) of the draft.

3. Faculty Senate is working on a fringe benefits program to have the University or State pick up the employees part of their retirement plan.

Pat added that she mentioned to Dr. Lennon at a cabinet meeting the day before that we were going to be voting on a pay plan today and he said if he didn't have it by tomorrow that we may as well wait a year. The pay plan was discussed at length and reworked. (Attachment 6)

New Business

Nomination for Campus Master Plan Subcommittee - Pat informed everyone that David Larson asked that they send recommendations for the Campus Master Plan Subcommittee. Nominations are to be in by the end of this week.

Distribution of letters - None

Reports

Communications Committee - The letter to Steve Copeland showing our appreciation for coming to the meeting was approved. The announcement of the Faculty/Staff Dining being housed at Edgar's and information had been in the Newsletter, and had brought positive and negative response.

Executive Committee - Had been working on the Pay Plan which has already been discussed.

Policy Committee - There was no one present to report. Pat read a letter that had been sent to the Committee from Paul suggesting
they begin the review of the Personnel Manual. It was suggested that the Personnel Manual, Business & Finance Manual, and the Faculty Manual be put into the computer. Once it was done, the manuals could be updated more conveniently and everyone would have access to it. Everyone agreed that this was a good idea and a letter was drafted to be sent to the Presidents Cabinet on Monday (copy to Paul)

Welfare Committee - They met last week and other than the four letters that have already been discussed they have requested the following from Personnel:

1. Study of the training programs - the results have been sent by Dick Simmons and will be looked at as soon as possible.

2. Salary survey - asked for a copy of the current when completed.

University Committee Reports

Child Care Committee - Have met three times and getting ready to pull together the information (location, size of program - 50 children from infant to three and after school program, contacting fire marshal for approval, not providing lunch, drop-in service, meeting with Cindy Nail (Director of the Tri-County Tech program for preliminary work involved). Plan to have report to the President in March.

Telecommunications Committee - Have not met.

Blue Light Alarm System Committee - Met last week, and are looking into a different type alarm system for pedestrians on the main pathways of the campus. These will be similar to telephone booths that are wired directly to the Police Department for protection.

Joint City/University Advisory - They are doing a traffic and parking survey and a housing survey right now.

Announcements

Report to President regarding Commission's 1987 agenda - Pat will send a summary to all Commission members before reporting.

Annual Report at Faculty/Staff Meeting - Pat will look back over the minutes for things endorsed, recom
mended, and approved to make a summary to be sent out beforehand.

Motion was made to adjourn at 3:15 p.m. and passed.
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
Commission on Classified Staff Affairs

This represents a partial summary of approximately 550 responses from the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs Interest Survey. Ranked below are the top 15 items of highest interest from those classified staff who responded:

1. Merit pay
2. Professional development opportunities
3. Parking
4. Longevity pay programs
5. Health insurance
6. Performance evaluation
7. Annual leave
8. Compensation
9. Job training
10. Retirement programs
11. Dental insurance
12. Compensatory time
13. Comparable worth
14. Wellness program
15. Disability Programs/Life Insurance Programs

The compilation of the Interest Survey was conducted by staff in the College of Nursing Media Center and their contribution to this effort is greatly appreciated:

Ms. Deborah Moore, Media Resources Coordinator
Mr. Brian Cotterill, Graduate Student
Mr. Steve Hamilton, Graduate Student
Mr. Gary Stoddard-Elder, Graduate Student
Mr. Kelly Martin, Graduate Student
Miss Margaret Galloway, Work Study Student
Listed below are verbatim comments obtained from respondents of the Interest Survey.

1. Health Insurance Program: Cost projected to increase and benefits decrease.

2. Parking: Plan currently being considered will be the equivalent of a pay cut and worse than that, if students have access to employee parking space, it will be even more difficult to find a space.

3. Retirement Program: Need to get the cost of buying time, if you have 25 years or more, down to same rate (10%) as out-of-state service or military time.

4. Smoking Areas: The issue of passive smoke is very important. Smokers should smoke only in their offices (when they are the only ones there) or in designated areas--NOT break areas where non-smokers are also present.

5. Money! Money! Money!

6. I'm ------about getting a little more pay. I think that the State should give employees a pay raise instead of wasting their money on unimportant things that the State should leave well enough alone.

7. No Comment!

8. I would like information on courses that are available for employees, either credit or noncredit and information on auditing a class.

9. Other: Job classification procedure--very interested.

10. I feel that the merit raises should be re-evaluated. I do not think that the way the system is set up really gives employees too much incentive to strive very hard. The way the merit system is set up now, someone who starts work at the University ten years from now will be making the same amount of money as someone who has been employed for ten years, and has not had a raise except for the cost of living, which raises the base for everyone.

11. Interested in reclassification or promotion as new responsibilities (such as computer work, etc...) are added to job.

12. Reduced tuition for children--very interested.

13. Department staff meeting--very interested.
14. Reclassification procedures--very interested.

15. I am extremely interested in grievance procedures.

16. Child care facilities not applicable to me, but I feel would be very worthwhile. Educational opportunities on campus--day or preferably night. I would like to recommend the following be looked into:
   a. Having either steps or a walk installed on the Clemson House hill for the convenience of employees who park in the opposite direction from the Alumni Center.
   b. Having a traffic director at the crosswalk in front of Sikes Hall when the traffic light is on "blink" and the "walk" sign is inoperative.
   c. Having traffic director at corner of Parkway Drive and S. Palmetto Boulevard at 4:30 so people leaving Sikes Hall that are parked on one way Parkway Drive can get out into traffic on S. Palmetto.

17. Grading system.

18. Grade classification.

19. Advancement opportunities.

20. Involuntary retirement programs.

21. If we have to do performance evaluations and get good ratings, then there should be some type of merit increase. Performance evaluations make us justify our existence and then there is no structure for increased incentive. How about tuition reduction for staff's and/or professors' children. If we can't get higher pay for what we do and do well, then let's go for the benefits.

22. Sexual Harassment: For more than ten years, I endured sexual harassment from my boss because I was scared to death of him firing me and I know I had to have the job because I was solely supporting two kids. I'd like to see a program that would protect a person and their job security during the process of handling such incidents as reporting and prosecuting the person doing the sexual harassment. My boss made my life miserable, and the effects of it still go on after his retirement a few years ago. I finally did report
him and he is very bitter towards me and he is friends with individuals at the University who have influence over my present job. That influence is affecting my professional advancement.

Seniority Appreciation: I’ve worked at CU close to 16 1/2 years and have earned a reputation for doing a good job. I’ve developed a good relationship with my clients, I work fast in order to help the client maintain a tight schedule, my experiences are on a broad scale, my aim has been to serve, serve well and with a cheerful attitude and professional approach. With all the above, I was passed over when promotion time came. A very ambitious young man with only 2 years at CU made it very clear that he was after the promotion. He negotiated and re-negotiated, talked, argued until he got it. This should not happen!

23. Parking: The whole problem of traffic and community growth.

24. Other: To be up grade

25. Would like to see program on sick "pay" incentive—-that is sick leave unused over a certain amount you could be paid for—such as reducing from 180 to 90 days maximum. If you have over 90 days sick, and if you do not use any sick days, receive pay. Also on annual leave, rather than lose days above 45, be paid for it.

26. I would like to see us use the merit pay. Mainly because each year we just stay even with our grade. This means to get a real increase, we would have to be upgraded. This is a very long drawn out process. And also with just receiving grade pay increase, this means that a new employee with no experience at Clemson comes in making the same thing—now I do not believe this is fair.

27. Nearly every health plan on the market has maximum coverage up to $1 million. Since the main need for this coverage is for catastrophic illness, I would want a higher deductible in exchange for this increased coverage. I have supplemented the Plan B insurance with $10,000 deductible plan—that has a $1 million maximum. I am not comfortable with a $500,000 maximum, especially as a lifetime maximum. Such coverage should be included in a benefit package.

28. Non-monetary performance acknowledgement and performance evaluation are one and the same.

29. Other: Campus Planning—very interested. Campus planning seems to have no one to stop a poor plan that every one objects to. No one taken into consideration not only regular but night parking.
30. Please consider the lack of convenient HMO plans available in Pickens County. I would join the Anderson plan if available.

31. Other: Socials for single staff--very interested.

32. The faculty should have no tie to the staff affairs and related doings or accomplishments.

33. Other: Employee assistance program.

34. I would like very much to see a cafeteria or restaurant for employees offering nutritious lunches at reasonable prices.

35. I would like to see some sort of cafeteria or restaurant where employees could get something for lunch without having to go downtown. A cafeteria limited to faculty and staff, set up like the dining halls on campus, would be nice where an employee could purchase nutritious meals at a reasonable price. (May be the employee could sign up on a meal plan like students do now.) The cafeteria would need to be conveniently located and reasonably priced to be a success. Thanks for allowing me an opportunity to express my opinion. Sincerely, Angie W. Justice.

36. Do away with time sheets.

37. I am very interested in and have many questions about the inconsistency of job responsibilities/descriptions vs. classification grade levels across campus. I have interviewed for several positions across campus where the job responsibilities were no different from my current position and yet the pay grades for these positions were 3 to 4 levels higher than I am now.

38. I maintain that classified staff need to be accorded the same degree of courtesy and dignity with regard to their "professionalism" as do faculty. In this regard, it has always been a mystery to me as to why classified staff, no matter what their age, are called by their first name, whereas faculty, no matter how young, are called by their title and last name. This is a form of double standard.

39. Sabbaticals for professional/administrative personnel--very interested.

40. Tuition break for kids. I sent you a letter about tuition break for kids. Any results or answer? Do you function or are you part of the "good ole boy" system, much talk and no action. Bruce E. Herzogh.
41. Continuing education and evening availability of courses (non-graduate).

42. Especially using it (sick leave) for sick family members.

43. As a part time employee since 1974, I don't think the University compensates those of us who work part time as they should. Re-thinking of qualifications for health and dental insurance after years of loyal and consistent service in a part time capacity.

44. Other: Reduced tuition for employees' spouse and children.

45. I hope some type of action will be taken with these issues, with positive results. Your efforts are appreciated.

46. Very important issues for me personally: compensatory time, job training, longevity pay program, merit pay, non-monetary performance acknowledgement, overtime, professional development opportunities. Other: Tuition for employees and their families, bonus pay and technical training.

47. More on the job training.


49. Other: Educational benefits at CU

50. I believe state employees should be allowed to use some sick leave each year when their children are sick.

51. Hours of work "possibly flex time".

52. Longevity pay program, please explain. Non-monetary performance compensation, please explain. Merit pay, need.

53. Dental insurance, health insurance and life insurance, we have. Our insurance programs seem to be meeting our needs.

54. Other: Budget cuts and their impact on classified staff relative to merit raises.

55. Other: Job security and plain harassment.

56. Note: would be interested in developing a program for providing child care to university employees. I feel it is needed and think the response of employees with children would be favorable and supportive.

57. Very disheartening with no merit raises--no chance to advance.
58. I would like to see some kind of compensation for those who have annual leave days built up to 45 days but cannot really afford to be away from their office to take the remainder of the annual leave days they have earned.

Parking is a very real problem—not only at my office, but when I must use my personal car to deliver items to another office across campus. Rumor has it the University is going to begin charging to park. I sincerely hope the Commission will protest this. (I know of no other business that charges their employees to park on their own property.) There must be an answer to the parking problem.

59. Currently the department in which I work offers zero incentive for a person to continue their education. I would like to see a University wide program established whereby a person is compensated for their level of education and/or the department pays for the education.

60. Many states provide some form of compensation for unused sick leave at the time of retirement. Why cannot SC do this?

61. Child care Facilities: This is an area that is of interest to me only as a supervisor of younger women who could benefit greatly from having peace of mind and better attendance and punctuality if such facilities were available on campus.

I feel that employees should be remembered for NOT using their sick leave indiscriminately by allowing it to be added to years of service when computing retirement benefits (or a portion thereof), or by allowing a percentage of sick leave to be passed to annual leave as personal days when a maximum number of days is reached. Most working women need time off to care for sick children or other family members and there should be a category (perhaps personal leave) to draw from rather than vacation days.

62. Very interested in getting paid on Thursdays again.

63. Preretirement programs offered only during work hours. How about an evening or Saturday option? Better information on investment opportunities through CU.

64. Very interested in returning to our regular payday on Thursdays.

65. One of the areas that I am very interested in is child care at the University. Even though my child is now school age, child care at the University would be a wonderful benefit to parents. Adequate, high quality child care is one of the
most important issues today. In my opinion, the University could set up a very good child care program. The facilities are available, and several of the departments, such as Nursing and Education, could also benefit. A high quality child care facility at the University would be an added employment benefit for employees. It could also be an incentive for students with children.

66. What is comparable worth? Parking is a problem around the P and A Building.

67. Grievance Procedures: Need office where employee concerns and problems are advocated.

Other: Employee advocacy

68. Other: Promotion possibilities; classification of positions.

69. Attached is my memo dated 9/10/86. Due to the parking situation, the park benches would give us an incentive in staying on campus, although at the same time, getting out of our offices for lunch hour. We do not have a lounge or eating area for the secretarial staff in the building. We are now contemplating changing a storage room in the basement into a lounge and eating area. There is much work to do first to make it pleasant enough for an adequate surrounding. As I will state again, the staff is regarded as always being low priority and their needs are overlooked. We do need pleasant working conditions to help keep morale and spirit in the vein it should be.

70. I think we need to consider after school facilities as well as preschool programs. Since I have no axe to grind, I would be glad to serve on a committee.

71. I think the non-monetary performance acknowledgements would put us on the same level as fast food workers or maids/janitors. I thought we were supposed to be well trained, intelligent professionals.

72. Dental insurance programs, disability pay programs, grievance procedures, health insurance programs: I have little interest in these. You should have used an interoffice address—why waste $ on postage?

73. Something must be done to alleviate the parking problems.

74. Liability insurance.

75. Promotion Policy: Could you study comparable grade and wage for jobs that are the same, whether minority or not?
76. Would like flexible hours.

77. Leave needs to be provided for mothers that have children when they are sick. Men are able to take military leave with pay and no annual leave is taken.

78. One of my chief concerns is the Progressive Discipline Policy. I feel that some of the causes listed for disciplinary action are vague and broad, so much so that you can drive a truck through them. While some are quite clear and specific, others are not. How about one that says that "any significant misconduct relating to employment that is not listed in the foregoing?" That's in the general section of the discipline policy. And how about "Any serious misconduct that is detrimental to the University not listed in the foregoing?" What the hell is that?

The policy also fails to spell out employee rights politically and otherwise. I know of a case where an employee involved in public relations was given a written reprimand for a letter he wrote to a newspaper editor in confidence. It was a personal letter written in supposed confidence, but the editor made the letter public and its contents divulged to Clemson officials. Is the employee protected by free speech rights? Can an employee speak out on public and political issues without fear of reprisals from the University? None of this is detailed or spelled out in the policy for classified or unclassified employees as far as I'm concerned. We're naked. Do we surrender constitutional protections at the door? Does our job depend on muzzling?

pmp
12-8-86
Dear 

Thank you for your recent inquiry concerning Health Maintenance Organizations. Mr. Ron Herrin, Director of Payrolls and Employee Benefits Programs, has been contacted regarding this concern. Attached for your information are copies of correspondence from Mr. Herrin, President Max Lennon and Mr. Joe Mack, Deputy Director of the South Carolina Retirement System, which address the unique problem encountered during open enrollment with the HMO alternative health care program. Due to potential legal problems related to changing contractual arrangements with HMO’s for fiscal year 86-87, there is little likelihood that changes can be made for the current year. The Payroll/Insurance Office and the South Carolina Retirement System are presently working on a possible solution to avoid this same problem in the future.

We appreciate your interest and if you have further questions or comments, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Pat M. Padgett
Chair, Commission on Classified Staff Affairs

PMP/e
Attachments
Pat Padgett

9/12/86
11:05 a.m.

Received a call from: She had attended the meeting on September 11 about Health Maintenance Organizations. Stated that because she lives in Pickens County she cannot join Anderson County HMO even though her family doctor is with the Anderson Group. She could not join another HMO because it had met its quota, etc. She felt excluded from participating.

She said that there were many angry people after the meeting was over and wanted the Commission to look into this. Someone on the appropriate committee should call her.

Gail Jameson
Mr. Max Lennon  
President  
Clemson University  
Clemson, South Carolina 29633-0992  

Dear Mr. Lennon:

I read with interest your comments on the Clemson situation relative to Anderson Health Plan. I certainly appreciate your input.

The configuration of service areas along county lines was an effort on the part of the State to actually promote equal choice of alternative delivery systems among employees, not restrict them. In this effort, outmigration studies were made to evaluate where employees in given counties actually sought medical care. Based on these studies and the known fact that in other states HMOs have a tendency to only offer services in the larger metropolitan cities, South Carolina devised a predetermined service area approach that coupled smaller rural counties with those having larger metropolitan populations. Consequently, it was anticipated that HMOs wishing to serve employees in a given area would be compelled to extend benefits to all counties where employees live or work regardless of population size.

Anderson Health Plan (AHP) had this opportunity but chose not to apply to serve Pickens and Greenville counties for this fiscal period. Instead, Anderson Health Plan decided to confine its activities to the Anderson and Oconee county areas.

Clemson is in a unique geographical location relative to the service areas involved, but exception cannot be made to the HMO guidelines nor can guidelines be changed at this late date. Contractual arrangements have already been entered into with the various HMOs for FY 86-87 and changes to contracts would be disruptive. Perhaps next year AHP will be in a position to expand into other service areas.

Thank you again for your comments.

Sincerely,

Joseph A. Mack  
Deputy Director

JAM:lg  
cc: Mr. Ron Herrin
Mr. Joe Mack, Deputy Director  
S. C. Retirement System  
P. O. Box 11960  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211  

Dear Mr. Mack:  

In the enclosed letter Mr. Ron Herrin explains the peculiar position in which we find ourselves, here at Clemson, with respect to the availability of health services. Our physicians in this area use the hospitals in Service Area 1, as do the large majority of our employees, but we have been placed in Service Area 2. More than 1600 of our employees are directly affected by the situation.  

Anything that you can do to alleviate the problem would be very much appreciated.  

Sincerely,  

Max Lennon  

ML:ak  
cc: Dr. W. David Maxwell  
Mr. Ron Herrin
Mr. Joe Mack, Deputy Director  
S. C. Retirement System  
P. O. Box 11960  
Columbia, S. C. 29211  

Dear Joe:

We have a unique problem at Clemson University concerning the HMO's available to our employees with which we need your help.

I have attached a copy of the State Regional Service Areas and the Service Area that Anderson Health Plan is licensed to serve, which includes the cities of Liberty, Central, and Clemson, which is a part of the State Service Area 2 (Pickens and Greenville). In the small corner of Pickens County where Clemson University is located, there are 1,614 employees who live and work in the State Service Area 2, although they are connected geographically with Service Area 1.

The large majority of these employees use physicians in the Clemson, Pendleton, Seneca and Anderson Area (which is Service Area 1).

The physicians in the Clemson, Pendleton, Seneca and Anderson Area use the Anderson and Oconee Hospitals (Service Area 1) not Easley and Greenville, (Service Area 2).

Based on the above information and because of the number of employees affected (1,614), the uniqueness of the situation because of geography, where our employees seek their medical services, and where the physicians in this area have admitting privileges at hospitals -- we request that an exception be made to allow employees who work at Clemson University to be eligible to enroll in the Anderson Health Plan.

To accomplish the notification and enrollment process, we would also need at least a one week extension on open enrollment from the date we receive approval.

I appreciate your attention to this matter and look forward to an early response.

Very truly yours,

Ron Herrin, Director of Payrolls and Employee Benefit Programs

Enc: Eligibility Map
DETERMINING PARTICIPATION ELIGIBILITY

The eligibility requirement for participation in a particular HMO is based on residence and/or employment in the service area of the HMO. The map and chart below divide the state into numbered service areas showing the counties within each area and the HMOs which will be serving them.

SERVICE AREAS

($)P available in ALL Service Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>HMO Plan Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oconee, Anderson</td>
<td>A, C, N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pickens, Greenville</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spartanburg, Union, Cherokee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lancaster, York, Cherokee</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Greenwood, Laurens, Abbeville, Saluda, McCormick</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lexington, Newberry</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Richland, Kershaw, Fairfield</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aiken, Edgefield, Barnwell</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Orangeburg, Calhoun, Allendale, Bamberg</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Clarendon, Lee, Sumter</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chesterfield, Marlboro, Darlington, Dillon, Florence, Marion, Williamsburg</td>
<td>C, W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Georgetown, Horry</td>
<td>C, W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Charleston, Berkeley, Hampton, Colleton, Dorchester</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Beaufort, Jasper</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HEALTH PLAN CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>State Group Health Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Anderson Health Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Companion HealthCare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>HealthAmerica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Whittaker Health Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATE REGIONAL SERVICE AREAS

Anderson Health Plan Service Area

The shaded area below represents the Anderson Health Plan service area.
September 23, 1986

Mr. Joseph A. Mack  
Deputy Director  
South Carolina Retirement Systems  
P.O. Box 11960  
Columbia, S.C. 29211  

Dear Mr. Mack:

As you are probably aware, The Anderson Health Plan is a South Carolina Licensed Health Maintenance Organization. This spring, AHP was approved to offer its benefits to SCRS employees in Service Area #1. Anderson Health Plan is licensed to operate in Anderson & Oconee Counties as well as the portion of Pickens County which includes Clemson and surrounding areas. Because the town of Clemson is located in Pickens County, Service Area #2, AHP was unable to offer to Clemson University Employees who live in the Clemson area. This represents over 1,600 employees.

As you can see on the enclosed map, Clemson is located in the very corner of Pickens County, nearly touching both Anderson and Oconee Counties. Over the past few weeks I have received many phone calls from some very upset Clemson University employees who live in Clemson. They are upset because even though Anderson Health Plan is licensed to operate in Clemson, SCRS will not allow us to offer benefits to these employees. The reason that AHP received licensing for Clemson is that virtually all of the physicians in that area have admitting privileges to Anderson and or Oconee hospitals. In nearly every case they do not have admitting privileges to the Greenville Hospital System. By including Clemson in the Greenville Service Area only, you are essentially asking Clemson University employees to change physicians and hospitals rather than drawing the service area lines to match the communities medical delivery system. This is because the HMOS approved to offer in Pickens County are Greenville based and have no providers in the Clemson area.

AHP is the only SCRS approved HMO that has virtually every physician and the referred to hospital in Clemson as providers. Because of this, I feel that The Anderson Health Plan is the most appropriate HMO to offer to employees of Clemson University. I have been asked if AHP would accept members who live in the Clemson area if SCRS were to allow them to enroll in AHP. The answer to this question is a definite yes.
If there is anything I can do to facilitate the inclusion of the Clemson area into Service Area #1, please let me know. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Ted Morlok
Director of Marketing

TM/Iw

c: Ron Herrin
This area represents the Service Area for The Anderson Health Plan.

AHP FORM: #0045
Dear

Thank you for your memorandum to the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs regarding benches on Strode Tower lawn.

I referred your inquiry to Mr. L. E. Anderson, Grounds Maintenance Supervisor at the Physical Plant. Mr. Anderson responded that the Physical Plant manufactures these benches and plans for this year had originally included placing benches in the Strode Tower area. Due to budget constraints, however, it may be spring or summer of next year before this is accomplished.

We appreciate your interest and if you have any further questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely,

Pat M. Padgett
Chair, Commission on Classified Staff Affairs

PMP/e
September 10, 1986

TO: Ms. Pat Padgett, Chair
    Commission on Classified Staff Affairs

FROM:

RE: Benches on Strode Tower Lawn

    On behalf of the staff in the
        I am requesting that consideration be given to
    placing benches out on the lawn between Strode Tower and Palmetto
    Boulevard among the many shade trees.

    As we are all well aware, the parking problem has recently
    worsened and it has been most inconvenient to leave the premises
    at lunch time only to find there are no parking spaces upon your
    return. This would not only alleviate the frustration of the
    parking problem but would enhance the staff morale by all getting
    together for the lunch hour in a most pleasant atmosphere.

    I ask that you refer this suggestion to the appropriate
    department for action.

cc: Leland Anderson
    Superintendent of Grounds
MEMORANDUM

TO: Concerned Staff Member

FROM: Classified Staff Commission

SUBJECT: The Longevity Program

December 8, 1986

Your memorandum dated July 8, 1986 has been referred to the Clemson University Personnel Division which has provided the following information.

In responding to your letter dated July 8, 1986, we need to review some background information that is basic to understand what happened in your case. First, a reallocation is the re-assignment of a class of positions from one pay grade to another based on labor market salary data. S. C. longevity increases were monetary awards to employees who had been at the maximum of their pay grade for two consecutive years with no salary increase other than cost of living increase.

Prior to September 1983, the only compensation given for grade reallocations was the amount needed to take a salary to the minimum of the new grade. Around the time of the clerical study the state amended its policy to allow increases of up to four percent (4%) to all positions reallocated not to exceed the maximum of a grade. This increase disrupted the longevity eligibility of several employees who were at the maximum of their grade. The two consecutive years (were determined to be from the date of their upcoming review date not from the date of the reallocation) of no salary increases other than the cost of living increase would need to be met, meaning almost a three (3) year delay for some. We called the S. C. Division of Human Resource Management to verify that we were interpreting their policy correctly, regrettably we were!

In June of each year, the legislators meet to draw up the Appropriations Act to govern state agencies for the upcoming fiscal year. One provision of the Act for FY 1986-87 called for the discontinuation of the longevity program effective July 1, 1986. Therefore, no state employees with review dates after June 30, 1986 would receive longevity increases. Clemson University made its position clear, that we wanted some type of longevity increase, but with no success. The fact that those individuals whose review dates fell prior to July 1, 1986 received longevity increases while those with review dates after did not, was not connected to the reallocation of 1983 but the Appropriations Act.

As already indicated, Clemson University opposed the deletion of this longevity increase but with no success. Regretfully no compensation will be awarded to
state employees currently receiving maximum compensation under their classification. To answer your question on how to rectify the situation, the University and the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs is currently in the process of proposing a longevity increase program based on number of years of service rather than whether or not an employee is at the maximum of their grade or not.

We appreciate your comments, questions, and interest in state policy and its affect on state employees.
July 8, 1986

To the Classified Employee Commission:

I would like an answer to a question regarding the recent discontinuation of the longevity program. I am a classified employee, having been employed in the same department for the last 10 years. My original date of employment was June 10, 1976. I reached the top of my grade (pay-scale) on October 22, 1982. I would have been due for a longevity increase in October of 1984. In December of 1983 clerical positions were reallocated, changing most positions one grade (I went from a grade 19 to a 20). We received a small pay increase at that time. This reallocation did not change my review date, but meant that I would not be due a longevity increase for 2 years hence (December 1985). However, I would have to wait until my review following that 2 year period, which would fall in October of 1986 (almost a full year later).

My complaint is that I feel the system is unfair because all clerical employees were affected by the reallocation in December of 1983. However, those individuals whose review dates fell before July 1, 1986 received their longevity increases—those individuals whose review dates fell after July 1, 1986 will not receive a longevity increase. I feel that there is a flaw in the system for this unfair situation to exist. I should have been eligible to receive my longevity increase as well as all other individuals who were at the top of their grade when the reallocation occurred.

The bottom line is that I have had no pay increase (other than cost-of-living) since October of 1982. This certainly does not encourage "career" employees to work for the State. I would like to know how this can be considered fair to all those involved and what, if anything, can be done to rectify the situation.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
August 5, 1986

Commission on Classified Staff Affairs
P. O. Box 2121
Clemson, SC 29634

Dear Commission:

I would like to address the issue of the number of military days an individual may take during one fiscal year. During the past, this has been a total of 15 days. The number of days we are given is not the issue, but having to include weekends in the total number of days we take is.

I am in the National Guard and take two weeks summer camp every year, which means I am away from my position at Clemson for a total of 10 working days, but because of the policy I am deducted for the weekend days which come in the middle. I feel this is wrong and would like to see it corrected.

The National Guard is changing just as everything else. More emphasis is being placed on training; and I would like to be able to utilize the full 15 days allowed for military leave. I do not agree that I should be deducted two days of military leave for weekends. I do not accrue annual leave or sick leave for weekends, nor is that deducted from my annual leave. Why is it deducted for military leave?

If the change cannot be made, possibly the State should consider increasing the days of military leave to 20.

Sincerely,
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
COMMISSION ON CLASSIFIED STAFF AFFAIRS

The Commission on Classified Staff Affairs proposes the following three point pay plan for classified staff for fiscal year 1987-88:

1. Use the total available money pool to fund a merit program. The Commission on Classified Staff Affairs endorses the concept of rewarding performance espoused by the Division of Human Resource Management. Additionally, the Commission recommends that Clemson University be allowed to exercise discretion in regard to the distribution of the merit pool, similar to the discretion used in determining salary increases for unclassified employees.

2. Establish a longevity pay plan. The Commission recommends a plan to reward loyal, career-type employees in the following way: Based upon $50.00 for each year of service after the third year, classified employees will receive longevity pay on the anniversity dates of their employment with Clemson University. For example, an employee with five years University service would receive a $100.00 check on fifth anniversary.
3. Improve classified employee fringe benefit program.

The Commission on Classified Staff Affairs recommends the following:

1. The retirement program be evaluated to see if it is to the advantage of the employee and economically feasible to have the state make the contribution for the employee.

2. Special tuition rates be considered for the employee and their dependents.

3. Allow employees who live in Pickens and work at the main campus of Clemson University to participate in H.M.O.s of Area 1 (Anderson/Oconee) or Area 2 (Greenville/Pickens).

4. Consider granting study leave for classified staff similar to sabatical leave granted to faculty members.

5. Make the early buy-out option of the state retirement more economically feasible.

6. Use a portion of employees sick leave as credit towards retirement.

7. Extend the definition of sick leave to include any member of the employees immediate family (within the 2nd degree of consanguinity), who is dependent upon the employee for welfare.

Approved as corrected and to be hand delivered to the President this afternoon.