MINUTES
COMMISSION ON CLASSIFIED STAFF AFFAIRS
January 13, 1987

Present: Pat Padgett (Presiding), Mary Ann Eddy, Martin Fowler, Paul Gable, Hank Goodman, Ron Herrin, Gail Jameson, Tom Kasperek, Mickey Lewis, Gary McCombs, Judith McNinch, Pat Seitz and Deborah Slice of the Newsletter

Absent: Ray Thompson

The January 13 meeting was called to order by Pat Padgett at 1:15 p.m. The minutes of the December 9 meeting were discussed and approved. The meeting continued as follows:

Pat introduced Mr. Bill Pace and welcomed him to the meeting. He discussed the changes that had been recommended to the administration, but not yet adopted, as listed:

1. Beginning in August, limit the number of decals per person - study shows some have more than one car on campus at one time, which indicates that the decals are being misused.

2. Restructure parking fines - double all fines, discounting 50% if paid within fifteen (15) days. Towing will cost $30 instead of $20.

3. Time all spaces, 30 minute parking spaces, from 7:00 a.m. until 2:00 a.m. for all spaces.

4. Permit commuting students in unrestricted spaces after 4:30 p.m. instead of 5:00 p.m. until 7:00 a.m.

5. A vehicle impounded and stored for thirty (30) days is considered University property to be disposed of as the University sees fit.

Questions:

Q. Mickey - What is the plan for behind Mell Hall parking?
A. As of this time, the Mell Hall parking is low on the priority list.

Q. Mary Ann - how will restructuring of the spaces affect the high school students who come to use the Library at night?
A. They will be able to pick up a visitors permit.

Q. Tom - Are motorcycles required to have a decal?
A. No they do not have to use a decal, but there is a $30 fee for towing.

Q. Tom - Are mopeds required to have a decal?
A. No, there are too few to worry about.
Q. Pat - Is there any discussion on a charge for decals?
A. Yes, there will more than likely be a charge.

Bill Pace added that the Student Senate favored the recommended student transportation system. The students will be encouraged to use the transportation system because of steeper parking fines. There has also been a proposal to use parking meters for visitors spaces.

After discussion on steps that should be taken by the Commission in response to Mr. Pace's comments, Pat Seitz was asked to draft a memo for consideration.

Pat Padgett shared with the group that she had been approached about a need for a place on campus in charge of rental information for new and visiting faculty & staff. After discussing this, it was agreed that the housing office kept information at hand and was available if needed.

Reports

Communications Committee: No report

Executive Committee: No formal report other than the Goals to the President (Attachment 1)

Policy Committee: Working on Section IV (Leave/Fringe Benefits) and need to bring recommendations to the Commission for a vote.

Welfare Committee: Distributed progress report (Attachment 2), and had three new letters.
1. HMO
2. Merit pay
3. Reduction in force policy
University Committee Reports

Day Care Center Committee:

Pat Padgett says Committee getting real close to making recommendations to the President. Possibly working with an outside company to manage the Center. Discussion ensued regarding taking business away from the local day care centers. Discount for state employees at the local centers? Pat says there are no openings at the local day care centers. Center ready by June? Possibility of opening a sick day care center in the CON. Students involved would not be paid anything; it would be a part of their education.

Announcements:

Letter in The Newsletter: Employee Relations Board - Business and Finance

Discussion ensued. (Tom) says Staff Commission should write a letter to someone saying we applaud problems being held in this way. Keep in mind Staff Commission purely advisory. Pat asked if someone wants to make a motion regarding this discussion. Motion moved to table discussion.
Faculty/Staff Dining Room

August 25, 1986 - Meeting was held with Steve Copeland from Business Services to discuss faculty/staff dining room. He gave a very broad overview of possibilities, problems, etc., and stated that Edgar's was currently under consideration. This information was presented to the Commission at its next meeting. Commission voted to go on record as opposing the use of Edgar's.

October 7, 1986 - the Communications Committee met with Mark Wright, Campus Master Planner, to discuss faculty/staff dining facility. He covered pretty much the same information as Copeland but suggested that committee make their interest known to the Faculty Senate.

Call was made to Faculty Senate President Dyck, who stated that he would talk to members of the Welfare Committee, and we would be kept informed.

November 5, 1986 - Steve Copeland met with the Executive Committee of the Staff Commission and explained plans for the "renovation" of Edgar's for the faculty/staff dining facility. After hearing plans, the Commission voted on November 11 to support the use of Edgar's as a first-site for the faculty/staff dining facility. A write-up appeared in the December 3, 1986 Newsletter stating that Edgar's would be open for light lunch beginning in January 1987.

The Committee will stay in touch with those concerned and keep them aware of the Commission's interest in a satisfactory location.

2121 Flyers

Approximately 250 2121 flyers have been sent to departments for posting. Additional flyers will be printed and posted throughout campus.

Activity Reports

Eight activity reports from classified staff have been submitted for publication in the Newsletter.

Gail Jameson, Chair
Martin Fowler
Hank Goodman
In November 1986, the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs completed a survey of classified staff relative to benefits, conditions and policies which most concern them. The final tally resulted in 785 respondents, which constitutes 34 percent of the classified staff employed by Clemson. You have a copy of the line item results.

The Commission will use the information obtained from the survey in the following ways:

1. Develop goals for 1987 which will be discussed in more detail later.

2. Revitalize Newsletter question and answer column using as a base comments noted on the returned surveys.

3. Plan follow-up surveys regarding staff’s perceived needs in the areas of professional development opportunities, health insurance programs, leave policies and retirement.

The Commission was pleased to discover that some of the areas of highest interest expressed by staff already have been studied by the members and recommendations developed and submitted to the President’s Cabinet. I will outline an example below.

Merit pay was by far the area of highest interest. Six hundred employees noted this on their surveys. You will recall the Commission approved and the Cabinet endorsed, in principle, a proposed pay plan for 1987-88 which includes:

1. Merit pay increases based on performance.

2. Longevity pay based on years of service.

3. Improvement of the retirement program.

Additionally, the plan encourages University administration to pursue ways in which Clemson may obtain autonomy in the manner in which pay increases are disbursed to classified employees.

During the remainder of this year, the Commission will consider the merits of and if appropriate, develop recommendations regarding, some of the other topics and comments ranked high in the survey. Take for example, the policy dealing with the use of
annual leave when dependent family members are ill and the employee must stay home to give care. Many employees see this as inappropriate use of annual leave and would like another leave category established, such as personal leave.

Additionally, there was much discussion in the comments about sick leave. For example, staff think that a program which rewards the employee for not using sick leave is a benefit they would like to see implemented. This could be accomplished in several ways, such as:

1. A "pay-out" system based on accrued sick leave in excess of 90 days.

2. Conversion of sick leave accumulation to annual leave or personal leave which could be used by employees with ill dependent family members.

3. Conversion of sick leave accumulation to retirement credit.

Professional development opportunities and job training are also high on the staff’s list. Part of staff’s concern will be ameliorated when Personnel Division’s job training program is fully implemented. I think that staff would appreciate an update on the status of the job training survey conducted by Personnel and should be kept informed of such opportunities when they are available.

Staff feel strongly that special tuition rates should be established for family members and that Clemson employees should be encouraged by supervisors to further their education by providing staff opportunities to attend classes at Clemson. Another idea along these same lines is granting education leave for staffers—similar to sabbaticals granted to unclassified employees.

Ideas concerning improvement of the retirement program, from the staffer’s perspective, include:

1. A review to ascertain if it would be advantageous for Clemson to pay the employees’ portion of retirement contributions; and

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

Comparable worth related observations were made in the survey and there is strong feeling that an aggressive study should be conducted to see if job descriptions are fairly written, classified consistently, and paid appropriately. In addition, some employees have concerns about the reclassification process. The workshop planned by Personnel Division to review the forms,
process and procedure related to reclassification should assist in solving some of the mystery.

A very sensitive area expressed by diverse groups centered around grievance procedures and the appraisal system. There seems to be widespread discomfort felt by staffers relative to how they think their evaluations are handled; and subsequently, they are powerless to react to the evaluations negatively because they do not believe they are protected by current grievance procedures. The Employee Relations Board program recently introduced in Business and Finance area may be a solution; however, I see a re-education of supervisors as necessary. Attitude, spirit and intent of the appraisal system should be adjusted positively. It is my guess that we would discover many supervisors who do not view the process as valuable, but rather see it as another time waster.

Harrassment is mentioned in the survey results; and there is good news and bad. The good news is that sexual harrassment does not appear to be an issue with the exception of one unfortunate person's personal experiences. However, the bad news is that job harrassment is prevalent, especially in the trades areas. This issue is linked closely with the problems expressed relative to grievance procedures and the appraisal system.

Health insurance programs and HMO's were hot subjects as well. Clemson must push for all campus-based employees to be eligible to enroll in the Anderson Health Plan, if they so desire.

As you can easily determine, with all the ideas, suggestions and questions brought forward by staff as a result of the survey, the Commission has a full plate to consider. Commission members are excited about the future of classified employees and feel that this University administration seems to be especially sensitive to their needs. The opportunity the Commission has to work with administration and learn the realities of the business of education is extremely valuable and is mutually advantageous.

In summary, the Commission on Classified Staff Affairs sets 1987 goals to be as follow:

1. Reestablish a question/answer column in the Newsletter.

2. Conduct follow-up surveys in the areas of professional development opportunities, health insurance programs, leave policies and retirement program.

3. Develop recommendations to President's Council regarding:
   a. Revision of leave policy.
b. Establishment of special tuition rates for employees' family members.

c. Institution of education leave for classified staff.

4. Review in detail the retirement program and recommend improvements.

5. Study the recent Personnel Division Administrative Assistant/Secretarial Review conducted during Fall Semester 1986.

6. Recommend a program to instruct supervisors relative to the intent and spirit of the Employee Performance Management System.
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