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Tim Burns, Plant Operations and Maintenance, 2-7637
Ann Bowers, Center for Archival Collections, 2-2411
Josh Kaplan, Student Health Service, 2-2274
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Jane Schimpf, Food Operations, 2-2891
Norma Stickler, Committee Chair, Academic Affairs, 2-2915
Fran Voll, Athletics, 2-7069
Dick Zolman, Computer Services, 2-2911
August 23, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: Tim Burns, Plant Operations & Maintenance
    Ann Bowers, Center for Archival Collections
    Joshua Kaplan, Student Health Center
    Pat Koehler, Channel 27
    Jane Schimpf, Food Operations
    Fran Voll, Athletics
    Dick Zolman, Computer Services

FROM: Norma J. Stickler
      Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs

The first meeting of the Personnel Welfare Committee will be at 8:30 a.m., Friday, August 25 in the McFall Center Chart Room. The agenda is attached.

Again, many thanks for agreeing to serve on the committee. We should have a busy, but interesting, year.

wv
attachment
Personnel Welfare Committee
Agenda
August 25, 1989
8:30 a.m. McFall Chart Room

Agenda items for the year—these items have been suggested to date

✓ Preventing erosion of benefits
✓ Drug Free Workplace (see attached)
✓ Sick leave/vacation
Market adjustment statements
  Revision of statement approved in June (see attached)
✓ Distribution guidelines

_salary increases for externally funded personnel
✓ Other Handbook changes
 Others?

Subcommittees

Drug
  Serving J. S. L. S. J. R. F. K. T. B.
 IRC

Sick, Vacation, Pay - J. T. R. N. K. T. B.
Handbook - A. N. M. S.

Timetable for consideration of the agenda

Regular meeting time
  1st & 3rd Tuesday
  9:00
  1st & 3rd Wednesday

Next meeting
  Drug Free Workplace
  Market adjustment
  Statement on new bill due
  "great funded, "
Notes on PWC Meeting
August 25, 1989

Agenda items for the year (to date) and subcommittee assignments:

Benefits—prevention of erosion, cost containment, health care, fitness
Dick, Josh, Tim
Drug Free Workplace policy
Pat, Fran
Sick Leave/Vacation—loaning or borrowing sick leave, lost vacation days
Jane, Pat
Handbook policy statements, externally funded personnel, residence hall directors, job security
Ann, Norma
Awards Dinner
Ann, Norma
ERIP
Norma will check on progress of last year's committee
Market Adjustment Distribution Guidelines
All PWC members

Other discussion:
Could we avoid collecting money at the opening day reception? (NJS will check with Executive Committee on other possibilities)
Can we do more to welcome new staff members?
How much are we saving by encouraging the use of generic drugs? (DZ will check with Morris) Might it be a good idea to limit the use of generics?

Meeting times
Agreed to meet first and third Fridays at 9:00 a.m. More frequent meetings will be held only if we fall behind in our agenda.

Next Meeting
Friday, September 15, 9:00 a.m., McFall Chart Room

Agenda:
Drug Free Workplace
Market Adjustment Distribution Guidelines
New Business

NJS
August 25, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jill Carr
   Chair, Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Norma Stickler
       Academic Affairs

The Personnel Welfare Committee held its first meeting today, and we established our agenda for the next few weeks. We dispensed with one item that had been given to us—a proposed revision to the Market Adjustment Procedures that were approved by the Administrative Staff Council in June. A member of the staff had suggested that it is contradictory to say in paragraph two that the process begins with a meeting with the supervisor when in the previous paragraph it says the process begins by conferring with the Administrative Staff Personnel Services Office. The Committee recommends that the policy be amended to say "The process for requesting a market adjustment shall include a meeting of the Administrative Staff member, the staff member's immediate supervisor . . . ." It is further the recommendation of the PWC that the Executive Committee could simply make this change as a friendly amendment without taking it to the full Council.

I am enclosing a membership list of the PWC for your reference and for the reference of the Council in case they have questions about any of the materials we forward this year.

Attachments
Market Adjustments in Salaries

In situations where the salary of an Administrative Staff member is not competitive with other comparable positions, a market adjustment in salary can be requested. Administrative Staff members shall seek the guidance of Administrative Staff Personnel Services when gathering materials to support a request for a market adjustment in salary. Requests for market adjustments in salary are independent of the merit evaluation process and can be initiated by the Administrative Staff member. These requests shall be in writing and shall include a survey of salaries of comparable positions, comments from Administrative Staff Personnel Services, and other relevant supportive documentation.

The process for requesting a market adjustment in salary shall begin with a meeting of the Administrative Staff member, the staff member's immediate supervisor and the budget administrator for the staff member's area. Following this meeting, the request for a market adjustment in salary shall be submitted, by the Administrative Staff member, to his/her contracting officer or designate for review.

Approved by the Administrative Staff Council June 1, 1989
MEMORANDUM

TO: Norma Stickler

FROM: Jill Carr

RE: Personnel Welfare Committee

First, please accept my thanks for agreeing to chair the Personnel Welfare Committee. This committee is so important to the overall success of the Administrative Staff Council. Your leadership will continue this "tradition".

Second, attached please find your committee roster. I will contact each committee member and extend my appreciation to them for agreeing to participate as a member of the committee.

I look forward to seeing you at the Exec Committee meeting at the beginning of each month. Thanks again for your willingness to take on this task. Please call me if you have any questions.

JC/jm
PERSONNEL WELFARE COMMITTEE

ROSTER

NORMA STICKLER - CHAIR

- Deb McLaughlin
  Jane Schimpf
  Ann Bowers
  Josh Kaplan
  Pat Koehler
  Tim Burns
  Fran Volf
  Dick Zolman
1. Drug Free Workplace--action

2. Market Adjustment Distribution Guidelines--action

3. Progress reports
   Generic Drugs - Dick Zollman
   Revisions to page 1, 10, and 9.2 in Administrative Staff Handbook
   Others

4. New items
   Compensatory Time Ann.
   Maternity Leave OK as is $45 x 52 W
   Family Insurance Coverage
   Reciprocal Dependent Fee Waivers with Ohio schools
   Sabbatics
   Minority hiring incentives

5. Next meeting agenda - Oct. 6
   Drug free
   Pages 1, 10, 9.2
   Comp Time
Notes on PWC Meeting, September 15, 1989

1. Review of Drug Free Workplace information and suggestion that a form be developed that has signature for employee and contracting officer. Agreement supervisor should not have to sign attesting to fact that he/she had explained the policy to the employee. Pat & Fran will review again and propose a form to be signed.

(Later information: Alcohol is not considered a "controlled substance." The form that was distributed from Sam Ramirez is presently being used for classified and administrative staff.)

2. Review of Market Adjustment Distribution Guidelines. Agreement on a 10% cutting off point and on a few other editorial changes. The statement will be sent to the Executive Committee.

3. Dick Zolman reported on the use of generic drugs—approximately 25% of the drugs purchased through our plan. Total monthly drug costs are about $50,000.

4. Distribution of 3 revisions to the handbook, pages 1, 10, and 9.2

5. New items (from ASC discussion on September 7)
   Compensatory time—Ann and Norma will review for possible Handbook revision.

   Maternity Leave—agreement to leave our policy as it is.

   Family Insurance Coverage—Subcommittee will be examining, but changes may need to wait until such time as all employees have same benefit. For now, little chance of increasing the benefit.

   Minority hiring incentives—HS will contact Jill Carr about have an informational session for the Council.

6. Next Meeting—October 6, Chart Room
   AGENDA:
   Drug Free Workplace
   Revisions to pages 1, 10, and 9.2 in Handbook
   Compensatory Time
   Updates from subcommittees
   Additional new items
     Reciprocal Fee Waivers
     Sabbaticals
Proposed Distribution Guidelines for Market Adjustments
for Administrative Staff

The Administrative Staff Council realizes that the "market" for any employee is not an absolute figure, but represents a range within which a staff member would expect to find employment elsewhere and within which the University might expect to pay a replacement staff member should a vacancy occur. For the purposes of making market adjustments, we recommend that a figure of plus or minus ten percent of the average salary for comparable positions be considered as being within "market" salary for an individual.

It is the firm belief of the Administrative Staff Council that the University has an obligation to make sure that all of its Administrative Staff are being paid a wage that is within a "market range" commensurate with required education, skills, experience, and responsibilities.

The Administrative Staff Council recommends that the following criteria be used in determining which adjustments are made:

1. Market adjustments should be made only for those whose salaries fall more than ten percent below the average for comparable positions.

2. Of those who fall below market, highest priority should be given to those whose salary is the farthest percentage below market regardless of the actual dollar amount this represents.

3. Market adjustments should be available only to those who have been employed in their current University position for 3 years or more at the end of the current fiscal year.

4. Other criteria being equal, priority should be given to those who have served the University the longest in their current University position.

5. Market adjustment should be given in sufficient amount to assure that the staff member's resulting salary would at least be within market range, that is plus or minus five percent of an average of comparable positions. This adjustment might take more than one year.

* Market adjustments are not to be confused with changes in position or responsibility. Money for promotions and changes in responsibilities should be provided separate from the market adjustment criteria outlined here.

Approved by PWC 9/15/89
September 15, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jill Carr
Chair, Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Norma Stickler
Chair, Personnel Welfare Committee

At its September 15 meeting, the PWC took action on the Distribution Guidelines for Market Adjustments, and a copy of our proposal is attached. The proposal is basically the same as the one approved by the Executive Committee last year; namely, we recommend that a person should be determined to be ten percent off the average before a market adjustment is applied. We recognize, however, that it may take more than one adjustment to bring the person into line. Paragraph number 5 acknowledges this point and also notes that any adjustment should bring the person at least to within the five percent range.

In looking at the market adjustments made for 1989-90 salaries, we found that some "market adjustments" were made for amounts of less than one percent of the person's salary. While this may be a desirable adjustment, it is difficult to show that a person is less than one percent off average.

Also at its September 15 meeting, PWC discussed the issue of possible changes in our maternity policy with the intention of making our benefit more comparable to the classified staff. It was agreed by the committee that no changes be made to our policy, which allows four months off. It was felt that it would be too disruptive to the functioning of an area to have an administrative staff person gone for six months. The other point to be considered is that we have paternity/maternity leave, whereas classified staff receive only maternity leaves.

Another issue that we discussed arose from the comment made at the last ASC meeting regarding incentives for minority hiring. It was suggested that the Council may first need to be "educated" on a few points about minority hiring generally. How many Blacks and Hispanics do we have among the faculty and staff? What things have already been done by Annmarie's office to increase our advertising to minorities? Is there a higher or lower percentage of minority staff compared to faculty? What can we do to further increase minority composition of the staff? Perhaps Annmarie Heldt or Robb Cunningham could address the Council on these questions.

Please give me a call if you want any further background on these recommendations.

xc: PWC members
MEMORANDUM

TO: Jill Carr
Director, Housing

FROM: Robert L. Martin, CPE
Vice President for Operations

RE: Administrative Staff Handbook

September 19, 1989

Just a quick note to let you know we have not forgotten your request concerning revisions to the University's Administrative Employees Handbook.

As a result of the recommended consolidation of Personnel Offices, I have asked our staff to review the Administrative and Classified Staff Employees Handbooks. I firmly believe as we discussed earlier, that review of these handbooks is warranted to determine if some consolidation of handbook procedures can be accomplished and to further determine whether each contains administrative practices which are best covered through other forms of University policy rather than inclusion as handbook policy.

To attempt the above, I've asked Annmarie Heldt and our staff to work with you and the Administrative Staff Council to complete this review. It is our intention that we complete this procedure by the end of November and have the handbook ready for submittal to the Board of Trustees in the February meeting.

Thank you for your patience and intendant cooperation.

xc. A. Heldt
MEMORANDUM

TO: Tim Burns, Plant Operations and Maintenance
    Ann Bowers, Center for Archival Collections
    Josh Kaplan, Student Health Services
    Pat Koehler, WBGU-TV
    Deb McLaughlin, Publications
    Jane Schimpf, Food Operations
    Fran Voll, Athletics
    Dick Zolman, Computer Services

FROM: Norma J. Stickler
      Assistant to the Vice President
      for Academic Affairs

Ann Bowers and I have drafted the attached change to our Handbook policy on compensatory time. Please look it over and add as an action agenda item for our October 6 meeting.

attachment
Compensatory Time

Under normal circumstances, a full-time administrative staff member is expected to work a minimum of forty hours per week. There may be occasions, however, when it will be necessary to work beyond the forty hours in order to fulfill the contracted obligations. No compensatory time is earned for these occasional extra hours of service. When an administrative staff member's normal duties perpetually require work beyond the forty hour week, it is assumed that this situation will be taken into account in the employee's overall compensation AND THAT THE EMPLOYEE WILL BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY FOR A FLEXIBLE WORK SCHEDULE (See also Holiday Policy).
First Page

The policies in this Handbook apply to all administrative staff members who sign a "Contract for Administrative Staff Employment," INCLUDING THOSE WHO SIGN NINE- AND TEN-MONTH CONTRACTS.

Page 10 - Policy for Administrative Staff in Grant or Externally Funded Positions

(last paragraph) Grant/external funds must be set aside each year to cover salary and all benefits that have a direct financial impact on the University. Failure of the grant or external source to provide said funds could result in the termination of employment and/or the curtailment or elimination of certain benefits. ACCESS TO EXTERNAL FUNDS SHALL NOT BE USED AS A RATIONALE TO SET SALARY LEVELS OF EXTERNALLY FUNDED EMPLOYEES ABOVE THE REASONABLE LEVELS OF OTHER COMPARABLE POSITIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY NOR TO INCREASE SALARIES EXCESSIVELY BEYOND THE LEVELS OF EACH YEAR'S AVERAGE SALARY INCREASE FOR OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF.


MEMORANDUM

To: Annmarie Heldt, Acting Director, Personnel Services
Rob Cunningham, Acting Director, Affirmative Action

FROM: Jill Carr, Chair, Administrative Staff Council

DATE: September 29, 1989

REQUEST: Attached please find a request for information from the Personnel Welfare Committee of the Administrative Staff Council. The issue of increasing the number of minority faculty and staff arose at our last Council meeting. The Council is interested in assisting with the achievement of this goal as well as becoming more educated about the current status of minority administrative staff and what incentives can be used to hire additional minority staff.

Would you both review the paragraph in brackets and let me know if you can provide this information. I'd also like each of you to consider addressing the full Council on this issue later in the year. I'll contact you in November with further details.

Thank you in advance for your assistance. Please give me a call if you have any questions.

JC/jm

cc: Gregg DeCrane
    Greg Jordan
September 15, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jill Carr  
Chair, Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Norma Stickler  
Chair, Personnel Welfare Committee

At its September 15 meeting, the PWC took action on the Distribution Guidelines for Market Adjustments, and a copy of our proposal is attached. The proposal is basically the same as the one approved by the Executive Committee last year; namely, we recommend that a person should be determined to be ten percent off the average before a market adjustment is applied. We recognize, however, that it may take more than one adjustment to bring the person into line. Paragraph number 5 acknowledges this point and also notes that any adjustment should bring the person at least to within the five percent range.

In looking at the market adjustments made for 1989-90 salaries, we found that some "market adjustments" were made for amounts of less than one percent of the person's salary. While this may be a desirable adjustment, it is difficult to show that a person is less than one percent off average.

Also at its September 15 meeting, PWC discussed the issue of possible changes in our maternity policy with the intention of making our benefit more comparable to the classified staff. It was agreed by the committee that no changes be made to our policy, which allows four months off. It was felt that it would be too disruptive to the functioning of an area to have an administrative staff person gone for six months. The other point to be considered is that we have paternity/maternity leave, whereas classified staff receive only maternity leaves.

Another issue that we discussed arose from the comment made at the last ASC meeting regarding incentives for minority hiring. It was suggested that the Council may first need to be "educated" on a few points about minority hiring generally. How many Blacks and Hispanics do we have among the faculty and staff? What things have already been done by Annmarie's office to increase our advertising to minorities? Is there a higher or lower percentage of minority staff compared to faculty? What can we do to further increase minority composition of the staff? Perhaps Annmarie Heldt or Robb Cunningham could address the Council on these questions.

Please give me a call if you want any further background on these recommendations.

xc: PWC members
PWC AGENDA
October 6, 1989

1. Drug Free Workplace
   work w. A. Senate

OK 2. Revisions to pages 1, 10, 9.2 in Handbook

OK 3. Compensatory Time (page 40 in Handbook)

4. General question about format of the Handbook

5. Updates from subcommittees

6. New business
   Professional leaves/development
   Reciprocal fee waivers
1. A drug free workplace statement was reviewed. Contact has been made with Faculty Senate to coordinate our responses.

2. Review and approval of changes to the Handbook—to the introduction, the procedures for grant funded employees, evaluation procedures, and the compensatory time statement.

3. Updates from subcommittees on insurance and benefits and sick leave/vacation.

4. Review of letter from VP Martin regarding format of the Handbook. A response will be drafted at the next PWC meeting.

Next meeting:
October 20
BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY DRUG FREE WORKPLACE POLICY

It is the intent and obligation of Bowling Green State University to provide a drug-free work environment as mandated by the Drug Free Workplace Act of 1988. (Public Law 100-690).

This Act states that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensation, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the workplace.

Employees must, as a condition of employment, abide by the terms of the policy and report any conviction under a criminal drug statute for violations occurring on or off university premises while conducting university business. A report of the conviction must be made to the university within five (5) days after the conviction.

Violations of this policy will result in disciplinary actions as specified in the Administrative Staff Handbook.

I have read and understand the BGSU Drug Free Workplace Policy and as a condition of employment, agree to abide by the terms of BGSU's Drug Free Workplace Policy. I further agree to report any conviction under a criminal drug statute for any violation occurring on or off university premises while conducting university business within five (5) days of the conviction as mandated by the Drug Free Workplace Act of 1988.

I have been issued a copy of this statement.

_________________________   ______________________
Employee (typed)                  Date

_________________________
Employee's signature

_________________________   ______________________
Witness                  Date
MEMORANDUM

TO: Jill Carr
   Chair, Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Norma Stickler
       Chair, Personnel Welfare Committee

At its October 6 meeting, the Personnel Welfare Committee approved four revisions to the Administrative Staff Handbook, as attached.

The first is to be included on the introductory page to clarify that the Handbook is applicable to staff members such as the Residence Hall advisors who sign nine month contracts.

The second proposal relates to grant funded employees. They are presently covered by the policies of the Administrative Staff Handbook. This proposed revision is meant to clarify that their salary levels and increase recommendations also fall within the guidelines applicable to all administrative staff.

Revision number three is intended to provide a procedure for supervisors to follow when there is a performance related problem with an administrative staff member. In these cases, it is proposed that the supervisor is to meet with the staff member to identify the problem and to outline steps for improvement. If improvement is not satisfactory, the problem and corrective action are to be outlined in writing.

The fourth revision relates to compensatory time. The PWC endorses the first part of the present statement that says administrative staff members do not accumulate compensatory time when they occasionally work over a forty hour week. On the other hand, if the administrative staff members are frequently asked to work beyond forty hours, then there should be the opportunity for a flexible work schedule (and for a salary that reflects the additional hours). We do not feel that administrative staff should be getting "compensatory time" hour-for-hour for work beyond forty hours, but we do believe that some time off should be given in recognition of extra hours worked.

The PWC also discussed the Drug Free Workplace policy and procedure. We feel that all three employee groups should be operating on the same procedure, and contacts have been made with the Classified Staff and the Faculty Senate to coordinate our responses.

We briefly reviewed the format of the Administrative Staff Handbook, and at our next meeting we will be drafting a response to Vice President Martin's memorandum on that issue.
The policies in this Handbook apply to all administrative staff members who sign a "Contract for Administrative Staff Employment," INCLUDING THOSE WHO SIGN NINE- AND TEN-MONTH CONTRACTS.

Policy for Administrative Staff in Grant or Externally Funded Positions

(last paragraph) Grant/external funds must be set aside each year to cover salary and all benefits that have a direct financial impact on the University. Failure of the grant or external source to provide said funds could result in the termination of employment and/or the curtailment or elimination of certain benefits. ACCESS TO EXTERNAL FUNDS SHALL NOT BE USED AS A RATIONALE TO SET SALARY LEVELS OF EXTERNALLY FUNDED EMPLOYEES ABOVE THE REASONABLE LEVELS OF OTHER COMPARABLE POSITIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY NOR TO INCREASE SALARIES EXCESSIVELY BEYOND THE LEVELS OF EACH YEAR'S AVERAGE SALARY INCREASE FOR OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF.


Approved by Personnel Welfare Committee 10/6/89
Compensatory Time

Under normal circumstances, a full-time administrative staff member is expected to work a minimum of forty hours per week. There may be occasions, however, when it will be necessary to work beyond the forty hours in order to fulfill the contracted obligations. No compensatory time is earned for these occasional extra hours of service. When an administrative staff member's normal duties perpetually require work beyond the forty hour week, it is assumed that this situation will be taken into account in the employee's overall compensation AND THAT THE EMPLOYEE WILL BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY FOR A FLEXIBLE WORK SCHEDULE (See also Holiday Policy).
TO: Robert Martin

The Personnel Welfare Committee and the Executive Committee of the Administrative Staff Council have given consideration to your suggestions regarding the Administrative Staff Handbook and the Classified Staff Handbooks. We have the following responses/recommendations.

1. The Handbooks for classified and administrative staff should remain as separate documents. We are firmly opposed to combining the handbooks for the administrative staff and classified staff.

2. After examining the Administrative Staff Handbook, we do not find any portions that we feel should be deleted.

3. There are several policies/procedural statements in the Administrative Staff Handbook that could (should) be contained in the handbooks of all three constituent groups and should be identical in all three:

   Fee Waiver Policy  
   Sexual Harassment Policy  
   Racial and Ethnic Harassment Policy  
   Role and Mission Statement  
   Employee Solicitation Policy  
   Key Replacement Policy  
   Jury Duty  
   Parking Regulations  
   Severe Weather Policy  
   Statement on Affirmative Action Policy  
   Use of Computer Facilities  
   Nepotism
While it could be argued that because there are these several policies in common to all employee groups, they should be placed in a separate policy book, these policies are a part of the contract between the employee and the University and as such should be contained in the Handbooks, which are referenced in the contract signed by the faculty and administrative staff. Each classified staff member, likewise, signs for receipt of the classified staff handbook.

4. Over the past two years the Administrative Staff Council has approved several changes to the Administrative Staff Handbook. We have yet to be informed whether these changes have been accepted, and we have had no new handbook during that time period. Before a decision is made to change the format of our handbook, we would like to have in hand the revised handbook with its changes in policy and format as approved by the Council.

5. There is insufficient time before the end of November to make significant changes to the handbook and have them approved by the Council. In addition, because the Personnel Office is in a state of transition and has no permanent director, it does not seem to be an opportune time to be making significant changes to the handbooks. We recommend waiting until the new director is appointed.

6. We have been advised previously that we should submit our handbook changes only once a year. It is our recommendation, however, that any substantive change to the administrative staff handbook be forwarded to the administration as soon as it is approved by the Administrative Staff Council. Therefore, if there are questions, they can be resolved in time for the annual presentation of the handbook to the Trustees.

We would be pleased to discuss these recommendations with you if you have questions or concerns.
Market Adjustments in Salaries

In situations where the salary of an Administrative Staff member is not competitive with other comparable positions, a market adjustment in salary can be requested. Administrative Staff members shall seek the guidance of Administrative Staff Personnel Services when gathering materials to support a request for a market adjustment in salary. Requests for market adjustments in salary are independent of the merit evaluation process and can be initiated by the Administrative Staff member. These requests shall be in writing and shall include a survey of salaries of comparable positions, comments from Administrative Staff Personnel Services, and other relevant supportive documentation.

The process for requesting a market adjustment in salary shall begin/with include a meeting of the Administrative Staff member, the staff member's immediate supervisor and the budget administrator for the staff member's area. Following this meeting, the request for a market adjustment in salary shall be submitted, by the Administrative Staff member, to his/her contracting officer or designate for review.

Approved by the Administrative Staff Council June 1, 1989
Revised by Executive Committee September 12, 1989
Ned to feature
- reviewed last year's system
- talked at tech show
- discussed agenda

Working with Tim King and some from Able
- what portions will be used

Also doing at procedure of having King read - as full narrative

Have tech read adjustments, then notify thingamajig
50 portions - what level of coverage those portions at.

Non-screening
- Jill in Bande
- Hollywood Sioux
MEMORANDUM

TO: Jill Carr, Chair
Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Norma J. Stickler, Chair
Personnel Welfare Committee

October 20, 1989

I am enclosing two items from today's meeting of PWC. The first is a re-write of the statement on externally funded employees. I think this version will be more neutral but will accomplish what we intended.

We also recommend that the Handbook policy entitled "Property Disposal" be changed to "Property Use/Property Disposal."

In comparing the Classified Staff and Administrative Staff Handbooks, we noted that our handbook does not contain a reference to discounts for non-credit continuing education courses. The discounts do apply to all full-time employee groups at the University. If appropriate for inclusion in the handbook, the reference should apply to all three employee groups.

The second item is a draft memorandum to VP Martin in response to his memorandum to you of September 19, 1989 requesting changes to the Administrative Staff Handbook. We reviewed the entire Handbook and are agreed that there are no sections we wish to remove. There are, of course, some parts of the Handbook that are not policy (references to our Council, the Ferrari Award, parking, keys, etc.), but these are very important points of information for all administrative staff. It makes more sense to have them included in our Handbook than in some second document that would also have to be copied and distributed.

I meant to report to you also that at an earlier meeting of PWC we discussed the Drug Free Workplace statement. We have drafted a statement for all administrative staff employees to sign. This statement is very similar to the one now being used by the Personnel Office. We thought, however, that all three employee groups should have the same statement, so I have contacted Ann-Marie Lancaster who will have their committee work with our representatives Pat Koehler and/or Fran Voll. I expect that it may be a few months before Faculty Senate's committee gets organized and ready to make a recommendation.

enclosures
TO: Robert Martin

The Personnel Welfare Committee and the Executive Committee of the Administrative Staff Council have given consideration to your suggestions regarding the Administrative Staff Handbook and the Classified Staff Handbook. We have the following responses/recommendations.

1. The Handbooks for classified and administrative staff should remain as separate documents. We are firmly opposed to combining the handbooks for the administrative staff and classified staff.

2. After examining the Administrative Staff Handbook, we do not find any portions that we feel should be deleted.

3. There are several policies/procedural statements in the Administrative Staff Handbook that could (should) be contained in the handbooks of all three constituent groups and should be identical in all three:
   - Fee Waiver Policy
   - Sexual Harassment Policy
   - Racial and Ethnic Harassment Policy
   - Role and Mission Statement
   - Employee Solicitation Policy
   - Key Replacement Policy
Jury Duty
Military leave
Smoking policy
Injury/workmen's compensation
Parking Regulations
Severe Weather Policy
Statement on Affirmative Action Policy
Use of Computer Facilities
Nepotism
Ohio Ethics Law
Discounts for Continuing Education Courses

While it could be argued that because there are these several policies in common to all employee groups, they should be placed in a separate policy book, these policies are a part of the contract between the employee and the University and as such should be contained in the Handbooks, which are referenced in the contract signed by the faculty and administrative staff. Each classified staff member, likewise, signs for receipt of the classified staff handbook.

4. The following policy statements apply to Administrative Staff and Classified Staff and could be the same in both books:

Voting
Holidays
Transfer of Employees between classified and administrative staff
5. Over the past two years the Administrative Staff Council has approved several changes to the Administrative Staff Handbook. We have not yet been informed about whether these changes have been accepted, and we have had no new handbook during that time period. Before any decision is made to change the format of our handbook, we would like to have in hand the revised handbook with its changes in policy and format as approved by the Council.

6. There is insufficient time before the end of November to make major changes to the handbook and have them approved by the Council. In addition, because the Personnel Office is in a state of transition and has no permanent director, it does not seem to be an appropriate time to make major changes to the handbooks. If changes of that nature are to be undertaken with all handbooks, we recommend waiting until the new director of personnel is appointed.

7. We have been advised previously that we should submit our handbook changes only once a year. It is our recommendation, however, that in the interests of efficiency, any substantive changes to the administrative staff handbook be forwarded to the administration as soon as they are approved by the Administrative Staff Council. Then if there are questions or if legal counsel needs to be sought, there will be time for resolution in time for the annual presentation of the handbook to the Trustees.

We would be pleased to discuss these recommendations with you if you have questions or concerns.
Page 10 - Policy for Administrative Staff in Grant or Externally Funded Positions

(last paragraph) Grant/external funds must be set aside each year to cover salary and all benefits that have a direct financial impact on the University. Failure of the grant or external source to provide said funds could result in the termination of employment and/or the curtailment or elimination of certain benefits. THE DETERMINATION OF APPROPRIATE SALARY LEVELS AND ANNUAL SALARY INCREASES FOR GRANT FUNDED ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF EMPLOYEES IS BASED ON THE SAME PROCEDURES, GUIDELINES, AND MARKET CONSIDERATIONS AS FOR OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF EMPLOYEES.

Page 44--Property Disposal
Change the title to PROPERTY USE/Property Disposal

Add to the Handbook a statement about continuing education courses

FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES ARE ELIGIBLE FOR A 20% DISCOUNT ON REGISTRATION FOR DISCOUNT-ELIGIBLE NON-CREDIT COURSES AND CONFERENCES OFFERED THROUGH THE OFFICE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION.

Approved by PWC 10/20/89
The policies in this Handbook apply to all administrative staff members who sign a "Contract for Administrative Staff Employment," INCLUDING THOSE WHO SIGN NINE- AND TEN-MONTH CONTRACTS.


Compensatory Time

Under normal circumstances, a full-time administrative staff member is expected to work a minimum of forty hours per week. There may be occasions, however, when it will be necessary to work beyond the forty hours in order to fulfill the contracted obligations. No compensatory time is earned for these occasional extra hours of service. When an administrative staff member's normal duties perpetually require work beyond the forty hour week, it is assumed that this situation will be taken into account in the employee's overall compensation AND THAT THE EMPLOYEE WILL BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY FOR A VARIABLE WORK SCHEDULE (See also Holiday Policy).

Approved by Personnel Welfare Committee 10/6/89
Approved by Executive Committee 10/10/89
AGENDA

1. Review and approval of minutes for meeting of October 25.
2. Consideration of contract for Third Party Administrator.
3. Coordination of inputs regarding Third Party Administrator.
4. Letter to faculty and staff regarding:
   a. Escalating costs
   b. Need for cost containment
   c. Availability of appeals process
5. Consideration of other potential agenda items.
**INSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**COLLEGE PARK OFFICE BUILDING - CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**OCTOBER 25, 1989**  
**3:00 - 4:30 P.M.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**  
Darwin Close  
Gaylyn Finn  
Mark Hafner  
Annmarie Heldt  
Park Leathers  
James Morris  
Dave Mears  
Genevieve Stang  
Richard Zolman

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**  
John Erion  
Janet Welch

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 by Chair Leathers. Each member introduced themselves and the department or area they were from. The minutes of the last meeting held April 3, 1989 were approved as written on a recommendation made by Heldt, seconded by Finn.

The election of a chair for the 1989-90 academic year was then held. Finn nominated Leathers, seconded by Heldt, and as there were no other nominations made, Leathers accepted the nomination to serve as Chair for the 1990-91 year.

Leathers then asked for reports from Morris and Finn regarding matters of importance to the committee members. Morris gave each member a copy of a detailed analysis of the Employee Benefits Survey conducted during the Spring 1989 Semester. He noted that 40% of those responding indicated they did not understand their benefits very well and consequently the Benefits/Insurance Office conducted ten (10) benefit seminars to inform individuals of their benefits, claims procedures and an explanation of the benefit worksheet that is received when benefit payments are made. Information concerning the University Appeals Committee was also given by Dr. Robert Goodwin, Chair of that committee. The seminars were not attended by a large number of employees, but Morris hopes to hold more seminars in the future to further increase awareness of benefits. Morris also noted that 50% of the respondents indicated they had used their medical, dental or vision benefits. Approximately one-half of the respondents were not satisfied with the claims service by the Third Party Administrator, noting inaccuracy of claim payments and discourtesy of claims processors. An overwhelming majority of responses were satisfied with the service of the University’s Benefit/Insurance Office. Other comments made included the need for preventative care and the extension of dental and vision benefits to dependents of Faculty and Administrative Staff members. A discussion ensued regarding the various questions/comments on the survey. Morris noted that he hopes to continue the benefits seminars in the future for employees and dependents to better help them understand their benefits.
Morris advised the members that a request for proposal has been prepared to ascertain whether there are other Third Party Administrators that would be interested in administering the University Health Care Plan. There are positive and negative implications involved in changing Administrators and adequate information must be provided to all parties involved before such a change is made. Finn noted that the cost increases that the University has been experiencing is not unknown to other universities. Universities with fully-insured plans have experienced significant rate increases also.

Stang asked if the University has experienced an increase in certain types of claims that warrant the large increase in costs. Finn and Morris noted that they could not really tell from the data available if certain types of charges have affected the claims experience. Morris stated that he would like to have the employees and dependents become more involved in their health care and become better informed consumers of medical services and supplies.

A question was raised as to why the University doesn't administer its own claims, rather than having a Third Party Administrator involved. Morris noted that you need to have that "insulation" between the University and the employee as to claims adjudication. If the University administered its own claims, it could be perceived as a way in which benefit payments could be cut to save money.

Stang mentioned that she had a complaint from a colleague concerning claim payment denial. Finn stated that he preferred to have claims questioned by the TPA if they are questionable in nature and ask the employee/dependent to obtain information to substantiate the claim. If these claims were paid without question, it would deplete the monies available for health care and funds would have to be taken from other areas (such as salaries) to cover the deficits. Morris stated that the individual should contact the Benefits Office regarding claims which are denied for possible review. In some cases, inadequate information is provided by the doctor or hospital regarding the type of test, diagnosis, etc., in order for the claim to be processed. When that additional information is provided, the claim can be reconsidered for benefit payment.

Morris noted that the University Appeals Committee had reviewed a total of 4 claims. Two denials were overridden by the Committee and the benefits were paid, the other two denials were upheld by the Committee. Morris noted that there was another appeal ready to go to the Committee for review.

Morris informed the members of a letter he received from Administrative Service Consultants requesting the University to indicate whether it wished to retain the second surgical opinion requirement. They are asking their clients to indicate one of the following:
1) They want to retain the mandatory second opinion requirement!

2) They want to drop the mandatory second opinion requirement

3) They want to make the second opinion requirement optional to the employee with no penalties imposed

This letter was sent to all ASC clients as it has been determined that second opinion by itself without other cost containment measures is not a cost effective measure.

Both Finn and Morris noted that the University needs to develop a viable health care plan that meets the needs of the employee as well as the University's financial needs. This needs to be done within a reasonable length of time and feels that the Insurance Committee should make this a project for the 1987-88 year.

Morris noted that he and Finn were scheduled to have a meeting with Dr. Chris Dalton and Robert Martin concerning the matter of changing Third Party Administrators and obtain a decision as to whether the University wants to request proposals from other Third Party Administrators. Finn stated he would like to have the decision be a management one but have enough constituency involvement to make it a smooth transaction.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

The next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Thursday, November 9 at 3:00 p.m. in the College Park Office Building Conference Room.

Respectfully,

Diana J. Shamp
Secretary

XC: Robert Martin, Vice President for Operations
Chris Dalton, Vice President Planning and Budgeting
Jill Carr, Chair of Administrative Staff Council
Joyce Hyslop, Chair of Classified Staff
Annmarie Lancaster, Chair of Faculty Senate
Notes on PWC Meeting of December 1, 1989

Present: Ann Bowers, Josh Kaplan, Dick Zolman, Deb McLaughlin, Tim Burns, Norma Stickler

1. Pat Koehler has agreed to represent the Administrative Staff on the Drug Free Workplace committee now being established by the Faculty Senate.

2. Section 125 Plan
Josh gave a summary of the Section 125 Plan as described by Gaylyn Finn at a recent Executive Committee meeting and in later conversations. The plan allows employees to make a yearly determination that they wish a stipulated amount of salary set aside in a pre-tax fund which can then be used during the year to pay health insurance premiums, deductibles, or other costs not covered by the University insurance. The amount can change from one year to the next, but not within the year. If the money is not used by the end of the year, it will revert to a general fund to cover administrative costs. One of these administrative costs results from the fact that if employees leave the University before they have contributed the full year's amount, they can still claim the full amount that they would have contributed. The plan can be established on a fiscal year basis, so the foregoing disadvantage would be minimized. The University could opt to set up such a plan strictly for the purpose of paying the family health coverage. If adopted, the plan would be optional for employees, not required. The University could place a cap on the amount of money that an employee set aside each year and could place a minimum amount on the claims that would be processed.

It was the consensus of PWC that Administrative Staff Council should proceed to request participation in the plan. Norma will check some questions with Gaylyn Finn. (Note responses below.) Dick will bring it up at next week's Insurance Committee meeting to see what the reaction is from the other constituent groups.

Could ASC move ahead without the other two constituent groups?
Yes, we could make a recommendation at any time.

Can an administrative fee be built into the amount deducted?
Gaylyn is not sure that this would be possible.

Can the University define its year as fiscal year or academic year or both?
We can do either fiscal or academic year. It would be too administratively cumbersome to have two years in operation. It would probably be best to use a fiscal year.

If an employee is hired after the beginning of the year, can they sign up on a prorated basis?
Yes.
3. **Miscellaneous**

Closing between Christmas and New Year's: Norma will check with Annmarie Heldt about the feasibility of closing the University. In the past, the problem has been that some classified staff had to work during that time, so the question is whether paying them overtime would be offset by the savings in utilities, etc.

PERS contributions for 9- and 10-month employees. Can the paychecks of these employees be spread over 12 months in order to afford them full-time PERS contribution benefits?

According to Annmarie Heldt, the University is now in compliance with the law which stipulates that in order to receive PERS credit, the employee must earn at least $250 in a month. They will receive PERS credit only for those months. Previously, the University gave 12 months of credit to the PERS members who had their checks spread over 12 months even though they worked only 9 or 10. That practice was halted in 1987 as it was not in compliance with the State PERS regulations. New part-time employees are now informed of the method by which PERS credit is calculated.
After Gaylyn Finn summarized the Section 125 Plan for the ASC Executive Committee, it seemed that there were enough administrative drawbacks to the system that it was probably not worth pursuing. Subsequently, information obtained from Gaylyn has shed a new perspective on the issue, and it is the recommendation of the Personnel Welfare Committee that ASC proceed to request that the University initiate a Section 125 Plan for the Administrative Staff, effective July 1, 1990.

The new information affirms that we can establish the plan on a fiscal year basis, thus avoiding the costs associated with employees who resign before their year's contributions have been made.

I have asked Gaylyn Finn and Jim Norris to send me additional information on the Plan.
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2. **Section 125 Plan**
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According to Annmarie Heldt, the University is now in compliance with the law which stipulates that in order to receive PERS credit, the employee must earn at least $250 in a month. They will receive PERS credit only for those months. Previously, the University gave 12 months of credit to the PERS members who had their checks spread over 12 months even though they worked only 9 or 10. That practice was halted in 1987 as it was not in compliance with the State PERS regulations. New part-time employees are now informed of the method by which PERS credit is calculated.
detail including the correct name, Social Security number, date of birth, and names of members of the immediate family and parents, and their dates of birth.

CONTRIBUTIONS

EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS

As a member of PEPS you are required to make contributions to the System through payroll deductions. The current contribution rate is 8.5% of earnable salary. Members in the law enforcement division pay 9.5%. These contributions are credited to your savings account. A statement of savings of your account as of the previous December 31 is mailed to you during the first quarter of each year.

Federal tax law makes it possible for your employer to pay (pick-up) employee contributions to PEPS. This enables employers to designate employee contributions picked-up by the employer as an employer contribution. (Refer to Tax Liability in the PERS section of this handbook, page 27, for more information.)

EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS

Employers are required to make contributions to the System on the basis of a percentage of reportable payroll. Penalties and interest are added for late payments. The contribution rate for state employers is 13.71%; for local employers, 13.65%; and for employees in the law enforcement division, 13.10%.

EARNABLE SALARY

Under Ohio law contributions are made on an employee’s “earnable salary.” Not all compensation to a member is considered earnable salary. The following are examples of what compensation may be included or excluded for purposes of contributions to the Retirement System.

Earnable salary includes amounts such as salary, wages, pay for sick or vacation leave used or converted in the year earned, pay for overtime worked or converted in the year earned, or longevity supplements.

Earnable salary does not include employer-paid amounts for insurance, reimbursement for job-related expenses, leave or overtime hours earned previously but converted in the current year, amounts paid as part of an agreement to retire, or incidental benefits such as cars.

SERVICE CREDIT

A member's service credit after Jan. 1, 1935 is based on all service for which contributions to PEPS were taken from earnings. Service credit is calculated on a calendar year basis, January 1 through December 31. You cannot receive more than one year of service credit for any calendar year even though employed concurrently on more than one public job. Neither can you receive a full year of service credit if length of employment or earnings per month indicate less than full-time service. Earnings of $150 or more per month are counted as full-time employment through Dec. 31, 1984. Earnings of $250 or more per month produce full-time credit beginning Jan. 1, 1985.

In addition to contributing service credit, you may obtain credit for other types of service as described below. You should contact PERS for the proper forms needed to obtain this credit.

FREE SERVICE CREDIT

Military Service—Up to 10 years of free service credit may be granted a member who, after at least one year of PEPS contributing service, left public employment for active duty in the armed forces and returned to a position covered by PEPS, the State Teachers Retirement System (STRS), or the School Employees Retirement System (SEPS) within two years after discharge. A member must establish one year of service credit upon returning to public employment and must furnish a copy of the discharge or separation notice from the armed forces.

Workers' Compensation—Members may be eligible to claim service credit for a period of up to three years, during which they were off the payroll because of an injury for which a weekly award through Workers' Compensation was received. A member's claim number and a record from the Bureau of Workers' Compensation of this time must be submitted as proof.

Prior Service—Service credit may be granted to members who were employed in public service in Ohio prior to Jan. 1, 1935. Service must be documented on the basis of existing payroll records, or, in their absence, a statement from the department that no records exist, plus the sworn affidavits of three persons having a personal knowledge of the employment before 1935.

PURCHASED SERVICE CREDIT

Military Service—A member may purchase up to five years of military service (which may include Red Cross service in a combat zone) or an amount equal to accumulated Ohio service credit, whichever is less, if that military service credit is not used for other retirement pay except Social Security. Payment must be made at the contribution rate in effect at
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The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair Leathers. The minutes of the October 25th meeting were approved as corrected by Stang. Heldt made a motion, seconded by Finn, to approve the corrected minutes.

Morris handed out draft copies of the request for proposal. This request for proposal deals with the University's health care plan and the possible replacement of the current Third Party Administrator for the plan. Morris noted that Vice Presidents Martin and Dalton were to send copies of the request for proposals to chairs of the three constituent groups for their review. Morris stated that input from the groups should be channeled thru members of the Insurance Committee or himself.

Stang raised a question regarding what information the University hoped to gain from the request for proposals. Morris stated that information received in the proposals would be used to evaluate the services of the bidder. The information in the request for proposal also provides the bidders with data regarding the University, such as experience trends in prior years, benefit plan design.

Morris stated that he feels the University should obtain professional expertise in evaluating the proposals received. He noted that Findley-Davies of Toledo had submitted a quote for professional assistance, following a conversation with Finn and himself. Morris gave Committee members a copy of the correspondence received from Findley-Davies, who had done similar work for HCO and University of Toledo. Finn noted that the University will send request for proposals to those organizations who have contacted the University, as well as organizations recommended by the consultant or University attorneys. Morris stated he had hoped to get the bids out in the middle of January.

Morris stated that any answers to questions received from bidders would be done in writing and sent to all interested parties. He suggested a 30-45 day period for proposals to be received from the bidders. The proposals would then be reviewed by the appropriate parties, as well as the consultants and a final recommendation given to Vice Presidents Dalton and Martin.
Morris hopes to have this done within a reasonable time frame so that there is sufficient time to allow for a smooth transition.

Finn noted that a change in Third Party Administrator could result in higher costs to the University. Stang asked how the higher cost would fit into the University's budget process. Finn stated the University is trying to build a "pool" of funds that would help absorb an increase in the administration expenses. A new third party administrator should be able to adjudicate claims better, resulting in a savings that could offset any increase in actual costs. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding this issue.

The next item of business discussed was the letter received from Findlay-Davies and whether the University wanted to retain their services. Morris stated there are many consulting firms available, but since they had provided similar types of services for MCO and UT on their health care plans, they are familiar with University programs. Stang asked about Findlay-Davies credentials and Finn and Heldt agreed they had had favorable experience with representatives of the firm. It was the consensus of the committee to retain Findlay-Davies as the consultants in connection with the evaluation of proposals.

Leathers asked members to submit a schedule for Spring Semester so a meeting time can be established.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana J. Shamp
Secretary

djs

XC: Robert Martin, Vice President for Operations
Chris Dalton, Vice President Planning and Budgeting
Jill Carr, Chair of Administrative Staff Council
Ann Marie Lancaster, Chair of Faculty Senate
Joyce Hyslop, Chair of Classified Staff Council
December 7, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: Personnel Welfare Committee

FROM: Norma J. Stickler
       Assistant to the Vice President
       for Academic Affairs

Please review the attached information on Section 125 Plans. Note that Section 125 also governs cafeteria style benefit plans as well as the flexible spending account that we have been discussing.

PWC will not meet December 15, but we will have a meeting on January 5 at 9:00 a.m. to discuss these materials and the substance of a recommendation on Section 125.

Also enclosed is information from Vice President Martin on health benefits.

Happy Holidays!

wv
attachments

xc: Jill Carr
Annmarie Heldt
January 8, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jill Carr
   Chair, Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Norma Stickle
       Chair, ASC Personnel Welfare Committee

RE: Request for Proposal for Third-Party Insurance Administrator

The Personnel Welfare Committee has reviewed the request for proposal for a third-party administrator. We have two major overall concerns and some editorial suggestions.

The Committee's primary concern is that this process be expedited and be moved along as quickly as possible. We urge that Gaylyn Finn, James Morris, and Robert Martin be encouraged to proceed without additional formal approval from the various constituent groups. This opportunity to review the RFP was very much appreciated, but since the basic insurance coverage is not affected, the process should now proceed.

The second major issue is that potential vendors should be asked to elaborate on the experience they have with core plans, modular plans, and cafeteria plans. There is already inclusion of provision for a flexible spending account, but we would like some idea of how many of the more complex programs could be handled.

Several editorial suggestions follow:

Page 1, #5, eliminate the portion in parenthesis. We must have aggregate coverage; the "and/or" gives the option of not having it.

Page 6, here and elsewhere in the document some terms need to be defined and used consistently, i.e., "Classified Staff," "Unclassified Staff," "Administrative Staff," "Faculty."

Page 8, #3, should the number of employees in each group be defined, or make a reference to the last page of the document where the numbers are given? Again, there is no consistency in definitions.
January 30, 1990

TO: Members of the Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Norma Stickler, Chair
ASC Personnel Welfare Committee

The Personnel Welfare Committee (Tim Burns, Ann Bowers, Josh Kaplan, Pat Koehler, Deb McLaughlin, Jane Schimpf, Norma Stickler, Fran Voll, and Dick Zolman) presents the attached recommendation to establish a Flexible Spending Account for the Administrative Staff. We ask that you study the enclosures and confer with your network colleagues about this program.

Please call any member of the Personnel Welfare Committee if you have questions.
Proposal for Section 125 Plan for Administrative Staff

The Administrative Staff Council is aware of the increasing costs of health care and the impact such costs have on the University's educational and auxiliary budgets. We are aware that this is a difficult time to seek additional benefits; however, we are also very concerned that the University does not provide family health care to the administrative staff. Administrative Staff members must purchase their own family health care coverage. Family dental and vision coverage is not provided, nor can it even be purchased.

As one effort to support creative ways to achieve cost containment and to provide some benefit to the Administrative Staff, the Administrative Staff Council recommends that, effective July 1, 1990, the University allow members of the Administrative Staff to participate in a Flexible Spending Account (FSA) as provided for by Section 125 of the Internal Revenue Code. At this time, the ASC requests that members of the Administrative Staff be allowed to use the FSA for the purposes of paying dependent health insurance premiums, life insurance premiums, and child care costs to the maximum provided for by IRS regulations (currently $5250 per year). This recommendation takes no University resources except for the administration of the program, and the general mechanism to deduct tax deferred dollars from employees' payroll is already in place.

It is recommended that the plan be administered on a fiscal year basis, that it be available to employees immediately upon employment, that claims be honored 60 days past the end of the claim year, and that any unclaimed funds revert to a reserve to fund the University's overall health care plan.

It is further recommended that in the next year consideration be given to expansion of the program first to allow use of the FSA for other health costs such as deductibles and copayments. Secondly, the University should consider future expansion to include a modular/core or cafeteria style benefits plan. A critical part of expanding the plan into the above areas is communication. Section 125 Plans will be new to the University, and their complexity will require extensive education and communication.

ASC recommends this step-by-step process in order that administrative costs be eased in. Inclusion of health care costs in the FSA will involve additional administrative costs, and starting with the simpler version of the FSA will provide the graduated experience necessary to implement a more complete program.

In supporting this recommendation, the ASC believes that providing a Flexible Spending Account option will be a tax advantage for employees in a time when we have received no other additional benefits. It will provide some small incentive in recruitment and
retention and responds to the needs of groups of employees disadvantaged by the current plan, i.e., those paying their own family coverage. Unexpended dollars are to revert to the general insurance reserve, an advantage to all members of the University. Organizations that have instituted Section 125 Plans report that employees become more aware of their benefits package and use their benefits more wisely.

The Administrative Staff Council wishes to emphasize that this recommendation should not be interpreted as a substitute for improved University-provided benefits. We remain concerned that family health care is not provided to all employees of the University.

approved by PWC 1/26/90
approved by Executive Committee 1/30/90
Summary of Flexible Spending Account Provision

Section 125 of the Internal Revenue Code allows employers to establish a "spending account" for each employee. Into this account each employee may place a specified amount of his or her salary that will then be used for pre-determined purposes as acceptable under the IRS guidelines. The amount placed into the account is pre-tax income and as such is not reported to the IRS as income, although it is reported as salary income to the Public Employees Retirement System. Each year the employee establishes the amount of salary that will be placed into this pre-tax account and the amount that will be used for each primary purpose such as child care, insurance premiums, health care costs not covered by the employer's insurance. The account can then only be used for those purposes, and funds cannot be shifted from one category to another, e.g., between child care and insurance premiums. It is critical that at the beginning of the year, the employee be as accurate as possible in estimating the amount to be placed into each category and into the total fund, as ANY MONEY NOT USED BY THE END OF THE YEAR CANNOT BE CLAIMED BY THE EMPLOYEE.
December 7, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: Norma Stickler
   Assistant to Vice President of
   Academic Affairs

FROM: Gaylyn J. Finn
   Treasurer and Assistant
   Vice President for Planning and Budgeting

RE: Flexible Benefits Overview

Subsequent to our conversation in which you requested a summarization of
the issues surrounding Section 125 and similar flexible benefits, I
received from Scott Hamner of Findley, Davies and Company what appears to
be a comprehensive summary of flexible benefits. Hopefully, the attached
copy will be of benefit when the Administrative Staff Council Welfare
Committee considers the benefit changes, which may be requested for the
1990-91 fiscal year. As you will note, in addition to the positives of
the programs, the drawbacks and cost considerations are also addressed.
If you have any questions after reviewing the attached material, please
feel free to give me a call.

GJF:msb/GF202

Attachment

cc: Jim Morris
FLEXIBLE BENEFITS OVERVIEW
FOR
BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
# FLEXIBLE BENEFITS OVERVIEW

## General Description

### Introduction

This General Description uses a simple question and answer format to introduce you to the concepts of a flexible benefits plan. These questions are the most common ones asked by employers considering flexible benefits for the first time.

### What is a flexible benefits plan?

A flexible benefits plan (sometimes referred to as a Section 125 plan or cafeteria plan) is a benefit program which permits employees to select among different non-taxable benefits (i.e., health care, group term life insurance, dependent care, and cash), or to take cash in lieu of those benefits offered. The basic premise is that the employee may elect increased compensation and give up certain non-taxable benefits, or may elect reduced compensation but receive additional non-taxable benefits. Such a program is established under Internal Revenue Code (IRC) Section 125. In general, Section 125 states that the mere fact that the employee could take cash, which is a taxable benefit, rather than a non-taxable benefit, will not "taint" the non-taxable benefit and make it taxable.

### Why would my company want to establish a flexible benefits plan?

There are several major reasons why companies consider flexible benefits plans:

1. Many companies implement flexible benefits plans in an attempt to meet the evolving needs of their changing work forces. These work force changes include the increased number of working women, employees with working spouses, and working single parents. A flexible benefits plan can assist the employer in meeting the diversity of that work force and the diversity which results from employees of different ages and different personal interests.
2. Cost containment is also a major reason. Many employers begin to think about flexible benefits plans when they analyze their ever increasing health care or medical benefit plan cost. A flexible benefits plan can help hold the line on benefit dollars spent by the employer.

3. A flexible benefits plan can ease the pressure for additional benefits. Under a flexible benefits plan an employee can tailor the benefits to his or her individual needs. The choice provided to employees can make employees more appreciative of their compensation package.

4. All employers want to deliver benefits on a tax efficient and low cost basis. Because of the tax savings which result to the employees by giving up taxable compensation for non-taxable benefits, the employee saves tax dollars and, in effect, the government "subsidizes" a portion of the employee's benefit. The government subsidy (i.e., tax savings) can make cost shifting to employees more palatable. Further, the employer saves Social Security taxes on the amount of any non-taxable benefits provided to employees in lieu of taxable compensation.

Other reasons to consider a flexible benefits plan are:

1. The program may help distinguish non-union employees from union employees.

2. It can also aid in recruitment as prospective employees may appreciate the flexibility that it offers in tailoring benefits to their own needs and the sponsoring company may be perceived as being more flexible, concerned with its employees, and forward-thinking.

3. It can aid relations with current employees and the community because of the flexibility and progressiveness that it projects.
What is a simple form of a flexible benefits plan?

Premium Conversion

The simplest form of a flexible benefits plan is a “premium conversion plan”. Many employer plans provide for an employee contribution for health care coverage. This contribution can be paid for by the employee on a pre-tax basis under a flexible benefits plan. The employee agrees to a salary reduction in the amount of the required contribution in exchange for receiving health care benefits. This is a tax effective method of delivering health care as the employee does not pay taxes on the compensation which he uses to pay for the health care benefits. The employee’s contribution reduces his taxable compensation subject to federal income taxes and Social Security taxes (and generally state income taxes). There is essentially no cost to the employer from this method as there are no additional dollars required of the employer to provide the benefit; it is merely the employee’s costs which are affected due to the tax savings.

Spending Accounts

A form of flexible benefits which is only slightly more complex is a spending account program. These programs go by many names, such as reimbursement account plans, spending account plans, or flexible spending account plans. They are all the same. The reimbursement account concept results in certain employee expenses which would otherwise be paid with employee after-tax dollars being paid with employee pre-tax dollars.

Basically, there are two major categories of benefits which are paid for by the employees on a salary reduction pre-tax basis: A Health Care Reimbursement Account and a Dependent Care Reimbursement Account.

A health care reimbursement account enables the employee to set aside pre-tax dollars to pay for qualifying medical expenses (i.e., health care or medical expenses which otherwise could potentially be deducted on the employee’s income tax return). The employee agrees to the salary reduction in exchange for the employer agreeing to reimburse the employee for those qualifying health care expenses. The amount which is set aside is elected by the employee, although the employer generally establishes minimums and maximums. The employer’s reimbursement obligation is limited to the maximum amount which the
employee has elected to set aside. These employee contributions reduce the employee's taxable income; consequently, the employee's federal income tax liability and generally state income tax liability is reduced. Social security taxes are reduced if the reduction brings the employee's social security income below the wage base ($48,000 in 1989).

Typical items reimbursed from a health care reimbursement account are uninsured medical expenses such as deductibles, co-payment amounts, vision care, prescription drugs, etc. Because most employees are not able to deduct their medical expenses, the flexible benefits plan's reimbursement account can effectively permit employees to "deduct" their qualifying medical expenses.

The dependent care reimbursement account works essentially the same way as the health care reimbursement account. The employee agrees to a salary reduction in exchange for tax-free reimbursement of qualifying dependent care expenses. As with the health care reimbursement account, the employee's dependent care contributions reduce the employee's taxable income.

Qualifying dependent care expenses are those child care expenses which enable the employee and the employee's spouse, if any, to work. Examples include day care or baby-sitting expenses while the employee and spouse are working. Although the maximum child care reimbursement limitation rules are a bit more complex than this, the maximum reimbursement and, hence, salary reduction, is $5,000 per year.

**Are there other, more complex flexible benefits plans?**

The more complex flexible benefits plans can require the use of "credits" granted to each employee, in addition to utilizing salary reductions. The more complex flexible benefits plans provide the employee with multiple benefit choices or options.

A "modular" flexible benefits plan gives the employee a choice among any one of several complete benefit packages. Each benefit package is a "module". Each module may be of equal value or, if there is a difference, require a certain amount of benefit credits or
salary reduction contributions to elect that other module. For example, one module may have life insurance equal to one times annual salary and a modest health insurance plan. A second module may provide lesser life insurance, but a slightly higher level of health care benefits.

Another type of flexible benefits plan is the "core" plan. In this arrangement, participants receive the same basic core of benefits, but every participant also gets the election for additional benefits with respect to all or most of the components of the core benefit package. For example, the core benefit structure could be group term life insurance coverage of one-half times annual compensation and health care benefits with a $500 individual deductible, 20% coinsurance, and $2,000 maximum out-of-pocket. The employee could have the option to buy up to two times group term life insurance coverage and buy into a health care benefit with a $200 deductible and a $500 out-of-pocket maximum. Under this program, the employer could provide benefit "credits" which the employee would use to pay the differential in cost between the core and optional benefit. Credits provided would not generally equal the "cost" differential for all of the benefits offered and could require salary reduction contributions by the employee. The credit amounts and the pricing of the cost differential between the core and optional benefit can be somewhat arbitrary and used to sway benefit option decisions. Typically, employees make benefit selections once per year and in the event the employee does not use any credits provided, those credits would convert to cash.

A third type of program is the complete cafeteria plan. Under this program, employees are given benefit dollars or credits which they can use to purchase different types of benefits (i.e., health care benefits, group term life insurance, etc.) and different levels of benefits within those types. Benefit dollars or credits provided each employee would not be sufficient to buy the maximum benefit level of each type of benefit, although it should be sufficient to provide basic amounts of all types of benefits. In effect, this is similar to providing a core of benefits. The employee is under no compulsion to "spend" his or her credits on every type of benefit and, in fact, could disregard one type of benefit (e.g., health care) in favor of being able to purchase the highest level of other types of benefits (e.g., life insurance, dental benefits, etc.). In the event that all benefit dollars or credits were not "spent", they could be converted to cash, or perhaps deferred into a 401(k) plan.
Is there any "most appropriate" time to consider flexible benefits?

The reasons why employers consider flexible benefits were generally described above. There is no "most appropriate" time; however, it does appear that the single biggest reason why employers consider flexible benefits plans is to contain health care costs and to provide tax efficient compensation. If your company or business requires employee contributions for health care coverage, you should strongly consider establishing a flexible benefits plan which would at least permit employees to pay their health care contributions on a pre-tax basis.

Utilizing a flexible benefits plan when revising a health care plan to either "cut back" benefits or shift some of the cost to the employees can be an effective way of minimizing the employee's perception of change and results in the government subsidizing through tax savings the cost-shifting to the employee.

If my company establishes a health care reimbursement account plan, or a dependent care reimbursement account plan, how accurate should the participants be in establishing their contributions?

The employer should emphasize to the employee that care should be taken when the employee makes his salary reduction election because any funds remaining at the end of the year must be forfeited. This is a result of the IRS rule that there can be no "deferred compensation" in a flexible benefits plan (except for 401(k) plan elections).

There are several ways an employer can minimize this forfeiture issue:

1. All claims do not have to be submitted by December 31. The employer typically provides an extended period after the end of the plan year for employees to submit claims related to that prior plan year. For example, the employer could permit claims incurred by December 31 for a calendar year plan to be submitted by a date in the following plan year (e.g., March 31).

2. The plan can provide that any contributions remaining at the end of the year, but after the extended claims period, will be divided on a per capita basis among all participants in the plan in that subsequent plan year. For example, if there was $100 of "forfeitures" determined for 12/31/89 at the end of the extended claims period, 3/31/90, and there are ten participants in the plan, each participant would have allocated to his or her account in 1990 an additional $10.
Once the employee makes elections under the flexible benefits plan, can the employee change those elections?

All elections are made prior to the beginning of the plan year and are irrevocable during that plan year, unless there is a "change in family status".

A "change in family status" results when there is a change in the employee’s family situation. Divorce, legal separation, birth or death of a child, and the spouse’s obtaining or losing employment are all examples of a "change in family status".

What are the negatives to salary reduction contributions?

Essentially, there are three negatives:

1. Beginning in 1990, due to proposed regulations, the employer has a greater risk with respect to a health care reimbursement account. At any time during the plan year the employer’s reimbursement obligation for any qualifying medical expense is the maximum amount which the employee has agreed to contribute to the plan during that plan year, regardless of the amount the employee has contributed up to that date, less any prior reimbursements. For example, if an employee agrees to contribute $40 per month during a calendar plan year, for a total of $480 per year, and the employee seeks reimbursement in January for a qualifying medical expense of $480, the employer would have to reimburse the employee $480 despite the fact that the employer may have only collected $40 (the first month’s employee contribution). This effectively puts the employer at risk for those employees who separate from employment before all employee contributions are collected.
Despite the risk transfer issue, health care reimbursement accounts continue to have viability and can be designed to minimize exposure to terminating employees. These proposed regulations do not apply to dependent care reimbursement accounts.

2. Such contributions are not subject to FICA. Consequently, the employee’s social security wages are reduced and the employee’s social security benefit could be reduced. It is generally believed that the social security benefit reduction is de minimis and probably exceeded by the accumulated FICA tax savings, plus earnings, if the savings would be set aside by the participating employee.

3. As described above, once an election is made it is irrevocable during that plan year unless there is a change in family status.

What other drawbacks are there to such a program?

One drawback is the administrative burden placed on companies which establish flexible benefits plans. There is cost associated with enrolling employees and having accessible employee election data and the benefits for which the employees are eligible. If credits are granted to employees, the credits may be dependent upon an employee’s age, length of service and marital status and this requires accurate data and calculation of credits for each eligible employee. Obviously, there are also costs associated with designing, implementing and communicating a new flexible benefits plan.

Whenever there are insurance coverage elections, there is always a risk of “adverse selection”. Adverse selection results when employees select a benefit coverage which they know they will use or are fairly certain they will use. When employees only select the benefits which they will use, the result is a high level of benefit utilization which will drive up the cost of those benefits.

While an employer may work hard to communicate a benefit program (and shouldn’t even institute a benefit program unless it intends to adequately communicate that program), a complicated full option cafeteria plan can be difficult for employees to understand; hence, the employees may make inappropriate decisions under the options available or fail to utilize the program effectively. This lack of understanding can totally eliminate all value which was attempted to be created.
Why would I want to establish a dependent care reimbursement account? Isn’t there dependent care tax credits available for those expenses?

Under federal income tax law, an employee who incurs qualifying dependent care expenses to enable the employee, and his or her spouse (if any), to work can obtain federal income tax credits which are a percentage of those qualifying dependent care expenses. Generally, an employee will realize greater tax savings by taking advantage of salary reduction contributions to a dependent care reimbursement account rather than utilizing the dependent care tax credits, if the employee’s, and spouse’s, adjusted gross income exceeds approximately $18,000. Our statistics show that an employer establishing a dependent care reimbursement account should anticipate that only 3% to 5% of its work force will participate in the program and that the average annual salary reduction would be approximately $2,000.

Do the employee contributions have to be set aside in a trust?

Under current Department of Labor rules, the contributions do not need to be set aside in a trust.

Are there plan tax return or other filing requirements?

A flexible benefits plan is required to file a Form 5500 (or Form 5500-C for plans with less than 100 participants) each year with the IRS. The amount of information required is minimal.

What type information must I provide to the participant if I establish a reimbursement account program?

Employee participants should be informed before the date by which claims must be submitted of the remaining contributions in the account so that no forfeitures inadvertently occur. Also, the IRS requires that the amount of any dependent care reimbursements be shown on Form W-2.
FLEXIBLE BENEFITS OVERVIEW
BENEFIT ALTERNATIVES

I. PERMISSIBLE BENEFITS/CASH

Non-Taxable Benefits:

Accident or Health Plan Contributions

- Medical and other health care benefits (including dental, vision care, and prescription drug benefits)
- Long or short term disability coverage
- Accidental death and dismemberment

Dependent Care Plans

Group Term Life Insurance Plans up to $50,000

Cash or deferred arrangements

Taxable Benefits:

Cash

Group Term Life Insurance Plans excess over $50,000

II. BENEFITS WHICH CAN NOT BE OFFERED

Qualified Scholarship or Tuition Reduction Programs

Qualified Employer Provided Transportation

Fringe Benefits (working conditions, discounts, etc.)

Section 106

Section 129

Section 79

Section 401(k)

Section 117

Section 124

Section 132
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Act</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>ERISA</td>
<td>Employee choice among taxable and non-taxable benefits will result in taxation of all benefits (regardless of the actual choice) which the employee may elect among. ERISA Section 2006 (Plans in existence on June 27, 1974 were &quot;grandfathered&quot;.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 401(k) added to the Code. Cash or deferred plans permitted exclusion from constructive receipt rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Separate discrimination tests for Section 401(k) and Section 125 incorporated in Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue Act</td>
<td>Created limited exception for 401(k) plans to deferred compensation prohibition in Section 125 plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>IRS Proposed Regulations 401(k) Plans</td>
<td>IRS issues proposed regulations regarding Section 401(k) cash or deferred plans sanctioning salary deferral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>IRS Proposed Regulations Section 125</td>
<td>IRS issues proposed regulations regarding Section 125 cafeteria plans sanctioning salary deferral and defining general options available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Tax Reform Act of 1984</td>
<td>Adds a limit on benefits available under Section 125 plan to &quot;key employees&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>IRS Information Release 84-22</td>
<td>IRS prohibits ZEBRA account, (i.e., Section 125 salary reduction election after medical expense incurred) and gives approval to salary reduction flexible spending accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Tax Reform Act of 1986</td>
<td>Section 125 discrimination rules with respect to eligibility and key employee benefits remain, but changes are made to incorporate Section 89 standards for benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Additional IRS Proposed Regulations under Section 125</td>
<td>Defined in greater detail &quot;change in family status&quot; and records requirement and transferred risk to employer for employee health care spending accounts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 7, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Richard Conrad, Director
   Computer Services and
   Assistant Vice President for
   Planning and Budgeting

FROM: Gaylyn J. Finn
       Treasurer and Assistant
       Vice President for Planning and Budgeting

RE: ASC Flexible Spending Account Proposal

To assist you in your consideration of the above-noted proposal as an
Administrative Staff Council member, I would make the following comments.
I believe the Section 125 Health Reimbursement Spending Account is an
excellent vehicle for both the employer and the employee to stretch health
care dollars further, i.e., pre-tax. I also believe that such a plan
would be of benefit not only to the University's administrative staff, but
also to all of the employees at Bowling Green State University.

However, I strongly believe that the implementation of a Section 125
Flexible Spending Program needs to be part of an overall revamping of the
University's Health Care Program. The sequence of events, which needs to
take place, includes, first and foremost, the selection of a third party
administrator. This administrator would collect and report the
information necessary to model the University's health care expenditures
under different programs in order to identify those changes in our basic
program, which will be of mutual benefit for the employees and the
University. Having made the third party administrator change and
established a base level of data for modeling, we can begin to consider
alternative benefit designs and in that consideration would be the
implementation of a Section 125 Program.

I appreciate very much the Welfare Committee's recognition that a
step-by-step implementation of the various facets of a 125 Program would
be in the best interest of the individuals and the University. I also
understand the desire of an early implementation as I, like many, am
paying for my family coverage with after-tax dollars. However, I would
note at this time I would be unable to support the implementation of a
Section 125 Program as I believe it should be part and parcel of an
overall redesign of our program. Once all of the goodies are given away,
it becomes much more difficult to achieve consensus that belt tightening
is also needed. If there is any additional input that I can provide on
this issue, please feel free to give me a call.

GJF:msb/GP243
cc: J. Christopher Dalton
    Jim Morris

FILE COPY
February 15, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Personnel Welfare Committee

FROM: Norma J. Stickler
       Assistant to the Vice President
       for Academic Affairs

There will be a meeting of PWC on Friday, March 2 at 9:00 a.m. in the McFall Chart Room. The agenda will be as follows:

1. Closing between Christmas and New Years—should we recommend such action? What are pros and cons?

2. Promotions for Administrative Staff
   How can we have a promotion policy/procedures and still abide by affirmative action and the principle of open searches.

3. Staff Awards
February 16, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO:  Norma Stickler  
      Personnel Welfare Committee

FROM: Marcia Buckenmyer  
      Administrative Staff Personnel

Listed below is the information you requested regarding Christmas vacation usage in December 1988 for administrative staff.

Eighty-Eight (88) records were checked - every fifth record and the following was determined:

Of those 88 records checked 22 people were new employees and were not eligible to take vacation during the 1988 Christmas break.

Of those 88 records checked 4 people work less than 12 months of the year and were not eligible for vacation.

Of those 88 records checked 3 people worked for an area that closes during breaks (Health Center).

Of those 88 records checked 22 people took some vacation during the Christmas break.

Of those 88 records checked 6 people did not have a current form in their file.

Of those 88 records checked 24 people did not take vacation during Christmas break.

Of those 88 records checked 1 person was on leave.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 2-2558.

mb
February 26, 1990

TO: Norma Stickler

In reply to your request for information concerning classified employee leave time during the week of December 25, 1989, 608 out of 1022 classified employees used a variation of leave time as follows:

- 394 employees used 6,436.8 hours vacation time
- 54 employees used 689.1 hours comp time
- 96 employees were on 1,012.2 hours sick leave
- 64 employees were on 1,161.2 hours leave without pay

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact this office.

Annmarie Heldt
Personnel Services

kf

An Equal Employment — Affirmative Action Employer
March 12, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ms. Jill Carr, Chair
   Administrative Staff Council

   Ms. Joyce Hyslop, Chair
   Classified Staff Council

   Dr. David Newman, Chair
   Faculty Senate

FROM: Robert L. Martin, CPE
   Vice President for Operations

RE: Participation in Interviewing Key Administrative Vacancy Applicants

Each of your organizations has adamantly expressed their interests in participating in the screening and interviewing processes for key administrative position replacements. I agree that participation by your groups provides a much better cross section view of the quality and potential of applicants for these positions. We have attempted to accommodate your needs with the screening, interviewing and selection of Director - Physical Plant, Executive Director - Personnel, and Director - Public Safety, with diminishing success. A few of our candidates were met by only a single individual during the time period allotted for your organization to interview. This lack of participation has definitely left a negative impression with the interviewees who expressed to me the apparent lack of interest the University has displayed in their recruiting and employment. This greatly disturbs me. This type of public image works against all we are attempting to accomplish by recruiting and hiring the best possible applicants.

I would ask that each of your organizations reaffirm your interest in participating with us in our recruitment/selection process to include a greater commitment for attendance. If you no longer believe participation is necessary so inform me and we will schedule future candidates accordingly.

I look forward to your responses.

xc. Dr. Paul J. Olscamp
   Ms. Annmarie Heldt
   Administrative Council
March 14, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jill Carr
    Chair, Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Norma Stickler
    Chair, ASC Personnel Welfare Committee

Enclosed, for consideration by the Executive Committee, is a statement of policy and rationale for internal promotions. We have modeled our policy statement after one from Wright State and have tried to keep it simple and straightforward. Annmarie Heldt estimates that we have about 50 searches a year for administrative staff. Since July 1 of this fiscal year, her office alone has handled 37 searches.

I will be on vacation until March 28, but would be happy to answer any questions. If you wish to discuss this at the 27th Executive Committee meeting, Pat Koehler or Josh Kaplan could respond to questions.

xc: PWC
    Annmarie Heldt
    Rob Cunningham
Promotion Policy

An internal promotion of a member of the University's Administrative Staff may be made without a search. In the case when such a promotion ultimately creates a vacancy within the specific unit or elsewhere within the University, the vacancy created will be filled by the normal recruiting processes. In making the decision for an internal promotion, the supervisor or vice president will discuss the matter in advance with the Director of Affirmative Action and will provide written documentation supporting the proposed promotion. Such a promotion must be approved by the appropriate vice president. When the supervisor is the vice president, the vice president should confer with the Director of Affirmative Action.
3/14/90

MEMORANDUM

TO: Executive Committee
   Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Personnel Welfare Committee

RE: Internal Promotion

Internal promotion serves the interests of both the University and the staff. The staff benefits because of the opportunity to advance without having to change employers. The University benefits because of improved staff morale, improved incentive for staff to function effectively, incentive for quality staff to stay at the University, smoother transitions when staff leave and are replaced from within, enhanced ability to recruit new staff, and decreased costs associated with advertising and interviewing. Affirmative action is not compromised by internal promotion.

1. Morale: Employees who do their job well may reasonably expect to be considered for promotion when an appropriate position becomes vacant. When this expectation is fulfilled, employees feel appreciated; when it is not, they feel cheated and discouraged.

2. Incentive to perform: An employee who has observed that promotions do occur has good reason to perform at the highest possible level. If, instead, openings are routinely filled from outside, there is little incentive to do more than an adequate job.

3. Incentive to stay: An employee who is ambitious and capable will seek advancement. If it is not available here, then it will be sought at another institution. We do not want to lose our best staff, and be left with only those who are less able or less ambitious.
4. Smoother transitions: When people are internally promoted, they are already familiar with not only their own operations, but also the functions and staff of other University offices. Lack of this information in someone hired from outside can result in a long, costly and inefficient period of orientation. Furthermore, newly promoted employees are able to train their own replacements.

5. Enhanced recruitment: Highly qualified and ambitious people will be more readily attracted to work here if there is opportunity for advancement.

6. Decreased costs: Hiring searches are costly. When positions are filled by internal promotion, vacancies are created, but they are created at lower levels of responsibility, and the resulting searches may be considerably less expensive. For example, the costs for advertising, and for bringing candidates to campus, are considerably less for a regional search than for a national search.

7. Affirmative action: There is no reason to assume that affirmative action principles are jeopardized by internal promotion. Ultimately, internal promotion results in a vacancy which can be filled with proper attention to affirmative action principles. Furthermore, while any system can be distorted and abused, internal promotion may in fact make it easier to assure that protected classes are represented not only in adequate overall numbers, but also in positions of higher responsibility. Perhaps the most effective response to the claim that there is a shortage of qualified applicants for more responsible positions is to train the necessary candidates in-house, on the job, and then promote them.

It should be noted that the BGSU Affirmative Action Manual (page 22) endorses the principles of internal promotion, career counseling, career advancement, in-house training, and career ladders.
3/14/90

MEMORANDUM

TO: Executive Committee
    Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Personnel Welfare Committee

RE: Internal Promotion

Internal promotion serves the interests of both the University and the staff. The staff benefits because of the opportunity to advance without having to change employers. The University benefits because of improved staff morale, improved incentive for staff to function effectively, incentive for quality staff to stay at the University, smoother transitions when staff leave and are replaced from within, enhanced ability to recruit new staff, and decreased costs associated with advertising and interviewing. Affirmative action is not compromised by internal promotion.

1. Morale: Employees who do their job well may reasonably expect to be considered for promotion when an appropriate position becomes vacant. When this expectation is fulfilled, employees feel appreciated; when it is not, they feel cheated and discouraged.

2. Incentive to perform: An employee who has observed that promotions do occur has good reason to perform at the highest possible level. If, instead, openings are routinely filled from outside, there is little incentive to do more than an adequate job.

3. Incentive to stay: An employee who is ambitious and capable will seek advancement. If it is not available here, then it will be sought at another institution. We do not want to lose our best staff, and be left with only those who are less able or less ambitious.
4. Smoother transitions: When people are internally promoted, they are already familiar with not only their own operations, but also the functions and staff of other University offices. Lack of this information in someone hired from outside can result in a long, costly and inefficient period of orientation. Furthermore, newly promoted employees are able to train their own replacements.

5. Enhanced recruitment: Highly qualified and ambitious people will be more readily attracted to work here if there is opportunity for advancement.

6. Decreased costs: Hiring searches are costly. When positions are filled by internal promotion, vacancies are created, but they are created at lower levels of responsibility, and the resulting searches may be considerably less expensive. For example, the costs for advertising, and for bringing candidates to campus, are considerably less for a regional search than for a national search.

7. Affirmative action: There is no reason to assume that affirmative action principles are jeopardized by internal promotion. Ultimately, internal promotion results in a vacancy which can be filled with proper attention to affirmative action principles. Furthermore, while any system can be distorted and abused, internal promotion may in fact make it easier to assure that protected classes are represented not only in adequate overall numbers, but also in positions of higher responsibility. Perhaps the most effective response to the claim that there is a shortage of qualified applicants for more responsible positions is to train the necessary candidates in-house, on the job, and then promote them.

It should be noted that the BGSU Affirmative Action Manual (page 23) endorses the principles of internal promotion, career counseling, career advancement, in-house training, and career ladders.
March 16, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jill Carr, Chair
   Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Annmarie Heldt
   Personnel Services

Thank you for bringing the ASC Salary Committee's report to my attention. I will begin looking into the three areas the committee has cited as concerns. The consistency of title usage on this campus has concerned me for some time, as I, too, have attempted to collect salary information from sister institutions in this geographical region. The other two (2) issues are more difficult to resolve (lack of female/minority representation in higher levels of administration, and salary discrepancies between genders in like positions). In order to correct discrepancies such as those three named, it will take time and input from a broad based group of administrators. I will be in touch with members of the committee for "start-up" input.

kh

xc: Rob Cunningham
   Robert Martin
March 22, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO:    Norma Stickler, Chair
       Administrative Staff Council Welfare Committee

FROM:   Annmarie Heldt
       Personnel Services

This is to confirm our telephone conversation relating to recruitment activities in the Administrative Personnel Division:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/1/83 - 6/30/84</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/84 - 6/30/85</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/85 - 6/30/86</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/86 - 6/30/87</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/87 - 6/30/88</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/88 - 6/30/89</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/89 - present</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

kh

An Equal Employment - Affirmative Action Employer
April 2, 1990

MEMORANDUM

To: Personnel Welfare Committee

From: Norma J. Stickler
Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs

I would like to have a meeting of the Personnel Welfare Committee on Wednesday, April 11 at 3:30 a.m. in the McFall Chart Room. Our proposal on Christmas hours will be going to ASC next week. Executive Committee has some questions about our promotion statement, and I will be meeting with them on April 10th. I will report to you on that discussion and on any suggestions they have for change.

Please review the attached memos from Mr. Martin for discussion also.

wv

enclosures
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Paul J. Olscamp, President
FROM: Jill Carr, Chair, ASC
RE: Representative to the Board of Trustees

At the April 5, 1980 meeting of the Administrative Staff Council Trustee Richard Newlove was present for our annual presentation by a Board member. During the course of the question and answer period, Mr. Newlove was asked to comment on his feelings regarding direct ASC representation to the Board of Trustees. Dick stated that he sees no problem with this, however, he does not want the Friday morning meetings to be lengthened. We are in complete agreement with Dick's request. Our preference is to have a representative at the Thursday afternoon and evening committee meetings. Dick also stated that he was asked the same question 6 years ago. His response at that time was similar. He is still not sure why this request hasn't been honored.

As a result of these comments we wish to pursue, again, our request for direct representation to the Board of Trustees. Your support of this issue is requested. We wish to proceed with this request in the most appropriate manner. We asked Mr. Newlove to indicate the appropriate channels for this request. He has suggested that we forward our request to Phil Mason for inclusion on the next Trustee meeting agenda. It is our intention to route this request through you and on to the Trustees for a final decision.

We are very pleased to have the opportunity to pursue this issue again. Should you desire further discussion with us regarding this matter, please give me a call.

We look forward to your response and thank you for your time and consideration.

cc: ??
MEMORANDUM

TO: Robert L. Martin
    Vice President for Operations

FROM: Annmarie Field, Executive Director
    Personnel Services

April 9, 1990

This is written in response to your March 21, 1990 memo relating to personal days. I have discovered that ASC's initial proposal was put forward orally to Chris Dalton in February of 1988. Ground rules were put forward by ASC -- just an attempt to get the proposal "on the floor" was made. The proposal should read as follows:

Each newly hired employee accumulating one hundred (100) hours of sick leave in one (1) calendar year earns the right to use one (1) day of personal time. Continuing employees who accumulate sick leave in excess of one hundred ten (110) hours in one (1) year in addition to the one hundred (100) hour accumulated minimum may use a second personal day per calendar year. Personal leave shall be deducted from sick leave but shall not accrue from year to year. Personal leave may not be used the day prior to or following a holiday or vacation period, nor may it be used as make-up time if the employee reports late for work.

The use of personal time must be authorized in advance by as much as the time intended to be used, i.e., one (1) day in advance for one (1) day usage or two (2) days in advance for two (2) day usage. No more than one employee per work unit shall take personal leave on the same day except by permission of the immediate supervisor. Personal leave requests shall be considered in order of receipt. Personal leave shall not be granted for other gainful employment, or during a time when vacation may not be scheduled.

Personal leave shall be reported utilizing the standard University exception form for classified employees and the Leave Request Form for administrative employees, checking OTHER and indicating Personal Leave.
April 10, 1990

TO: Jill Carr, Chair, Administrative Staff Council
    Joyce Hyslop, Chair, Classified Staff Council
    David Newman, Chair, Faculty Senate
    Harold Lunde, Chair-Elect, Faculty Senate
    Judy Hagemann, Chair, Personnel/Welfare Committee, CSC
    Genevieve Stang, Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee
    Norma Stickler, Chair, Administrative Staff Welfare Committee

FROM: Park Leathers, Chair, University Insurance Committee

RE: Search for New Third Party Administrator

As you know, the University has requested proposals from companies interested in becoming Third Party Administrator for the University's Health Care program. Requests for Proposals were sent to 21 companies and 15 proposals were received by the 2 P.M. decline on April 9.

During the current month, Benefits Manager Jim Morris and our consultant, Findlay, Davies and Company, will be conducting independent reviews of the proposals, using a weighted checklist that they have devised. Our committee also will conduct a review and prepare a checklist independent of theirs. The three of us will meet on Friday, April 27, to compare notes and (hopefully) agree on two to five finalists for more intensive scrutiny. The latter will include checks of references, further discussion with the potential provider, and visits to the office providing the service. Our committee will participate in these activities to the extent feasible. Both the Administration and we are committed to getting as much input and interchange as possible. On the other hand, we want to complete this process expeditiously.

The goal for the change-over is September 1, 1990. To achieve this, we want to have the committee's recommendation to the president so that he can make a decision by June 1. The Insurance Office believes that this will afford sufficient time to formalize the contract and coordinate the change.

Inevitably there will be adjustment problems, regardless of which administrator is selected. Therefore, we ask your indulgence and support in this process. If you have suggestions or would like to provide input, please contact me.

cc: Jim Morris, Benefits Manager
    Gaylyn Finn, University Treasurer
April 13, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Personnel Welfare Committee
FROM: Norma J. Stickler

Annmarie Heldt will be on vacation the week of April 16, so we have arranged to meet on Monday, April 23 at 8:00 a.m. in the McFall Caucus Room. Come with any questions you have for her on our policy. I have attached a draft as it now stands, incorporating the draft we looked at on Wednesday and the rationale statement we had agreed on earlier.
April 16, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jill Carr
Chair, Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Norma Stickler
Chair, ASC Personnel Welfare Committee

As you requested, the Personnel Welfare Committee reviewed Vice President Martin's memorandum regarding the possibility of having photo identification cards for Administrative Staff in order to move toward the potential of using the ID cards as "debit" cards.

The Personnel Welfare Committee has no problem with this proposal. It was suggested that coordination with the Library is important to assure that the cards can still be used with the circulation system. There also appear to be continuing problems with employees who terminate employment but do not turn in their cards. As changes are made, perhaps this latter problem could be addressed.
PROMOTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

On April 14, 1977, the University Board of Trustees approved a University Affirmative Action Plan that includes the following statements (p. 23, C & E):

Under procedures developed by the Affirmative Action Office in consultation with the Office of Personnel Support Services and Administrative Staff Personnel Services, a career counseling program will be established to assist lower level employees in achieving career advancement.

The Offices of Personnel Support Services and Administrative Staff Personnel Services, in consultation with the Affirmative Action Office, will develop specific career ladders as a generally sound procedure in personnel management.

The Administrative Staff Council endorses these concepts and urges compliance with the above provisions of the Affirmative Action Plan. As a further step in implementing this policy we recommend that an internal promotion of a member of the University’s Administrative Staff may be made without a search. In the case when such a promotion ultimately creates a vacancy within the specific unit or elsewhere within the University, the vacancy created will be filled by the normal recruiting processes. In making the decision for an internal promotion, the supervisor or vice president will discuss the matter in advance with the Director of Affirmative Action and will provide written documentation supporting the proposed promotion. Copies of the documentation will go to the Director of Administrative Staff Personnel Services. Such a promotion must be approved by the appropriate vice president. When the supervisor is the vice president, the vice president should confer with the Director of Affirmative Action.

The Administrative Staff Council urges the Director of Affirmative Action and the Director of Administrative Staff Personnel to work closely with University supervisors and administrative staff to develop career ladders and to identify administrative staff who might become candidates for career advancement within the University, either within their present organizational area or within another organizational area of the University.

The Administrative Staff Council believes that internal promotion serves the interests of both the University and the staff. The staff benefits because of the opportunity to advance without having to change employers. The University benefits because of improved staff morale, improved incentive for staff to function effectively, incentive for quality staff to stay at the University, smoother transitions when staff leave and are replaced from within, enhanced ability to recruit new staff, and decreased costs associated with advertising and interviewing. Affirmative action is not compromised by internal promotion.
RATIONALE:

Morale: Employees who do their job well may reasonably expect to be considered for promotion when an appropriate position becomes vacant. When this expectation is fulfilled, employees feel appreciated; when it is not, they feel cheated and discouraged.

Incentive to perform: An employee who has observed that promotions do occur has good reason to perform at the highest possible level. If, instead, openings are routinely filled from outside, there is little incentive to do more than an adequate job.

Incentive to stay: An employee who is ambitious and capable will seek advancement. If it is not available here, then it will be sought at another institution. We do not want to lose our best staff.

Sm either transitions: When people are internally promoted, they are already familiar with not only their own operations, but also the functions and staff of other University offices. Lack of this information in someone hired from outside can result in a long, costly and inefficient period of orientation. Furthermore, newly promoted employees are able to train their own replacements.

Enhanced recruitment: Highly qualified and ambitious people will be more readily attracted to work here if there is opportunity for advancement.

Decreased costs: Searches are costly. When positions are filled by internal promotion, vacancies are created, but they are created at lower levels of responsibility, and the resulting searches may be considerably less expensive. For example, the costs for advertising, and for bringing candidates to campus, are considerably less for a regional search than for a national search.

Affirmative action: Affirmative Action principles are not jeopardized by internal promotion. Ultimately, internal promotion results in a vacancy which can be filled by an external search. Furthermore, while any system can be distorted and abused, internal promotion may in fact make it easier to assure that all protected classes are represented not only in adequate overall numbers, but also in positions of higher responsibility. Perhaps the most effective response to the claim that there is a shortage of qualified applicants for more responsible positions is to train the necessary candidates in-house, on the job, and then promote them.

It should be noted again that the BGSU Affirmative Action Policy (page 23) endorses the principles of internal promotion, career counseling, career advancement, in-house training, and career ladders.

Approved by PWC 4/23/90
Administrative Staff Council
Executive Committee
April 24, 1990

Agenda

1. Olscamp Memo & CSC Resolution
2. Heldt Suggestions
3. Officer Slate
4. Committee Reports
5. Firelands Meeting
6. Joint Meeting - June
7. May Agenda
8. Good of the Order - District Card
   - Office Staff - Extending
MEMORANDUM

To: David Newman, Chair, Faculty Senate
From: The Ad Hoc Committee on Drug Free Workplace Policy
       Molly Laflin, Chair
       Bob Harr
       Tom Anderson
       Berry Cobb
       Robert Holmes
       Pat Koehler
       Jacque Daley
Date: 4/25/90
Re: Committee Report and Suggested Drug Free Workplace Policy Guidelines

The Ad Hoc Committee on Drug Free Workplace Policy was charged on
December 28, 1989 to develop guidelines for implementing the basic Drug Free
Workplace Policy passed by the Board of Trustees March 10, 1989. In developing our
recommendations we have reviewed:

a) the Bowling Green State University Drug Free Workplace Policy (Appendix A),
b) the federal form for Certification Regarding Drug-Free Workplace
   Requirements for Grantees Other Than Individuals (Appendix B),
c) the draft Bowling Green State University Notice to Grant Employees About
   Drug-Free Workplace developed by Research Services (Appendix C),
d) the Contract for Faculty Employment sections 6-8 (Appendix D),
e) the Contract for Administrative sections 6-7 (Unclassified) Staff Employment
   (Appendix E)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. In complying with the federal regulations requiring recipients of grant monies
to certify that they will maintain drug-free workplaces, every effort should be
made to protect the rights of University employees.

2. Due process regarding violations of the Drug Free Workplace Policy should not
be different from established guidelines and procedures for violations of other
university policies. No new procedures are necessary.
3. The BGSU Drug Free Workplace Policy should be placed in the Academic Charter, the Administrative Staff Handbook, the Classified Staff Handbook and the Student Code, or other appropriate publications.

4. The "draft Bowling Green State University Notice to Grant Employees About Drug-Free Workplace" developed by Research Services (Appendix C) should be adopted because it uses established mechanisms for disciplinary action rather than creating new ones and it reflects this committee's interpretation, which is in line with Research Services' interpretation, of the federal regulations as limited to employees of federal grants, not all BGSU employees.

5. The Board of Trustees BGSU Drug Free Workplace Policy is not a policy. Sections 2-3 of the draft Bowling Green State University Notice to Grant Employees About Drug-Free Workplace developed by Research Services (Appendix C), is, in fact, a policy. The Board of Trustees should adopt this policy and the guidelines it establishes.

6. The federal form for Certification Regarding Drug-Free Workplace Requirements for Grantees Other Than Individuals (Appendix B), requires the several certifications which can be accomplished as follows:

a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibitions.

   See #3 above, plus Research Services notifies employees of grants using the draft Bowling Green State University Notice to Grant Employees About Drug-Free Workplace developed by Research Services (Appendix C).

b) Establishing a drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:

   1. the dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;
   2. the grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;
   3. any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and
   4. the penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violation occurring in the workplace.

   Establish a drug free awareness program for faculty/staff (the Prevention Center exists for students only) and a rehabilitation program.

c) making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a).
This is currently being done by Research Services.

d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will -
   1. abide by the terms of the statement; and
   2. notify the employer of any criminal drug statute conviction for a violation occurring in the workplace no later than five days after such conviction.

Grant employees are notified of this requirement by Research Services in the "draft Bowling Green State University Notice to Grant Employees About Drug-Free Workplace" developed by Research Services (Appendix C).

e) Notifying the agency within ten days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notification of such conviction.

   This is the responsibility of Research Services.

f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted -
   1. taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination; or
   2. requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency.

Disciplinary actions are stipulated under the various codes for faculty, classified staff, administrative staff, and student employees. It may be necessary to add "requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency" to the various disciplinary codes.

g) Making good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

   Research Services will oversee compliance with the above.

7. The committee opposes invasions of personal privacy ("witch hunts" of any kind) including random drug testing.
APPENDIX

A

BGSU DRUG FREE WORKPLACE POLICY
PASSED MARCH 10, 1989 BY THE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Drug Free Workplace Act of 1988 - This Act requires most federal government contractors, as well as recipients of federal grants, to take specific steps to ensure a drug-free workplace, beginning March 18, 1989. One of the Act's central provisions requires employers to prepare and distribute an anti-drug policy statement prohibiting any drug-related activity in the workplace.

**Bowling Green State University Drug Free Workplace Policy**

It is the intent and obligation of Bowling Green State University to provide a drug free work environment.

Bowling Green State University plans to accomplish this by:

1. publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition.

2. establishing a drug free awareness program to inform employees about:
   a. the dangers of drug abuse in the workplace.
   b. the grantee's policy of maintaining a drug free workplace.
   c. any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs, and
   d. the penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace.

3. requiring that each employee engaged in the performance of a grant be given a copy of the statement as published under paragraph (1).

4. notifying each employee in the statement required by paragraph (1) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will:
   a. abide by the terms of the statement and
   b. notify the employer of any criminal drug statute conviction for the violation occurring in the workplace no later than five days after that conviction.

5. notifying the federal funding agency within ten days after receiving notice under subparagraph (4)(b) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of the conviction.

6. taking one of the following actions, within 30 days of receiving notice under subparagraph (4)(b) that an employee has been convicted of violating the statement as published under paragraph (1):
   a. taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, or
   b. requiring the employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a federal, state, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency.
APPENDIX
B
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
CERTIFICATION REGARDING DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS
Certification Regarding Drug-Free Workplace Requirements
Grantees Other Than Individuals

This certification is required by the regulations implementing the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, 29 CFR Part 35, Subpart F. The regulations, published in the January 31, 1989 Federal Register, require certification by grantees, prior to award, that they will maintain a drug-free workplace. The certification set out below is a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the agency determines to award the grant. False certification or violation of the certification shall be grounds for suspension of payments, suspension or termination of grants, or governmentwide suspension or debarment (see 24 CFR Part 35, Sections 35.915 and 35.920).

The grantee certifies that it will provide a drug-free workplace by:

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing a drug-free awareness program to inform employees about—

(1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;
(2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;
(3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and
(4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will—

(1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and
(2) Notify the employer of any criminal drug statute conviction for a violation occurring in the workplace no later than five days after such conviction;

(e) Notifying the agency within ten days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction;

(f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted—

(1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination; or
(2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;

(g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f).

Organization Name ___________________________ PR/Award Number or Project Name ___________________________

Name and Title of Authorized Representative ___________________________ ___________________________

Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________
APPENDIX

C

DRAFT BGSU NOTICE TO GRANT EMPLOYEES ABOUT DRUG FREE WORKPLACE POLICY
NOTICE TO GRANT EMPLOYEES ABOUT DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE

1. The Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-680) requires recipients of Federal grants to take specific steps to ensure a drug-free workplace. The University's Board of Trustees approved the University's Drug-Free Workplace Policy on March 10, 1989 (appended to this notice).

2. Part of the University's obligations under this policy requires publication of a notice to employees about the drug-free workplace policy.

Bowling Green State University affirms the principle of compliance with duly enacted Federal, State or local laws and regulations governing both the institution and its employees. Therefore, it is a violation of University policy to unlawfully manufacture, distribute, dispense, possess or use a controlled substance* in the workplace. Violations of this policy will be subject to disciplinary action up to and including dismissal as set forth in the following documents:


Administrative Staff: Administrative Staff Handbook, Section on Contract Information -- Continuation/Release/Termination, pg. 8.

Classified Staff: Classified Staff Handbook, Section on Discipline Policy and Procedure, pp. 8-13.

Students: Student Code, Section VI.E., Regulations, pg. 2.

3. As a condition of employment on any Federal grant, University employees must:

   (a) abide by the terms of the University's policy regarding a drug-free workplace;
   (b) notify the Associate Vice President for Research of any criminal drug statute* conviction* for a violation in the workplace no later than five (5) days after that conviction.

---

* For purposes of this University policy and related notices, the definitions of 34CFR Part 85.605 apply as follows:

1. "Controlled substance" means a controlled substance in schedules I through V of section 202 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812), and as further defined by regulation at 21 CFR 1300.11 through 1300.15.
2. "Conviction" means a finding of guilt (including a plea of nolo contendere) or imposition of sentence, or both, by any judicial body charged with the responsibility to determine violations of the Federal or State criminal drug statutes.
3. "Criminal drug statute" means a Federal or non-Federal criminal statute involving the manufacture, distribution, dispensing, use or possession of any controlled substance.
4. "Drug-free workplace" means a site for the performance of work done in connection with a specific grant at which employees of the grantee are prohibited from engaging in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession or use of a controlled substance.
5. "Employee" means the employee of a grantee directly engaged in the performance of work pursuant to the provisions of the grant.
APPENDIX D

CONTRACT FOR FACULTY EMPLOYMENT
This agreement is made and entered into by and between Bowling Green State University of Bowling Green, Ohio ("University") and ("Appointee").

TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT

1. Rank and/or title:
2. Type of Appointment:
   a. ( ) New employee, 1-9 Verified
   b. ( ) Continuing Employee
   c. ( ) temporary appointment for a specified period of time and such appointment does not lead to tenure

3. Period of Employment:
   a. ( ) Probationary in the ___ year of a seven year period
   b. ( ) Tenure

4. Payment Plan:
   Options available to full academic year contract holders only: * (Employee must select one option.)
   a. ( ) 9 payments
   b. ( ) 12 payments

5. Compensation:
   a. Salary for period designated above: ______ to be distributed as follows: Cash amount:
      ___ JISC Employer Pick-Up:
      ___ Pro-rated from Academic/Fiscal year rate of ___
   b. Fringe and Related Benefits: In addition to the annual salary paid to Appointee hereunder, University shall continue to provide Appointee all fringe benefits offered by the University as described on the enclosed sheet which is made a part hereof and give adequate notice of any changes in these benefits. Contributions, mandatory or voluntary, which are joint and/or separate by the Appointee and the University shall be identified on the enclosed sheet.

CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

6. Obligations of the Appointee: In consideration of the terms of this appointment, the Appointee agrees to meet such obligations and perform such professional duties as are normally associated with the stated appointment under prevailing academic practices. It is the responsibility of the officer signing for the University to verify whether or not the.Appointee's performance is in accord with prevailing academic practices. Service of faculty members shall be in accordance with the Conflict of Interest Statements as approved by the Board of Trustees. The Appointee shall advise the Chair or Director and 03or or equivalent officer of such gainful activities of said Appointee which may cause the Appointee to render less than those professional duties which are normally associated under prevailing academic practice with the stated appointment.

7. Incorporation by Reference: This contract is entered into by the Appointee and the University and is subject during the period of this contract to the established and existing provisions under (a) the Constitution and the Revised Code of Ohio, (b) the Academic Charter and procedures established under it, (c) the University Policy on Faculty Appointment and Tenure, and (d) other established official regulations of the Board of Trustees of the University as of the date of this contract. Copies of the Academic Charter, The University Policy on Faculty Appointment and Tenure, and other Governance Documents have been provided to each department, school, and college and are on file for faculty inspection. Amendments and revisions will be incorporated as necessary but will not become effective until the next contract.

8. Rights of the Parties:
   a. University:
      i. Disbursement of salary is contingent upon the availability of funds.
      ii. This contract is predicated upon substantive representations regarding education and experience qualifications which, if subsequently proven to be fraudulent, may cause this contract to be voidable.
      iii. Employment is contingent upon verification of employability on I-9 Form within three days of date of hire.
   b. Appointee: Signature on this contract does not preclude the Appointee from presenting a petition of grievance concerning salary or other terms of employment through established grievance procedures or pursuing such grievances already in process. If an Appointee is dissatisfied with the terms of the salary then the Appointee may with notification to the appropriate contract officer, grieve the proposed salary and such notification shall not be deemed a termination of this appointment.

9. Return of the Contract: The signed original and one signed copy of this contract shall be returned to the contracting officer by __________ (date) or within two weeks of date of receipt.

SIGNED FOR UNIVERSITY

______________________________
DATE

SOCIAL SECURITY NO.

______________________________
DATE

______________________________
SOCIAL SECURITY NO.

DATE

Budget/Cost $__

Time ___

Budget/Cost $__

Time ___

* Changes can be made in this option after the initial date of the contract only by payment of a $25 charge. Language in this contract conforms to 1975 requirements of the Auditor of the State of Ohio.
APPENDIX E

CONTRACT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE (UNCLASSIFIED) STAFF EMPLOYMENT
CONTRACT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE [UNCLASSIFIED] STAFF EMPLOYMENT

This agreement is made and entered into by and between Bowling Green State University of Bowling Green, Ohio ("University"), and ____________________________ ("Appointee").

TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT:

1. Position/Title:

2. Type of Employment:
   a. [ ] New Employee, I-9 Verified [ ] Continuing Employee
   b. [ ] Full-time [ ] Part-time
   c. [ ] regular position funded by the University [ ] appointment is for the time specified under Period of Employment and subject to renewal or non-renewal
   [ ] temporary position funded by the University [ ] appointment is for the time specified under Period of Employment and not subject to renewal.
   [ ] position funded wholly or in part by grant/external funds [ ] appointment is for the time specified under Period of Employment and subject to the provisions of the policy for administrative staff in grant or externally funded positions in the Administrative Staff Handbook.

3. Period of Employment:
   [ ] Fiscal year [ ] other

4. Compensation:
   a. Salary for period designated above: $____________ to be distributed as follows:
      Cash amount $____________;
      PERS Employer Pick-Up $____________;
      Prorated from Academic/Fiscal year at rate of $____________;
      Subsequent payments to be made on the 20th of each month through

   b. Fringe and related benefits: In addition to the annual salary paid to the Appointee hereunder, the University shall continue to provide the Appointee all fringe benefits offered by the University according to the Appointee's type of employment as described in the Administrative Staff Handbook and shall provide adequate notice of any changes in these benefits. Administrative staff are participants in the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) of the State of Ohio by virtue of their contract status.

5. Obligations of the Appointee: In consideration of the terms of this appointment, the Appointee agrees to perform such professional duties and services as identified in the appointed position or title, and/or as may be assigned or changed, to the satisfaction of the Appointee's immediate supervisor. It is the responsibility of the officer(s) signing for the University to verify whether or not the Appointee's performance is in accord with prevailing University practice.

6. Incorporation by Reference: This contract is entered into by the Appointee and the University and is subject to the established and existing provisions under the Constitution and the Revised Code of Ohio, the Administrative Staff Handbook, and other established official regulations of the Board of Trustees of the University in effect as of the date of this contract.

7. Termination: This contract may be terminated by the University through its appropriate agents or officers pursuant only to the procedures and reasons set forth herein and in the Administrative Staff Handbook.

8. Rights of the Parties:
   a. University:
      [1] This contract is contingent upon the availability of funds. In the case of employees whose positions are paid wholly or in part by grant/external funds, employment is contingent upon the availability of said grant funds.
      [2] This contract is predicated upon substantive representations regarding education, experience, and general background which, if subsequently proven to be false, may cause this contract to be voidable at the discretion of the University.
      [3] Employment is contingent upon verification of employability on I-9 Form within three days of date of hire.
   b. Appointee: Signature on this contract does not preclude the Appointee from pursuing established grievance procedures.

9. Return of the Contracts: The signed original and one signed copy of this contract shall be returned to the contracting officer by ____________________________ or within two weeks of date of receipt.

______________________________
SIGNATURE OF APPOINTEE

______________________________
DATE

______________________________
SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER

______________________________
DATE

$ __________
BUDGET/COST

$ __________
TIME

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

By ______________________________

______________________________
DATE

______________________________
DATE

$ __________
BUDGET/COST

$ __________
TIME
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Martin  
Vice President for Operations

FROM: Joyce Hyslop, Chair  
Classified Staff Council

April 25, 1990

The Classified Staff Council met recently to discuss the memo that was sent to you dated February 19, 1990 from Sam Ramirez, Manager of Personnel Services. The content of his memo dealt with his analysis of the Educator's Insurance benefit administered through the University. It is Mr. Ramirez's perception that this optional insurance benefit allows some employees to take a "cavalier attitude" toward sick leave usage because they can afford to take extended leaves of absence. In reference to Mr. Ramirez's summary paragraph, if a physician requires an employee to discontinue physical activity because of a medical problem, how can this be considered "cavalier or unnecessary" and who in Personnel Services or the Physical Plant is qualified to evaluate whether a leave is unnecessary? In addition, a classified staff member can only take a leave of absence after a request has been approved by Personnel Services, and his/her sick leave is exhausted.

In reviewing his analysis, it appears that some of the statistics are misleading. During 1988-89, there were 59 leaves of absence (medical, maternity and educational) but only 30 (51%) of those leaves were covered by Educator's Insurance. Mr. Ramirez fails to delineate those 30 leaves, which were faculty, administrative staff or classified staff. In addition, Council does not agree with his correlation between "those who have Educator's and those who use it." Of course, if a University employee pays the premiums for this optional insurance, they have the right to use it if the need arises.

Council perceives Mr. Ramirez's conjecture to be very biased and overstated against classified staff members. Only 11% of those 278 University employees who participated in Educators submitted claims during the 1988-89 year. Furthermore, it is not clear of that 11%, how many classified staff members were involved.

Council understands that a major portion of the participants would be classified staff members. We are, indeed, the largest group of employees on campus. In addition, the requirements of many classified positions demand that staff members be physically capable of performing their job duties. If an employee is unable to perform those job duties, they must take sick leave until they are again able to fulfill those requirements. Faculty and administrative
staff members have an advantage in that their job duties normally do not demand the same physical capabilities as many classified staff positions. This fact alone will negatively skew the statistics to appear that classified staff submit more claims than any other group, but what needs to be determined in a case-by-case basis is the justification for requesting the leave.

In summary, Council believes that this report unnecessarily casts a doubt on the legitimacy of claims submitted by classified staff members. If claims appear suspicious, most insurance companies have the capability to police that sort of thing themselves. Eliminating the opportunity to obtain this optional insurance benefit through the University only forces the employee to secure the insurance directly from the company. Classified Staff Council strongly recommends that the University continue to offer Educator's Insurance.

xc: S. Ramirez
A. Heldt
W. Montenegro
M. Sawyer
G. Finn
J. Morris
C. Dalton
J. Carr
Classified Staff Council
February 19, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Robert Martin, Vice President Operations

VIA: Annmarie Heldt, Director Administrative Staff Personnel

FROM: Sam Ramrize, Manager Personnel Services

BACKGROUND: Educator's Insurance is an optional benefit provided by the University that allows faculty and staff to purchase short-term disability insurance. The University has historically acted as a sponsor allowing premiums to be offered at lower group rates.

The original intent for providing Educator's Insurance was to offer limited protection from short-term disabling illness or injury for new employees who had not been employed long enough to build up a substantial sick leave balance. Depending on the amount of premium paid, participants can receive monthly benefits ranging from $400 to $2000 a month, for a period of up to six months.

PROBLEM: Educator's Insurance serves as an enabler that allows some employees to take a cavalier attitude toward sick leave usage because they can afford to take extended leaves of absence due to the income provided by Educator's. This, coupled with the fact that the University's health insurance coverage is available for four months after a leave begins, encourages employees, in some cases, to unnecessarily extend their leave of absence. In addition, Educator's allows an employee receiving benefits to work in an occupation unrelated to the disability or illness that caused the leave of absence, e.g., a custodial worker with a bad back is allowed to work as a cashier. In some cases, the leave of absences become predictable annual occurrences or are used to avoid or suspend the disciplinary process.

It is no coincidence that a year ago, Educator's informed the University they could no longer offer the insurance without substantial premium increases and a reduction in the duration of coverage from 12 months to 6 months. Quite simply, Educator's was losing money due to the high number of claims, because participants were signing up with the intent of using the insurance and not as supplemental protection, as originally intended.
Robert Martin, Vice President  
February 12, 1990  
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STATISTICAL ANALYSIS: Attachments 1 and 2 are documents prepared by Personnel Services that show the amount of leave taken by classified employees during the 1988-89 fiscal year. There are currently 278 faculty and staff members who participate in Educator's.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Staff</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1988-89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absences</th>
<th># Leaves</th>
<th># Covered By Educator's</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Only</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1988-89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leave Of Absence</th>
<th>No. Work Days Missed</th>
<th>Total Hours Missed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>9,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>13,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,995</td>
<td>23,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean LOA Duration: 10 weeks
Range: 2 weeks to 25 weeks
Multiple LOA's: 56% (Operations only, since 1985)

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Continue to offer Educator's Insurance.
2. Eliminate the University's participation at contract renewal time (5/90).
3. If an opportunity arises where Educator's approaches us with proposed increases, refuse to increase premiums and reduce benefits.
Robert Martin, Vice President
February 12, 1990
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PROS OF ELIMINATING:

1. Elimination of Educator's would encourage employees to save their sick leave in order to cover extended leaves due to illness or injury. Indirectly, this should equate into better and more efficient service to our clients.

2. Elimination would reduce the lengthy duration of absences because employees would not be able to afford to unnecessarily extend absences.

3. The morale of employees adversely affected by absent coworkers would improve because they would not have to cover for absent employees as frequently. Not only because employees would take shorter leaves, but because sick leave usage in general would decrease (among previous Educator participants).

4. Administrative relief would allow the Benefits Office to process claims and perform other duties.

   The Benefits Office estimates that an equivalent of one to two days per month is used in handling Educator's Insurance.

CONS OF ELIMINATING:

1. The employees who have paid the premiums and not used or manipulated the system, would be punished unfairly.

2. The amount of salary savings generated by not having to pay annual salaries for the equivalent of 11.5 full-time employees would be reduced. However, some of these monies are already used to pay for temporaries who assume the duties of the absent employee.

3. Backlash from classified staff who are the primary participants (88%) in the program.

SUMMARY: The impetus for this report was based on a request from Physical Plant management who suffer the bulk of the negative effects created by unnecessary leaves of absence. A telephone survey of other state institutions indicate that most do not offer Educator's or any similar insurance. The primary reason stated was, that they feel that the state's liberal sick leave policy is more than adequate protection for employees.

RECOMMENDATION: Alternative 3.

If our conjecture is correct, that a correlation exists between those who have Educator's and those who use it, it will only be a matter of time before
Educator's wants to renegotiate rates. At that time we should hold the line and place the burden of deciding whether or not to offer coverage on Educator's.

mh
attachments
c: A. Heidt
W. Montenegro
M. Sawyer
G. Finn
J. Morris
C. Dalton
## APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCES FY 83-89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Department</th>
<th>Maternity</th>
<th>Medical</th>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Affairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio-TV Film</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Studies in Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Affairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Recreation Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBGU-TV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Budgeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration and Records</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Support Svcs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Operations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Union</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Support Svcs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plant Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing Shop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint Shop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ALL AREAS</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>No. Work Days</th>
<th>No. Work Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Planning/Budgeting</td>
<td>Computer Serv</td>
<td>8-15-88 to 12-19-88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Graduate College</td>
<td>9-6-88 to 3-3-89</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate College</td>
<td>10-25-88 to 2-6-89</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate College</td>
<td>11-10-88 to 1-3-89</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Radio-TV-Film</td>
<td>6-13-88 to 8-8-88</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>5-15-89 to 6-11-89*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Relations</td>
<td>WBGU-TV</td>
<td>2-20-89 to 4-16-89</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Budgeting</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>7-11-88 to 11-23-88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>10-23-88 to 11-14-88</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td>11-2-88 to 1-27-89</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>12-2-88 to 3-11-89</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>12-16-88 to 3-1-89</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Office</td>
<td>9-19-88 to 1-9-89</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>5-8-89 to 6-11-89*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>6-13-88 to 12-14-88</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Ops</td>
<td>7-18-88 to 10-30-88</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Ops</td>
<td>7-15-88 to 9-22-89</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Ops</td>
<td>9-10-88 to 11-14-88</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>11-23-88 to 1-31-89</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Ops</td>
<td>1-6-89 to 2-30-89</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>1-23-89 to 3-31-89</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Maternity Leave of Absence Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>9,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Col. of Business</td>
<td>1-2-89 to 6-11-89*</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>1-30-89 to 4-18-89</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5-10-89 to 6-11-89*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Stu. Rec. Ctr.</td>
<td>11-14-88 to 1-2-89</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Food Ops</td>
<td>10-31-88 to 1-9-89</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Union</td>
<td>1-17-89 to 1-31-89</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Union</td>
<td>3-21-89 to 4-3-89</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Stores</td>
<td>10-12-88 to 11-20-88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>8-31-88 to 9-15-88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>12-29-88 to 2-13-89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plumbing Shop</td>
<td>12-12-88 to 4-20-89</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paint Shop</td>
<td>3-30-89 to 5-1-89</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td>11-21-88 to 3-13-89</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td>1-3-89 to 2-27-89</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td>5-3-89 to 6-3-89</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td>2-20-89 to 3-10-89</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>12-15-88 to 5-1-89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>6-27-88 to 7-25-88</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>3-1-89 to 4-16-89</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>8-24-88 to 11-25-88</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>9-19-88 to 1-3-89</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>10-3-88 to 3-7-89</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>5-29-89 to 6-11-89*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>10-24-88 to 1-24-89</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>1-9-89 to 1-8-89</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>1-7-89 to 6-7-89</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>12-8-89 to 2-7-89</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>12-19-88 to 6-11-89*</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>12-19-88 to 2-10-89</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>1-9-89 to 6-11-89*</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>1-17-89 to 2-13-89</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>2-6-89 to 2-20-89</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>2-6-89 to 3-6-89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>2-8-89 to 3-20-89</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>2-21-89 to 3-8-89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>3-15-89 to 5-1-89</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Personnel Welfare Committee

FROM: Norma Stickler

May 10, 1990

Jill Carr gave me the attached materials for PWC to review. There are two related issues, one dealing with the use of sick leave days and the other the use of Educators Short-Term Disability Insurance. I have some doubts as to whether we should take any formal stance on these issues, but because there are some implications for administrative staff, it might be a good idea for us to have a discussion. Could we meet at 8:00 on Wednesday, May 23 in the McFall Chart Room. We can also finish up any other pending business.
May 30, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jill Carr
   Chair, Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Norma Stickler
       Chair, Personnel Welfare Committee

The PWC met last week to review several pending items.

Correspondence regarding use of sick leave in the physical plant area:

   It is the recommendation of PWC that ASC take no action at this time. It is important for us to be informed on the issues, but until such time as the actions directly affect Administrative Staff and until the proposals are final, we do not feel we should intervene. It is our understanding that the proposal has been put on hold.

We did discuss a concern, however, about this particular issue as a sample of several that have occurred during the past year. It is another instance in which the manner of proposing change rather than the change itself seems to be the major concern—a manner which reveals that not enough long-range planning and consultation took place before a proposal was made. PWC is further concerned that issues such as this serve to further divide the constituent groups.

Educators Insurance

   The use or misuse of Educators Insurance does not seem to be a major issue for Administrative Staff at this time. Only a few Administrative Staff are members, and there is no indication that any of them have misused the policy. We do recommend that its use be monitored for possible future changes if the need arises.

Drug Free Workplace

   Pat Loehler reported that the university-wide committee met during the spring semester, and a standard form seems to be a probable way to handle new employees. A form is still in draft.
Awards Dinner for Employees

PWC recommends that the Personnel Office evaluate the gifts that are given for various years of service and, in consultation with the two constituent groups, assess whether there might be a change in the gifts given. Specifically, we believe that the rocking chair is inappropriate because of the implied message it sends. We ask further that something nicer be substituted for the silver bowl at 20 years. We realize the cost restrictions, but there are other possibilities at the same price. We would also like to see a distinction made between the 5 and 10 year recipients, again something that is within our budget but that will denote an added distinction. Suggestions were a lapel pin, stick pin, key chain.

I do not think that there is anything here that needs to be reported formally to the full ASC. We would like the suggestions on the awards communicated to the Personnel Director.

In closing, may I take the opportunity to thank each of the members of this year’s Personnel Welfare Committee: Tim Burns, Ann Bowers, Josh Kaplan, Pat Yoehler, Jane Schimpf, Fran Voll, Dick Zolman, and Deb McLaughlin. It has been a great group to work with, and I think we have accomplished some important things this year. We have, however, left a couple of minor items as “seed” for next year’s committee. I am enclosing a list of the agenda items that PWC reviewed during the year.
April 23, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Physical Plant Employees

FROM: Carl R. Cogar, Director
Physical Plant

RE: Sick Leave Usage Standards

Sick leave is a benefit designed to provide financial security to employees who must be absent due to illness, injury or other designated causes. Physical Plant management has no intention of interfering with any employee's legitimate use of sick leave; however, we all have an obligation to avoid the misuse of sick leave.

Sick leave usage cannot be regulated equitably unless a uniform standard is applied for all employees. The attached standard will be administered as department policy effective May 1, 1990.

ch:D100490
All Physical Plant Department employees are expected to meet a regular schedule of attendance. Employees who are unable to meet their employment obligation of regular and reasonable attendance and are excessively absent due to illness or injury shall (1) receive counseling, (2) be required to provide physician's evidence of disability, (3) provide a general medical evaluation of their ability to work, (4) attend a Sick Time Conference, and (5) may ultimately be discharged.

Absenteeism due to illness becomes excessive when it adversely affects our ability to maintain efficient service. It is the supervisor's responsibility to determine when an employee's absenteeism becomes excessive, but the following standards have been established to assist the supervisor in this effort:

Sick Leave Standards for Physical Plant Employees

Each separate or distinct absence for which no evidence of disability (physician's statement) is provided is considered an undocumented occurrence. An absence of two or more consecutive days is still considered to be one occurrence. In determining whether an individual's sick leave usage is legitimate, the number of undocumented occurrences within a specified time period is used.

The following standards should be consulted to determine whether an employee's absences are excessive and what corrective action is recommended. Occurrences of longer length (3 or more consecutive days) require documentation (physician's statement) to be submitted on the first day of return to work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDOCUMENTED OCCURRENCES</th>
<th>CORRECTIVE ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of less than 3 days' duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more undocumented occurrences in the last 5 months</td>
<td>Counsel employee about employment obligation of regular attendance. Execute Step 1 of Disciplinary Policy and Procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more undocumented occurrences in the last 6 months</td>
<td>Counsel employee again about the problem and request employee to furnish physician's proof of disability for each future absence. Execute Step 1 of Disciplinary Policy and Procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more undocumented occurrences in the last 12 months</td>
<td>A Sick Time conference will be attended by the employee, the supervisor, and the appropriate assistant director. This conference is followed by a letter to the employee that confirms his or her employment obligation of meeting a regular and reasonable standard of attendance. Execute Step 2 of Disciplinary Policy and Procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or more undocumented occurrences in the last 12 months</td>
<td>Execute Step 3 of Disciplinary Policy and Procedure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Malingering or casual use of sick leave privileges "with intent to defraud" shall be considered cause for termination of employment.
BGSU PHYSICAL PLANT DEPARTMENT

Physician's Statement Guidelines

A supervisor may require an employee to provide a physician's statement under the following circumstances:

1. When the supervisor has a reason to doubt that an employee is legitimately ill or injured. Evidence of disability should be required when an employee has shown a pattern of frequent one or two day absences due to illness. Other examples include before or after weekends, holidays, or vacations, or when a vacation day is requested, but denied. Please note that an employee can be required to provide a physician's statement for absences of any length, even one day or less. However, this must be requested before the employee returns to work.

2. To ascertain an employee's general health and ability to maintain his or her employment obligation of regular attendance. Employees who are frequently absent will be required to provide a physician's general evaluation of their fitness for duty, on a form provided by Physical Plant. After this is provided, a Sick Time Conference will most likely be scheduled.

Those employees who are required to provide medical evidence of their fitness for duty shall be examined by a physician selected and paid by BGSU.

All physician's statements must include the following information:

1. Name and signature of attending physician. A nurse, secretary, or office manager cannot certify an employee's disability or general health.

2. Date of examination. An employee must provide evidence that he or she was seen by the physician on the date of the disability.

3. Nature of illness or injury.

4. Duration of disability. The statement must indicate that the employee was unable to work and for what duration.
Physician's statements that do not provide the information listed should not be accepted. When a supervisor suspects the validity of a physician's statement, he or she should contact an appropriate administrator immediately. Falsification of a physician's statement is grounds for discharge. Employees who fail to provide the required evidence of disability shall receive an unexcused absence, which is subject to disciplinary action. When requested, medical statements are to be submitted by the employee on the first day of his or her return to work.

ch:D040390

4/17/90
It is the recommendation of the Administrative Staff Council that, with the approval of the contracting officer (i.e., vice president or dean), offices or work areas be allowed to close during the period between the Christmas and New Year's holidays. Such closure would be with the understanding that personnel would use vacation days or leave without pay. Closure would occur when the area supervisor can demonstrate to the contracting officer that it is not essential that personnel be on duty during the period.

Rationale:

1. There is already a high usage of vacation time, to the extent that it is difficult for those left on campus to complete assignments when that depends on contact with other offices or work units. In 1989, 39% of classified staff took vacation time during the days between Christmas and New Years. An additional 12% took compensatory time and leave without pay. Another 9% were on sick leave status. A random sample of administrative staff records revealed that of the 82 records checked, 28 took vacation. An additional 30 persons were either on leave or were not eligible because of having been here less than one year. In the case, therefore, of both classified and administrative staff, over half of the staff reported absences during the days between the two holidays.

2. In many instances, the staff who do remain would prefer to take time off, but do not have the opportunity because they must staff the area for others who are gone.

3. With the sparse staffing that now occurs in some offices, staff members are left alone in a corridor or building, causing a safety concern, particularly since those left alone in an area are often women.
May 30, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jill Carr  
Chair, Administrative Staff Council

FROM: Norma Stickler  
Chair, Personnel Welfare Committee

The PWC met last week to review several pending items.

Correspondence regarding use of sick leave in the physical plant area:

It is the recommendation of PWC that ASC take no action at this time. It is important for us to be informed on the issues, but until such time as the actions directly affect Administrative Staff and until the proposals are final, we do not feel we should intervene. It is our understanding that the proposal has been put on hold.

We did discuss a concern, however, about this particular issue as a sample of several that have occurred during the past year. It is another instance in which the manner of proposing change rather than the change itself seems to be the major concern—a manner which reveals that not enough long-range planning and consultation took place before a proposal was made. PWC is further concerned that issues such as this serve to further divide the constituent groups.

Educators Insurance

The use or misuse of Educators Insurance does not seem to be a major issue for Administrative Staff at this time. Only a few Administrative Staff are members, and there is no indication that any of them have misused the policy. We do recommend that its use be monitored for possible future changes if the need arises.

Drug Free Workplace

Pat Koehler reported that the university-wide committee met during the spring semester, and a standard form seems to be a probable way to handle new employees. A form is still in draft.
Awards Dinner for Employees

PWC recommends that the Personnel Office evaluate the gifts that are given for various years of service and, in consultation with the two constituent groups, assess whether there might be a change in the gifts given. Specifically, we believe that the rocking chair is inappropriate because of the implied message it sends. We ask further that something nicer be substituted for the silver bowl at 20 years. We realize the cost restrictions, but there are other possibilities at the same price. We would also like to see a distinction made between the 5 and 10 year recipients, again something that is within our budget but that will denote an added distinction. Suggestions were a lapel pin, stick pin, key chain.

I do not think that there is anything here that needs to be reported formally to the full ASC. We would like the suggestions on the awards communicated to the Personnel Director.

In closing, may I take the opportunity to thank each of the members of this year's Personnel Welfare Committee: Tim Burns, Ann Bowers, Joch Kaplan, Pat Koehler, Jane Schimpf, Fran Voll, Dick Zolman, and Deb McLaughlin. It has been a great group to work with, and I think we have accomplished some important things this year. We have, however, left a couple of minor items as "seed" for next year's committee. I am enclosing a list of the agenda items that PWC reviewed during the year.
Personnel Welfare Committee Report for 1989-90

1. Drafted statement in response to Drug Free Workplace requirements. Appointed Pat Koehler as ASC's representative to University Committee that is drafting response to be used by all constituents.

2. Reviewed Compensatory Time statement in Handbook and approved revision to allow variable work schedule for those who must work beyond regular work day on a continuing basis.

3. Drafted and approved guidelines for Market Adjustments.

4. Reviewed Maternity/Paternity policy and agreed to let stand as now written. It was felt that asking for six-months leave would be too disruptive to work schedules.

5. Drafted and approved policy to allow Administrative Staff to participate in 125 Plan.

6. Responded to Vice President Martin regarding plan to combine Administrative Staff and Classified Staff Handbooks.

7. Reviewed Administrative Staff Handbook, approved several format and editorial changes.

8. Developed and approved addition to evaluation procedure in Handbook to provide for fair notice to Administrative Staff if there are performance problems.


10. Approved policy to allow supervisors to request closing offices between Christmas and New Years—to be reviewed by Classified Staff Council.

11. Reviewed and made suggestions for revision on University's Request for Proposals for new third-party administrator of University Insurance Plan.

12. Developed and approved plan for promotions and internal searches.

13. Reviewed and endorsed plan for Administrative Staff to have photo identification card to allow coordination with debit card system being implemented for students.

14. Reviewed correspondence relative to use of sick leave in physical plant area and agreed not to intervene unless there are future implications for Administrative Staff.

15. Reviewed correspondence relative to use of Educators Insurance and agreed that ASC need not take action at this time. The use of the insurance should be reviewed if its use becomes a problem among Administrative Staff.
1. Drafted statement in response to Drug Free Workplace requirements. Appointed Pat Koehler as ASC's representative to University Committee that is drafting response to be used by all constituents.

2. Reviewed Compensatory Time statement in Handbook and approved revision to allow variable work schedule for those who must work beyond regular work day on a continuing basis.

3. Drafted and approved guidelines for Market Adjustments.

4. Reviewed Maternity/Paternity policy and agreed to let stand as now written. It was felt that asking for six-months leave would be too disruptive to work schedules.

5. Drafted and approved policy to allow Administrative Staff to participate in 125 Plan.

6. Responded to Vice President Martin regarding plan to combine Administrative Staff and Classified Staff Handbooks.

7. Reviewed Administrative Staff Handbook, approved several format and editorial changes.

8. Developed and approved addition to evaluation procedure in Handbook to provide for fair notice to Administrative Staff if there are performance problems.


10. Approved policy to allow supervisors to request closing offices between Christmas and New Years--to be reviewed by Classified Staff Council.

11. Reviewed and made suggestions for revision on University's Request for Proposals for new third-party administrator of University Insurance Plan.

12. Developed and approved plan for promotions and internal searches.

13. Reviewed and endorsed plan for Administrative Staff to have photo identification card to allow coordination with debit card system being implemented for students.

14. Reviewed correspondence relative to use of sick leave in physical plant area and agreed not to intervene unless there are future implications for Administrative Staff.

15. Reviewed correspondence relative to use of Educators Insurance and agreed that ASC need not take action at this time. The use of the insurance should be reviewed if its use becomes a problem among Administrative Staff.
May 31, 1990

TO: Kathryn Bisher
    Lee Norden
    Patricia Salomon
    Mary Zachary
    Cail Richmond
    Nancy Mueller
    Barb Costello
    Carol Davis
    Kory Tilgner
    Dan Greenberg
    Gerald Slivka
    Pat Browne

FROM: Bob Graham, Archivist
       Institute for Great Lakes Research

RE: Enclosed report of the Personnel Welfare Committee of the ASC

Please find enclosed a report prepared by the Personnel Welfare Committee of the ASC. We will be discussing the report at the June 7 meeting of the ASC. Please review the report and forward any comments to me c/o Institute for Great Lakes Research, Jerome Library, or feel free to call me at 1-874-3907.

RMG/shr

Enclosure
On April 14, 1977 the University Board of Trustees approved a University Affirmative Action Plan that includes the following statements (p. 23, C & E):

Under procedures developed by the Affirmative Action Office in consultation with the Office of Personnel Support Services and Administrative Staff Personnel Services, a career counseling program will be established to assist lower level employees in achieving career advancement.

The Offices of Personnel Support Services and Administrative Staff Personnel Services, in consultation with the Affirmative Action Office, will develop specific career ladders as a generally sound procedure in personnel management.

The Administrative Staff Council endorses these concepts and urges compliance with the above provisions of the Affirmative Action Plan. As a further step in implementing this policy we recommend that an internal promotion of a member of the University's Administrative Staff may be made without a search. In the case when such a promotion ultimately creates a vacancy within the specific unit or elsewhere within the University, the vacancy created will be filled by the normal recruiting processes. In making the decision for an internal promotion, the supervisor or vice president will discuss the matter in advance with the Director of Affirmative Action and will provide written documentation supporting the proposed promotion. Copies of the documentation will go to the Director of Administrative Staff Personnel Services. Such a promotion must be approved by the appropriate vice president. When the supervisor is the vice president, the vice president should confer with the Director of Affirmative Action.

The Administrative Staff Council urges the Director of Affirmative Action and the Director of Administrative Staff Personnel to work closely with University supervisors and administrative staff to develop career ladders and to identify administrative staff who might become candidates for career advancement within the University, either within their present organizational area or within another organizational area of the University.

The Administrative Staff Council believes that internal promotion serves the interests of both the University and the staff. The staff benefits because of the opportunity to advance without having to change employers. The University benefits because of improved staff morale, improved incentive for staff to function effectively, incentive for quality staff to stay at the University, smoother transitions when staff leave and are replaced from within, enhanced ability to recruit new staff, and decreased costs associated with advertising and interviewing. Affirmative action is not compromised by internal promotion.
RATIONALE:

Morale: Employees who do their job well may reasonably expect to be considered for promotion when an appropriate position becomes vacant. When this expectation is fulfilled, employees feel appreciated; when it is not, they feel cheated and discouraged.

Incentive to perform: An employee who has observed that promotions do occur has good reason to perform at the highest possible level. If, instead, openings are routinely filled from outside, there is little incentive to do more than an adequate job.

Incentive to stay: An employee who is ambitious and capable will seek advancement. If it is not available here, then it will be sought at another institution. We do not want to lose our best staff.

Smother transitions: When people are internally promoted, they are already familiar with not only their own operations, but also the functions and staff of other University offices. Lack of this information in someone hired from outside can result in a long, costly and inefficient period of orientation. Furthermore, newly promoted employees are able to train their own replacements.

Enhanced recruitment: Highly qualified and ambitious people will be more readily attracted to work here if there is opportunity for advancement.

Decreased costs: Searches are costly. When positions are filled by internal promotion, vacancies are created, but they are created at lower levels of responsibility, and the resulting searches may be considerably less expensive. For example, the costs for advertising, and for bringing candidates to campus, are considerably less for a regional search than for a national search.

Affirmative action: Affirmative Action principles are not jeopardized by internal promotion. Ultimately, internal promotion results in a vacancy which can be filled by an external search. Furthermore, while any system can be distorted and abused, internal promotion may in fact make it easier to assure that all protected classes are represented not only in adequate overall numbers, but also in positions of higher responsibility. Perhaps the most effective response to the claim that there is a shortage of qualified applicants for more responsible positions is to train the necessary candidates in-house, on the job, and then promote them.

It should be noted again that the BGSU Affirmative Action Policy (page 23) endorses the principles of internal promotion, career counseling, career advancement, in-house training, and career ladders.

Approved by PWC 4/23/90
Personnel Welfare Committee Report for 1989-90

1. Drafted statement in response to Drug Free Workplace requirements. Appointed Pat Koehler as ASC's representative to University Committee that is drafting response to be used by all constituents.

2. Reviewed Compensatory Time statement in Handbook and approved revision to allow variable work schedule for those who must work beyond regular work day on a continuing basis.

3. Drafted and approved guidelines for Market Adjustments.

4. Reviewed Maternity/Paternity policy and agreed to let stand as now written. It was felt that asking for six-months leave would be too disruptive to work schedules.

5. Drafted and approved policy to allow Administrative Staff to participate in 125 Plan.

6. Responded to Vice President Martin regarding plan to combine Administrative Staff and Classified Staff Handbooks.

7. Reviewed Administrative Staff Handbook, approved several format and editorial changes.

8. Developed and approved addition to evaluation procedure in Handbook to provide for fair notice to Administrative Staff if there are performance problems.


10. Approved policy to allow supervisors to request closing offices between Christmas and New Years--to be reviewed by Classified Staff Council.

11. Reviewed and made suggestions for revision on University's Request for Proposals for new third-party administrator of University Insurance Plan.

12. Developed and approved plan for promotions and internal searches.

13. Reviewed and endorsed plan for Administrative Staff to have photo identification card to allow coordination with debit card system being implemented for students.

14. Reviewed correspondence relative to use of sick leave in physical plant area and agreed not to intervene unless there are future implications for Administrative Staff.

15. Reviewed correspondence relative to use of Educators Insurance and agreed that ASC need not take action at this time. The use of the insurance should be reviewed if its use becomes a problem among Administrative Staff.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Annmarie Heldt, Executive Director of Personnel

FROM: Jill Carr, Director, Chair, Administrative Staff Council

RE: Promotion Policy

At the June 7, 1990 meeting of the Administrative Staff Council, the Personnel Welfare Committee's proposal for promotions for administrative staff was approved. I am now forwarding the proposed policy to you for forwarding to the appropriate approval channels.

Please note that the Council wishes to emphasize the need for the Director of Affirmative Action and the Executive Director of Personnel to closely monitor the implementation of this policy if it is to work in the fairest and most effective way and in the fashion as designed and intended by ASC. We realize that the potential exists for this policy to be interpreted as a perpetuation of the "old boy's network". We must do everything possible to keep this from happening. Please carry this message forward throughout the approval process.

If you have any questions, please give me a call. As always thank you for your assistance.

JC/jm

Enclosure

cc: Gregg DeCrane
    Greg Jordan
    Norma Stickler
PROMOTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

On April 14, 1977 the University Board of Trustees approved a University Affirmative Action Plan that includes the following statements (p. 23, C & E):

Under procedures developed by the Affirmative Action Office in consultation with the Office of Personnel Support Services and Administrative Staff Personnel Services, a career counseling program will be established to assist lower level employees in achieving career advancement.

The Offices of Personnel Support Services and Administrative Staff Personnel Services, in consultation with the Affirmative Action Office, will develop specific career ladders as a generally sound procedure in personnel management.

The Administrative Staff Council endorses these concepts and urges compliance with the above provisions of the Affirmative Action Plan. As a further step in implementing this policy we recommend that an internal promotion of a member of the University's Administrative Staff may be made without a search. In the case when such a promotion ultimately creates a vacancy within the specific unit or elsewhere within the University, the vacancy created will be filled by the normal recruiting processes. In making the decision for an internal promotion, the supervisor or vice president will discuss the matter in advance with the Director of Affirmative Action and will provide written documentation supporting the proposed promotion. Copies of the documentation will go to the Director of Administrative Staff Personnel Services. Such a promotion must be approved by the appropriate vice president. When the supervisor is the vice president, the vice president should confer with the Director of Affirmative Action.

The Administrative Staff Council urges the Director of Affirmative Action and the Director of Administrative Staff Personnel to work closely with University supervisors and administrative staff to develop career ladders and to identify administrative staff who might become candidates for career advancement within the University, either within their present organizational area or within another organizational area of the University.

The Administrative Staff Council believes that internal promotion serves the interests of both the University and the staff. The staff benefits because of the opportunity to advance without having to change employers. The University benefits because of improved staff morale, improved incentive for staff to function effectively, incentive for quality staff to stay at the University, smoother transitions when staff leave and are replaced from within, enhanced ability to recruit new staff, and decreased costs associated with advertising and interviewing. Affirmative action is not compromised by internal promotion.
RATIONALE:
Morale: Employees who do their job well may reasonably expect to be considered for promotion when an appropriate position becomes vacant. When this expectation is fulfilled, employees feel appreciated; when it is not, they feel cheated and discouraged.

Incentive to perform: An employee who has observed that promotions do occur has good reason to perform at the highest possible level. If, instead, openings are routinely filled from outside, there is little incentive to do more than an adequate job.

Incentive to stay: An employee who is ambitious and capable will seek advancement. If it is not available here, then it will be sought at another institution. We do not want to lose our best staff.

Smother transitions: When people are internally promoted, they are already familiar with not only their own operations, but also the functions and staff of other University offices. Lack of this information in someone hired from outside can result in a long, costly and inefficient period of orientation. Furthermore, newly promoted employees are able to train their own replacements.

Enhanced recruitment: Highly qualified and ambitious people will be more readily attracted to work here if there is opportunity for advancement.

Decreased costs: Searches are costly. When positions are filled by internal promotion, vacancies are created, but they are created at lower levels of responsibility, and the resulting searches may be considerably less expensive. For example, the costs for advertising, and for bringing candidates to campus, are considerably less for a regional search than for a national search.

Affirmative action: Affirmative Action principles are not jeopardized by internal promotion. Ultimately, internal promotion results in a vacancy which can be filled by an external search. Furthermore, while any system can be distorted and abused, internal promotion may in fact make it easier to assure that all protected classes are represented not only in adequate overall numbers, but also in positions of higher responsibility. Perhaps the most effective response to the claim that there is a shortage of qualified applicants for more responsible positions is to train the necessary candidates in-house, on the job, and then promote them.

It should be noted again that the BGSU Affirmative Action Policy (page 23) endorses the principles of internal promotion, career counseling, career advancement, in-house training, and career ladders.

Approved by PWC 4/23/90
STATEMENT

I, ________________, social security number ________________, acknowledge that as a specified condition of continued employment for the position of ________________, at Bowling Green State University, I may be required to have and maintain a valid drivers license and/or a chauffeur's license to operate university-owned or leased vehicles. If, at any time, my license is revoked, or if I place myself in a condition where I am uninsurable with the University's insurance carrier, I understand that I may be assigned duties which do not require operating university-owned or leased vehicles; I may be demoted to a lower classification, or I may be removed from my position at Bowling Green State University. This completed statement form will be a permanent record, to be used on an annual basis to conduct driving record checks.

I further understand situations which may affect my insurability are driver violations in the last three years that:

1. Include one or more of the following serious violations:
   A. Driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs.
   B. Hit and run.
   C. Negligent homicide arising out of the use of a motor vehicle.
   D. Operating during a period of suspension or revocation.
   E. Using a motor vehicle for the commission of a felony.
   F. Operating a motor vehicle without the owners authority (grand theft).
   G. Permitting an unlicensed person to drive.
   H. Reckless operation.
   I. Speed contest (racing).

2. Consists of any combination of accidents and moving violations which total four (4) in number. (All accidents, both at-fault and not-at-fault, are included in the total. The University's Department of Risk Management will determine if not-at-fault accidents can be excluded).

I, therefore, authorize the University's Department of Risk Management to conduct, on an annual basis, whatever steps are necessary to obtain my past driving record.

Date of Birth ________________ Drivers Lic#/State Issued ________________

Signature ________________ Date ________________

Form RM 689-1
Components of any Bowling Green State University employee/dependent health enhancement efforts should involve:

1. Preventive medical services;
2. Health protection;
3. Health promotion.

**BGSU Health Promotion Benefits Package for Faculty/Staff - Proposal**

**Medical A. Preventive Medicine Detection Examinations**

Examinations

To reduce mortality and morbidity of BGSU employees and dependents and thus decrease the resultant medical care costs, a selective approach of medical evaluation per guidelines of the American College of Physicians would be determined by the individual's age and gender. Such optional examinations ranging in cost from $25 to perhaps $500 each would be subsidized once per twelve months by Bowling Green State University.

($270,000) Probable cost: At an average evaluation cost of $250 and with a 25% faculty/staff and dependent participation rate (per the claims director of Benefit Plans Risk Management) a probable final cost of $270,000 results.

Please refer to Appendix A for a proposed schedule of preventive medicine detection examinations.

**E. FITWELL Assessment/Counseling**

(a Student Recreation Center Program)

Positive Lifestyle Promotion

The FITWELL assessment/counseling option now operational for Student Recreation Center members includes:

1. blood pressure screening
2. health risk appraisal (CDC Program)
3. cholesterol screening (total cholesterol)
4. body composition analysis by computer
5. ECG-monitored exercise treadmill examination.

Probable cost: Designed to incite "healthy people" to adopt and adhere to an active lifestyle, current FITWELL assessment/counseling carries a $30 fee if an SPC member. To encourage "shared responsibility" for health promotion it is recommended that the University subsidize the $30 FITWELL assessment fee if the employee/dependent first purchases SPC membership; for non-SPC members the $45 FITWELL assessment fee would require a $15 employee contribution (which is equal to the current BGSU student fee for a FITWELL assessment).

($32,340) Total probable cost: With 25% of BGSU employees and spouses subsidized by BGSU at $30 per FITWELL assessment, the $32,340 cost to the University would enable procurement of additional part-time personnel -- largely graduate assistants -- to enable such additional assessments.

Further detail of FITWELL option is available in Appendix B.
Health is a continuum. The range from illness to lack of illness is only half the range; the other half extends from lack of illness to wellness. It is important to keep in mind that although our ultimate goal is wellness, we must first assure that we achieve a lack of illness. To accomplish this the University provides health benefit to its employees. These benefits for the most part provide access to health care to treat illness. Unfortunately, our current plan does not readily provide access to health care to prevent illness. There are certain preventive medicine interventions which are certainly effective; examples include vaccination against serious infectious disease, screening programs to identify treatable conditions such as high blood pressure. Unfortunately, not all health professionals will agree about which screening procedures are appropriate, or for whom. This provides a problem when trying to design a program that will prevent unnecessary illness, and yet be affordable.

The screening program recommended by this Committee is based on recommendations from the Medical Practice Committee of the American College of Physicians, published in the Annals of Internal Medicine (American, 1981). The Committee recommended that each patient be evaluated on an individualized basis depending on the patient's sex and age. Included in this appendix are their recommendations, as well as an example of a screening program that is currently being provided by Parkside Health Management Corporation of Cleveland.

It is difficult to estimate the financial impact of such a program. In order to make an estimate, the following assumptions were made:

1. Covered testing would be limited to once per twelve-month period;
2. Coverage would include the employee and spouse only;
3. Screening would be available from specific providers who would follow recommended protocols, and who would charge a negotiated schedule of fees;
4. All positive physical findings would be referred to the individual's physician for treatment.

Based on those assumptions, Raleigh Hahn, formerly of Benefit Plans Risk Management, estimated that the cost of this plan would average approximately $125 per employee per year. He estimated that the average cost of an evaluation would be $250, and that 25% of the eligible staff and spouses would take advantage of the program. Mr. Hahn also estimated that although there would be an initial increase in claims, long-range health care savings would result in breaking even in about ten years, and net savings after that.

It should be noted that the above cost estimates do not consider employee morale, improved employee productivity based on better health, or more effective employee recruitment based on a better benefit package.
Periodic Health Examination: A Guide for Designing Individualized Preventive Health Care in the Asymptomatic Patient

MEDICAL PRACTICE COMMITTEE, AMERICAN COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Present data are not adequate evidence justifying annual complete examination of the asymptomatic patient at low medical risk. The American College of Physicians recommends that each internist develop individualized plans for patient examination. Such plans can be developed from the recommendations made in four published studies and summarized in graphic form.

The history taking and physical examination by the personal physician early in the course of ongoing medical care provide a necessary data base as well as an excellent cornerstone for developing and continuing the desirable close relationship between physician and patient. Although thorough histories and physical examinations can be effective mechanisms for detecting significant disease, there are insufficient data to justify annual history-taking and examination of the asymptomatic patient at low medical risk.

The American College of Physicians recommends that in lieu of the traditional annual physical examination each internist develop an individualized plan for preventive health care for each patient. To serve as a guide for tailoring a program for each patient, the College has compiled a graphic summary (Figure 1) of age- and sex-related recommendations from four recent major studies: Frame and Carlson (1), Breslow and Somers (2), Canadian Task Force on Periodic Health Examinations (3), and American Cancer Society (4).

These recommendations represent minimal preventive measures for asymptomatic persons at low medical risk. Furthermore, these recommendations are based on expert opinion and available evidence; continued research is needed to expand and refine the knowledge on which these recommendations are based.

Background

After decades of unquestioned, uncritical acceptance by the medical profession and the public, the effectiveness of a general, nontargeted approach to the periodic health examination for the asymptomatic, apparently healthy person is being questioned. The American College of Physicians' Medical Practice Committee reviewed the recent literature on the periodic health examination. The current state of the art appears to be best reflected in the four major studies described below. These studies led to the conclusion that for the low-risk, asymptomatic patient, prevention and early detection of disease can be better accomplished through a selective approach based on age and sex of the patient.

FRAME AND CARLSON

In 1975, Frame and Carlson (1) noted a lack of a sound scientific basis for the periodic examination. They reviewed 36 diseases selected on the basis of "incidence and prevalence, progression with and without treatment, risk factors associated with development of disease, and availability of screening tests." The feasibility of screening for each disease was analyzed. Justification for screening for a specific disease was based on criteria ranging from the disease's effect on quality and length of life to the availability of tests to detect the disease in asymptomatic patients. If the disease or test did not meet one criterion it was considered ineligible for screening consideration. For example, routine chest roentgenograms is not recommended as a screening procedure for lung cancer or ischemic heart disease. Application of these criteria led Frame and Carlson to propose that physicians select examination procedures in relation to age and sex.

BRESLOW AND SOMERS

In 1977 Breslow and Somers (2) proposed a similar approach in their "Lifetime Health-Monitoring Program," which emphasized the need for cost-effective and health-effective preventive measures to be integrated into patient care. Based on eight clinical and epidemiologic criteria, health goals, and professional services suitable for 10 different age groups were recommended. It should be noted that chest roentgenograms and tonometry are not recommended as routine screening procedures.

CANADIAN TASK FORCE ON PERIODIC HEALTH EXAMINATIONS

In 1979, a Canadian Task Force, which had been established in 1976, published a "lifetime plan for preventive medicine" (3). A group of distinguished clinicians and scientists, assisted by an international group of consultants, identified 78 major preventable conditions affecting Canadians. The world literature was reviewed to ascertain whether early detection of these conditions would be beneficial. The effectiveness of the ensuing treatment or preventive measure, the burden of suffering...
caused by the condition, and the characteristics of the early detection procedure to be used to find the condition” were considered (5).

The Task Force recommended a series of health protection packages, which were based on conditions determined to be preventable at each stage of life. The packages varied in content and frequency of administration according to age and sex. Recommended interventions were rated according to the level of evidence supporting their worth.

The Task Force criticized the focus of the routine annual physical examination on the grounds that it does not reflect the needs of different age groups. Further, it found that there was scant evidence for the efficacy of some of the tests and procedures included in most “routine” examinations as case-finding maneuvers. For example, it did not recommend use of routine electrocardiograms and chest roentgenograms. The Task Force’s main recommendation was that routine annual checkups be replaced by a selective approach determined by age and sex of the patient.

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY

In 1980, the American Cancer Society (4) reevaluated its recommendations on the cancer-related examination. Nine tests and procedures selected because of their potential costs, risks, and benefits were examined. The medical effectiveness of each test and procedure in reducing mor-
Each of the reports is based on clinical and epidemiologic studies and each is concerned with conditions and procedures for which effective interventions are known. The recommendations included in these reports recognize that sound medical practice includes specific procedure to specific age groups and to one or both sexes. Finally, they stress the need for further research.

The recommendations are not intended to be all-inclusive, but they do provide an opportunity for recognizing in relatively low-cost measures that are necessary for patients at increased risk. It is important, however, to emphasize that patients in both the high-risk and low-risk groups by the practicing physicians. The recommendations are not intended to replace the need for differential diagnosis and for counseling on controllable health hazards.
excessive use of alcohol.

The American College of Physicians commends these recommendations to its members and to other clinicians and encourages them to integrate the recommendations into care of patients.

References
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Eff. immediately</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&lt;22 yrs. old</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3 yr. F/T</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26 yrs. old</td>
<td>100% instr. fee</td>
<td>100% instr. fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Financial dependency; age limit of 23 for graduate</td>
<td>100% instr. fees</td>
<td>100% instr. fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>120 days</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Financial dependency; age limit of 23 for graduate</td>
<td>100% instr. fees</td>
<td>100% instr. fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3 yr. F/T</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Age 23</td>
<td>50% of instr. &amp; gen. fees</td>
<td>50% of instr. &amp; gen. fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unclass. staff eff. immediately, classified, 3 yr. full-time</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>200 hrs. (200 hrs. total for program eligibility)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Financial dependency; age limit of 23 for graduate</td>
<td>100% instr. &amp; gen. fees</td>
<td>100% instr. &amp; gen. fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Financial dependency</td>
<td>100% instr. &amp; gen. fees</td>
<td>100% instr. &amp; gen. fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unclass. staff eff. immediately, classified, 1 yr. continuous F/T.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1st degree earned from Toledo.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Financial dependency</td>
<td>100% instr. &amp; gen. fees</td>
<td>100% instr. &amp; gen. fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Eff. immediately</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Financial dependency</td>
<td>100% instr. &amp; gen. fees</td>
<td>100% instr. &amp; gen. fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Financial dependency</td>
<td>100% instr. fee</td>
<td>100% instr. fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>F/T 3 yr. continuous service</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>216 qtr. credit hours or no. of credit hours necessary to complete degree, whichever is less</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Financial dependency</td>
<td>100% instr. &amp; gen. fees</td>
<td>50% instr. &amp; gen. fees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For medical school, amount equals 100% of graduate instructional & general fees.
** In all cases, graduate fee waivers are reported as income to the employee.
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