

STAFF CONGRESS

Special Meeting - October 22, 1982

AGENDA

- I. Call To Order
- II. Personnel Policies & Benefits Committee Report
 - Recommendation on Staff Evaluations
 - Recommendation on Grievance Procedure
- III. Adjournment

STAFF CONGRESS
October 22, 1982

A special meeting of Staff Congress was held on Friday, October 22, 1982. The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m. and role was taken. A quorum was present.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Terry Andrews, Tom Barlow, Bob Barnes, Dan Bayes, Gail Cato, Pat Coleman, Gary Eith, Shirley Gallicchio, Don Gammon, Jerry Groeschen, Carol Guthier, Barb Herald, Dan Hoskins, Mary Kelm, Bonnie King, Bill Lamb, Joyce Maegly, Steve Priestle, Ken Ramey, Linda Sanders, Dolores Thelen, Nancy Utz, Mike Martin, John Fries, Gregg Schulte (ex officio).

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mike Baker, Cindy Dunaway, Dorinda Giles, Patti Jeffries, Nancy Perry, Pamm Taylor.

Tom Barlow said the meeting would basically be turned over to Linda Sanders, Chairperson of the Personnel Policies & Benefits Committee, to discuss the items on the agenda. Linda referred to the report she had distributed and asked that everyone read Item I dealing with the Proposed Changes to Grievance Procedure. Linda explained that Section A - Summary were the changes presented by Kim Hennessy, and these do not involve the Staff Congress Grievance Committee. She said that these changes need to be approved by Staff Congress before the recommendations of the Staff Congress Grievance Committee are addressed.

Linda then referred to Section B - Recommendation and asked for questions. Don Gammon asked if any consideration had been given to the relative number of people covered in the areas listed. Linda answered that Kim Hennessy felt that the number would probably be increased in order to make sure there were enough people in this pool to pull from as the need arose.

Terry Andrews asked Linda to clarify that pages 1 and 2 are Kim's recommendations to the Board of Regents, and page 3 lists our amendments to her recommendations. Linda said this was correct and said that on page 3, points 1, 2 and 4 are pretty technical. Point 3 is the important one as it allows Staff Congress to recommend eight staff members to the major department head, who in turn will appoint five of these members to the grievance committee pool.

Bill Lamb asked if these eight people had to be members of Staff Congress. Linda answered that they did not have to be.

Bob Barnes asked how Staff Congress would handle the recommendation. Linda said that would be up to the Congress to decide; the Executive Committee could appoint them, or they could be nominated and voted on by Staff Congress.

The chair entertained a motion regarding page 3, Section B - Recommendation. Nancy Utz moved that the recommendation of the Personnel Policies & Benefits Committee be approved. Pat Coleman seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Linda Sanders then read Item II - Staff Evaluation System Recommendations to the Staff Congress. She said that their committee had really put a lot of work in on this issue. She also said they had been helped by Gregg Schulte, Kim Hennessy, and Ray Souder of Business Administration, all of whom had been doing work in this area.

1. Ideally, this would be a correspondence directed to each staff member, or it could be routed through departments. This would help staff to be aware of the procedures involved.
2. Any evaluator doing this work for a department head would be required by that department head to attend training sessions.
3. This could be a project of Personnel Services and Staff Congress, or Continuing Education, or the Business Administration Department, or any appropriate area. Initial sessions would be for on-board personnel. Future sessions could be set up for new employees doing this type of work.
4. This would give a more comprehensive evaluation of an employee. The employee's strengths and weaknesses would be defined and worked on twice a year, allowing for twice as much inter-action. The dates suggested are to emphasize that merit increases should not be based solely on an evaluation, and that there are other objectives than merit behind evaluations.
5. This would allow the employee more time to review the evaluation, which would result in a more intelligent discussion of the evaluation.
6. This point gives the employee a chance to appeal his evaluation if he feels he has a valid objection to his supervisor's evaluation. Otherwise, the employee may feel his only recourse is to file a grievance which he may not wish to pursue. This would also allow the situation to be handled on lower levels, before it possibly gets out of hand.
7. The committee feels there is a need to have some basic policies, such as point 5, developed and included in the Red Book to protect the employees' rights and the supervisors' rights. Technical points such as what type of form to be used, etc., would not be included as these would be subject to change. Presently, what is done in the area of evaluations depends on the Director of Personnel Services. How much say the employees have in the system could possibly change with the next administration.
8. Along with point 7, the committee checked to see what the rights of employees are concerning evaluations. Legally, this area is not protected by Affirmative Action or non-discriminatory laws. Within the University, Gregg Schulte has said that if an employee has a serious problem with his evaluation that cannot be resolved with his supervisor, the employee may file a grievance. However, when Legal Services was contacted, Kim Hennessy said she would not recommend convening a hearing on evaluations. The committee would like to see basic policies and procedures included in the Red Book that would give employees and supervisors guidelines to follow.

Carol Guthier asked if the employee is still not satisfied after his supervisor has reviewed his evaluation, can the employee take it any further. Linda Sanders answered that the procedures have to be developed, but she sees this as possibly following the grievance procedure, where you do go through the chain of command.

Staff Congress
October 22, 1982
Page 3

Tony Escamilla of Student Government asked what caused Staff Congress to undertake this study of evaluations. Linda Sanders said that it was not prompted by any current procedures, this study was brought about when Personnel Services developed a new evaluation form and asked for input from Staff Congress. Also, we have had several types of evaluations and it was felt that a set procedure was needed.

Bob Barnes asked about point 5, should the supervisor fill out the form before giving it to the employee, as opposed to the supervisor and the employee filling it out together. Linda Sanders said that this does not say how the evaluation is to be completed, just that after it is completed the employee should have at least five working days to review it. It was suggested that the employee make a list of the job duties he feels he performs, and he and the supervisor go over this.

Gregg Schulte said the five working days will give the employee a chance to digest the material on the form and in doing so become prepared for the interview with the evaluator.

Gary Eith asked how in point 8 an evaluation is invalidated. Linda Sanders said that invalid means starting over, which is what they are suggesting. The whole evaluation would be done over.

The chair entertained a motion regarding page 4, Item II - Recommendations. Ken Ramey commended Linda Sanders for a fine job and moved that the Staff Evaluation System Recommendations, Item II, be approved. Gail Cato seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Linda Sanders thanked Ken and said she wanted to thank her committee for all the hard work they have done.

Don Gammon moved to adjourn and Gary Eith seconded the motion. The vote was taken and this motion passed unanimously.

REPORT TO CONGRESS

PERSONNEL POLICIES AND BENEFITS COMMITTEE

October 22, 1982

I. Proposed Changes to Grievance Procedure

II. Staff Evaluation System

I

PROPOSED CHANGES TO GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

A

SUMMARY

There will be proposed to the Board of Regents, at their November, 1982 meeting, several changes in the Grievance Procedure as outlined in the Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual. These changes are designed to resolve a potential conflict of interest and to allow for a pool of employees, appointed for a one year term, from which grievance hearing committees would be selected.

Kim Hennessy, University Counsel, presented these proposed changes to the Personnel Policies and Benefits Committee, and participated in discussion concerning them. The proposed changes can be summarized as follows:

1. The University Counsel will no longer serve as the impartial hearing officer. The University Counsel cannot serve as the impartial hearing officer and still act as advisor to the University.
2. The Affirmative Action Coordinator role and the University Counsel role are no longer separated: they reside in one office. The Affirmative Action Coordinator is excised from the grievance proceedings. The role of the Affirmative Action Coordinator is one of ensuring compliance with the law, not one of hearing grievances. The Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual, Section G3.5.1, as amended, reads:

In cases of alleged illegal discrimination the employee also has the right to seek the advice of the Director of Personnel Services at any time during the grievance proceedings.
3. The grievant's attorney may participate in the hearing only by privately advising the grievant. He may not address the other participants in the hearing.
4. Extension in time for filing or responding to a grievance may be granted by the Director of Personnel Services, rather than by the University Counsel.
5. The University's major divisions will each contribute five staff members, appointed by the major department head, to a pool from which grievance committees can be chosen. The major divisions named are Business Affairs, Institutional Support, Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Care will be taken to ensure adequate representation of women and minorities. These pool members will serve for one year, and will be trained in hearing procedures. Sections G3.17 and G3.18 concern the makeup of the Grievance Committee and its responsibilities. They are amended to read (in toto) as follows:

G3.17 The Grievance Review Committee will be comprised of three (3) impartial members who are chosen from the Grievance Review Committee pool as outlined in G3. Those appointed shall be from

units outside the department of the grievant. One employee shall be designated Chairperson of the Committee. The Committee shall investigate the grievance, accumulate and study the facts in the case, and conduct all necessary hearings. The grievant may be accompanied by a person who may give advice but may not otherwise represent the party.

G3.18 The chairperson of the Committee shall rule on questions of procedure. In addition, the chairperson shall reduce to writing and forward to the President the Committee's findings and recommendations for disposition. Within a period of ten (10) working days after notification of Committee appointment, unless extended for cause by the Committee chairperson, the Committee shall fulfill its charge.

Ms. Hennessy has indicated that, provided enough interest is shown by Law School faculty, they will form a pool from which an impartial hearing officer will be chosen for each grievance committee, eliminating the requirement for a chairperson.

Also, the intent is, in accordance with the original sections, that the Grievance Committee members and the chairperson or hearing officer will be appointed by the President.

B

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation of the Personnel Policies and Benefits Committee concerning the above changes is that these changes be approved with the following amendments:

1. Re-designation of the major divisions contributing to the grievance committee pool to reflect the recent reorganization: that is, the re-designated areas are: Administrative Affairs, Student Affairs, and Academic Affairs.
2. Increase the number of staff members chosen from each major division, to accommodate the smaller number of divisions.
3. The five or more staff members appointed to the grievance committee pool by each major department head will be chosen from eight staff members recommended by Staff Congress for each area.
4. Include the procedure for appointment of the grievance committee members and chairperson or hearing officer in Section G3.17 and G3.18.

II

STAFF EVALUATION SYSTEM

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Personnel Policies and Benefits Committee proposes the following recommendations concerning the staff evaluation system:

1. Provide uniform information and guidelines concerning each staff evaluation period directly to staff, rather than each department head interpreting to his staff.
2. Department heads require the attendance of all evaluators at training sessions.
3. Develop a workshop for training NKU supervisory personnel in evaluation and interviewing techniques.
4. Evaluate all staff semi-annually; the suggested periods are the end of January and the end of July.
5. The completed evaluation must be submitted to the employee for review at least five working days before the scheduled interview with the evaluator.
6. The employee may indicate, in a section provided on the form, if he wishes to review his evaluation with the next higher supervisor; by this indication, the next higher supervisor is obligated to provide an interview with the employee, not later than five working days after the initial evaluating interview. The evaluation is not complete until this review has taken place and the next higher supervisor has approved the evaluation.
7. Develop basic policies and procedures concerning the staff evaluation system for inclusion in the Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual.
8. Non-compliance with mandatory procedures (e.g. items 5 and 6 above) can invalidate the evaluation.

POLICY STATEMENT

Northern Kentucky University encourages its employees to participate in employee governance groups, professional associations corresponding with one's University responsibilities and to serve on University committees. Employees serving in these capacities will be granted reasonable time to attend meetings as long as such attendance does not detrimentally affect the operations of the University. Preparation for such meetings or completion of tasks associated with these University of professional groups/committees is to be accomplished outside the employees normal working hours and must not delay or otherwise interfere with the performance of regular work assignments. Each employee involved in a University or professional group/committee is urged to discuss these activities with his/her supervisor.