

Recommendations from Fac. Affair committee re HR policies 3.2019

- 3.16 Nepotism v10
- 3.XX Children in the Workplace v4
- 3.xx Promotion Demotion Transfer Policy v5
- 3.xx Reduction in Force v8
- 3.xx Rehire Eligibility v4

<b>3.xx Rehire Eligibility v4</b>		
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Limitations</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Procedure and definitions are mostly clear.	To whom exactly does this apply: all employees with terminal contracts, or some special circumstances of a personal nature leading to a hiatus? What distinguishes "rehire" from mere "hiring"? Why is something distinct needed for "rehire," if, as it seems, it's just a further assessment of hiring desirability? Agree with Deepak's point as well: won't a further review take place automatically. And does this mean HR is going to consider reversing Departmental hiring decisions if they are "rehire"?	Clarify information to left? Or perhaps there are obvious answers that I'm just not familiar with . . .  Why should we wait for one year? Why not leave the decision up to the hiring manager.  FAR checkbox?
To the point	PROCEDURE 3d seems invalid after 3c since "Employees deemed "Not Recommended for Rehire" remain in such status for one (1) year from separation date". Why would we need 3d in that case?	
		N/A (approve)

<b>3.xx Reduction in Force v8</b>		
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Limitations</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
	<p>I mostly like what I see here, though I would echo Deepak's caveats. My main concern was who makes the determination of "business needs," and it seems a good faith effort has been made to involve unit "leadership" in this determination. I do agree that tenure seems to forestall this procedure, and that is a nuance that needs to be considered. The talk about "human dignity" is strange in a document like this--as well as empty/undefined.</p>	<p>I like the idea to transfer to other positions in spirit, but it seems like a strange, non business-based decision. Employees would be relocated merely to shield them from harm, rather than for reasons of suitability for the position? Perhaps this is where "human dignity" is factored in. If there is another position to which the employee can transfer, how is that saving money or meeting "business needs," unless: it is lower paying, and also currently unstaffed. Perhaps some of these questions will be answered in the "Promotion Demotion Transfer" policy . . .</p>
<p>To the point</p>	<p>This may not be applicable to faculty (especially with tenure) unless it is financial exigency or similar reasons.</p> <p>Need assessment seems too subjective and based only on the leader. Must involve broader discussion.</p> <p>"Separation Date" indicates it may be forced upon the employee.</p> <p>"Separation Pay" seems to be pay for one pay period (unless additional money is factored into the pay). Not sure if this is what we want. There should be a uniform policy for the base (e.g. 2 weeks, 6 months??).</p>	<p>May want to consider that reasonable efforts are made to transfer the displaced employees in other available positions (priority given to them for open positions).</p> <p>PROCEDURE 3f: Clarify whether it is after separation or notice.</p> <p>Worksheet is missing &lt;1 year option in the last "Additional Points" section.</p>
		N/A (approve)

<b>3.xx Promotion Demotion Transfer Policy v5</b>		
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Limitations</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Mostly clear.	What is a "midpoint"? Is a "demotion" considered as moving to a new position, or simply a reduction of the existing position? Does a "demotion" then require an application through the ATS, as a transfer does? It seems as if a transfer would entail the usual hiring procedures being followed and the candidate competing with external applicants, if it is an open position, while the other two scenarios may be distinct?	Again, not sure about all this, but just trying to think it through: perhaps clarify any distinctions between the three scenarios vis a vis hiring/implementation procedures.
To the point.	PROCEDURE #2 may not be correct for demotion cases. This policy does not seem to address leader initiated cases - relies on employees to apply.	Should we consider cases "within" the same unit and/or "under" the same leader?
		N/A (approve)

<b>3.XX Children in the Workplace v4</b>		
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Limitations</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Clear and makes sense.	Typo in Definition 1: "Individuals . . . who IS."	Make either singular or plural. Echo Deepak on "charis."
To the point.	Only covers parents for the children.  "PROCEDURE": #1b could be removed/reworded to indicate that they could not use their authority to do so but otherwise (friendly) requests may be okay. #4 may be limiting and not necessary.	Consider using "... family/ <b>personal</b> " since the children may not necessarily be employee's children Chairs instead of "...Charis" under DEFINITION #3
		N/A (approve)

<b>3.16 Nepotism v10</b>		
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Limitations</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Clear and makes sense, mostly.	Doesn't "perceived" get into a lot of hazy, and perhaps non-material areas, as opposed to definitive situations of conflict? Also, we have "shall not" in 1/2 of the procedure, which seems to be contradicted by the subsequent steps. Overall, how does our recent work on the "consensual relationship" policy affect this document?	Discuss "perceived" scenarios. Consider modifying prohibitive language. Discuss alterations to consensual relationship policy and related changes required here.
To the point	"6. Reporting Relationship: A relationship, direct or indirect" will be an issue since higher level administrative positions may have indirect relationship with another employee at WSU.  7. Student: "... or has a continuing relationship with the University" may including almost everyone. RESPONSIBILITIES/Employee/#2: references to student is not clear.	May want to reconsider indirect and past relationships separately
		N/A (approve)
		No Changes. Approve as is.