

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
TELEPHONE (217) 333-1482



INSTITUTE OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS  
504 EAST ARMORY AVENUE, CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS 61820



RECEIVED

MAR 27 1973

VICE CHANCELLOR FOR  
ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS

March 26, 1973

To: Members of the Special Committee on Professional Personnel

From: M. Rothbaum *MR*

Enclosed are copies of our report, the transmittal letter to President Corbally, and a letter that I have sent to Barry Munitz for his views on where (if anyplace) we should go next.

I will be in touch with you as soon as I have further information.

Enclosures

*Jan B*

# UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

249 ILIR

March 26, 1973

Vice-President Barry Munitz  
378 Administration

Dear Vice-<sup>Barry</sup>President Munitz:

I am enclosing a copy of a report on Personnel Policy Guidelines for Academic Administrative and Professional Employees that has just been forwarded to President Corbally. In view of the considerable time that has elapsed since the Special Committee on Professional Personnel was appointed, we thought it would be appropriate to consult with you again about the direction of the Committee's work.

There are several possibilities, some of which are not necessarily mutually exclusive:

(1) The report may suggest further work that should be done in the same area. This might involve clarification or amplification of specific parts of the report, analysis of responses to the report from the campuses, or both.


(2) The Committee might move on to one of its two remaining charges. One relates to the Merit Board problem. When we discussed this last time, we agreed that the next step was basically an administrative job of organizing the University's reply to the Merit Board and was not appropriate for our Committee. If there are any policy issues that you would like to have us consider, we would be happy to do so.

The other area comes under the rubric of "long-range improvement" and probably should be defined more explicitly. That part which relates to the work of the Fleming Committee has been partially covered in the enclosed report.

(3) There may be some other problems in the general area of the Committee's interest that deserve greater priority.

(4) None of the above have very high priority at the present time and the Committee's work should be terminated.

We would appreciate any guidance that you may wish to give us on this matter.

  
Melvin Rothbaum, Chairman  
Special Committee on Professional  
Personnel

# UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

March 23, 1973

TO: President John E. Corbally, Jr.

FROM: Special Committee on Professional Personnel

RE: Report on Personnel Policy Guidelines for Academic Administrative and Professional Employees

In your letter of appointment dated September 30, 1971, you charged the Special Committee on Professional Personnel to explore three areas of University personnel policy. Vice-President Barry Munitz was designated your liaison to the Committee. In discussions with Vice-President Munitz, it was agreed that priority should be given to the problem of developing personnel policies for academic administrative and professional employees.

Enclosed are three copies of the Committee's report on this subject. While we believe that the report is self-contained, there are a few additional items that we wish to call to your attention.

As you know, the members of the Committee were drawn from the three campuses on the recommendation of the Chancellors. While individual committee members made some effort to secure opinions from campus colleagues and interested campus groups, the report is the collective opinion of the Committee members as individuals and does not represent the position or opinion of either the individual campuses or any particular groups on the campuses.

During the course of the Committee's work, Dean Alfred Maurice of the Chicago Circle campus was replaced by Vice-Chancellor Robert Bentz. We wish to acknowledge the important contributions made by Dean Maurice during his tenure on the Committee. We also wish to acknowledge the participation of Assistant Vice-Chancellor Carolyn Burrell, who is in charge of the Office of Academic Personnel for the Urbana-Champaign campus. Her assistance contributed significantly to the Committee's work

Hale C. Bartlett  
Robert P. Bentz  
John W. Briscoe  
John J. Desmond  
Anthony J. Diekema  
Oscar S. Smith  
Ward L. Walhay  
Melvin Rothbaum, Chairman

PERSONNEL POLICY GUIDELINES

FOR ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

Report of the Special Committee on Professional Personnel

March 20, 1973

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page Number</u>
Background	2
Administrative Control	5
Employee Participation in Personnel Policy and Grievance Procedures	7
Grievance Procedure	9
Job Description and Job Structure	12
Recruitment and Hiring	15
Performance Review	17
Transfer and Promotion	19
Compensation	22
Fringe Benefits	25
Involuntary Termination	28

In his letter to the Special Committee on Professional Personnel (SCPP) dated September 30, 1971, President Corbally suggested three areas of personnel policy and practice that were of special interest. This report is addressed to the first of those items.

"Improvement of the unsatisfactory employment status of administrative and professional personnel who do not enjoy the rights, privileges, and protection either of the University Civil Service System or of the tenure provisions of the University of Illinois Statutes."

It should be noted that many administrative and professional personnel are employed under the Civil Service System. However, consistent with the above charge, the committee has limited its study to employees with academic appointments. We have considered the status of similar employees under the Civil Service System only when interaction between the two groups raised significant policy questions for the academic appointees.

Early in its work, the SCPP decided that it could best carry out this study by concentrating on general policy statements rather than on detailed rules and regulations. Thus we have attempted to identify the major areas in which personnel policy decisions are needed, to clarify the issues involved, and to suggest guidelines for policy and procedures. Recommendations for specific language to implement the guidelines can be generated more appropriately and effectively by the campus employees and administrators who will have to live with them. The SCPP will be happy to review such recommendations if that should be considered desirable.

In carrying out this project, we have been guided by the following general criteria. University-wide personnel policy guidelines

- (1) Should provide both effective management tools for administrators and equitable conditions of employment for employees.
- (2) Should be flexible enough to permit differences in implementation on the various campuses.
- (3) Should be consistent with each other but, insofar as possible, capable of being implemented independently.
- (4) Should encourage the systematic participation of employees.
- (5) Should help produce equitable and defensible individual personnel decisions and clearly define the administrators who are responsible for making those decisions.
- (6) Should maintain the maximum flexibility for unit heads consistent with the achievement of the desired objectives.

More detailed discussion of these criteria is provided at appropriate points in the following sections.

Finally it should be noted that various aspects of the committee's charge have been the subject of previous studies. The most important of these are the report of the ad hoc committee chaired by Professor Robben Fleming in the mid-1960's and the more recent reports from the committees chaired by Professor William McPherson at Urbana-Champaign and Dean Nan McGehee at Chicago Circle. Our committee has carefully studied these documents and, in some cases, has incorporated material from them into our own report.

#### BACKGROUND

The academic administrative and professional employees with whom this report is concerned are broadly defined in the following fashion: they constitute all those employees of the University who occupy positions that

are not defined either as faculty\* or as Civil Service positions. This comprehensive definition is based on the type of positions and completely abstracts from the status of the individual occupying any particular position. There is a separate question as to whether employees in all of these positions (either because of the nature of the position or the status of the employee) should be included in the constituency of an employee advisory organization. This matter is discussed in the section on Employee Participation in Personnel Policy and Grievance Procedures.

Our best estimate is that there are approximately 1,300 such employees. There are about 200 at Chicago Circle, 170 at the Medical Center and 930 at Urbana-Champaign. They include an extremely diverse group of administrative, technical and professional occupations; and the occupational composition differs substantially among the campuses.

Historically there has been little in the way of a centralized personnel approach to this group of employees. As a result, job titles, compensation structures, and other conditions of employment have been determined mainly by the decentralized departments or other units for whom they work. In addition, there is some occupational overlap between this group and the Civil Service System. A separate study is in progress at the request of the Merit Board to determine the appropriate jurisdiction of the two groups and may result in some movement of positions between them. Such changes should have little, if any, effect on our recommendations.

Similarly questions have been raised as to whether some positions that now have faculty rank (for example, librarians) should be transferred to the

\* The committee recognizes that the word "faculty" is defined somewhat differently by the University Civil Service System, the University Statutes, and the various campus Senates. Nevertheless it appears to be the most appropriate descriptive term available for the purpose at hand.



academic administrative and professional category. Since this is a matter in which the faculty clearly should have direct input, we have considered it an inappropriate subject for a committee that has no provision for formal faculty representation.

It is fair to say that no personnel policy system currently exists for academic administrative and professional employees on any of the campuses. Units differ substantially in their personnel practices and many make personnel decisions essentially on an ad hoc basis. The resulting frustration, inequity and insecurity has increasingly generated a sense of disenchantment among this vital and dedicated group of University employees. The need for a fair and effective personnel system is clear. The main problem is to institute it in such a way that desirable areas of flexibility under current practices are retained.

#### Functions of a Personnel System

A sound personnel system has two fundamental and complementary purposes. First, it would serve as an effective managerial mechanism to aid in the planning and direction of the University's academic administrative and professional labor force. This includes the forecasting of manpower needs and the development of policies in such areas as recruitment, job structures, compensation and benefits, equal employment opportunity, training, performance evaluation, transfer, promotion, layoff and discipline. The performance of these functions also requires at least overall administrative direction for purposes of planning, operations and review.

Second, a sound personnel system would meet the needs of employees for fair treatment, professional development and advancement, and a reasonable degree of security. Such a system includes the opportunity to participate in personnel policy decisions, clear and explicit policies, and a formal

grievance procedure for appeals from individual personnel decisions. Because of the professional and semi-professional nature of most of the jobs, personnel policies for academic administrative and professional employees should focus particular attention on the development of individual employee capabilities and, insofar as the job structure permits, advancement within the University.

It should be emphasized that the two functions are, for the most part, complementary in nature. Effective management need not be sacrificed to meet employee needs, or vice versa. On the contrary, the best personnel practices reinforce both good management practice and good working conditions.

#### Organization of the Report

The initial sections of this report deal with the managerial administrative structure and mechanisms for insuring employee participation in decision processes relating to personnel policy and grievances. The remaining sections are concerned with specific personnel policy issues.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL

The current administrative structure is inadequate for carrying out the personnel functions relating to academic administrative and professional employees. The problem will worsen as more uniform and formal policies are adopted which require consistent administration, and as the liaison requirements with employee groups expand.

The functional needs can be grouped under four categories:

(1) Manpower planning. Leadership is needed at the campus and University levels to institute and coordinate manpower planning. This would involve (a) a forecast of future manpower needs, (b) a skill inventory of the current labor force and expected attrition rates, and (c) an analysis of the manpower gaps

indicated by the difference between (a) and (b). Such a planning effort would provide an early warning of possible surpluses requiring termination and transfers. It also would provide important career-opportunity information for performance reviews and a factual basis for expanding or contracting internal training programs.

(2) Personnel actions and records. Processing and record keeping associated with the approval of appointments, changes in status, requests for leave, and changes in budgetary sources should be centralized at the campus level (or at the University level in the case of general University staff).

(3) Personnel policies. Again leadership is needed at the campus, and in some cases at the University, level in the development, operation, and evaluation of specific personnel policies. Existing policies should be systematically evaluated and recommendations prepared for new or revised ones where needed. In terms of operations, this function might include such items as reviewing requests for the establishment of new positions, insuring compliance with hiring and transfer policies, acting (or recommending action) on grievances referred to the Office of the Chancellor, and assisting unit heads with personnel problems.

(4) Liaison with employees. The current development of advisory committees for academic administrative and professional personnel, and the possible development of other forms of employee organization in the future, require the designation of a formal channel of communication within the campus administration. The liaison function would provide for an exchange of information and insure the appropriate employee participation in personnel activities.

#### Recommendations

There should be an officer or staff member in the Office of the

Chancellor with formal responsibility for academic administrative and professional employee personnel functions. Whether this function requires full-time or part-time assignment probably will have to await further experience with the work-loads involved, and it may well vary by campus. The critical point is that the locus of responsibility be clear and that both administrators and employees are aware that a particular individual has formally been assigned this responsibility.

At the University level, it also would be useful to have the responsible University officer or staff member clearly designated. However, the functions at this level would consist mainly of a coordinative and leadership role.

#### EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION IN PERSONNEL POLICY AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

Historically the academic administrative and professional employees have been the only major employee group in the University which has enjoyed neither detailed formal regulations and policies nor a clear representative channel for the voicing of suggestions and complaints regarding the terms and conditions of their employment. Both the faculty through the Senate and the Faculty Advisory Committee and the nonacademic employees through formal advisory committees and the nonacademic grievance system have had such benefits for many years.

This situation has changed substantially in the last year. An elected Professional Advisory Committee (PAC) for academic administrative and professional employees is currently operating at Urbana-Champaign. Appointed PAC's at Chicago Circle and the Medical Center are studying alternative employee representation structures and are expected to report their conclusions this year.

Since it resides outside the strictly employment relationship, we have not addressed ourselves to the role, if any, of the professional employee in

matters of University governance. However, the matter is sufficiently related to the status of academic administrative and professional employees that it seems appropriate to note it here. These employees clearly represent a source of input into the deliberative processes relating to governance. Any future role probably will differ among the campuses, largely because the faculty senate traditions vary greatly. It might take the form, for example, of liaison, associate or full membership in the faculty senate or in senate committees. The role which is ultimately carved out in this substantive and sensitive area is one which is best created by the campus PAC's working with their respective campus leadership traditions.

#### Functions of a PAC

The most important characteristic of a PAC is that it provides a group of employee representatives who can participate in personnel matters on a continuing and systematic basis. It is an advisory body and consultative resource that has two major functions:

(1) It can offer advice and consultation, either upon its own initiative or upon the request of an administrative officer, in regard to the formulation of rules and policies relating to the employment relationship.

(2) It can consider individual problems relating to the employment relationship upon the initiative of an individual employee or upon the request of an administrative officer.

#### Recommendations

The University should encourage the establishment of a PAC or similar representative group on each of the campuses. Differences among the PAC's in the form of their representation system, the scope of their interests, and their positions on substantive issues are both viable and healthy. However, we believe that uniformity in a few basic areas is desirable.

(1) The representatives should be chosen by the employee constituency.

(2) Except for certain senior administrative positions designated by the Chancellor (or by the President in the case of general University staff), the constituency should encompass all of the academic administrative and professional employee positions in order to avoid further fractionalizing the personnel system.\*

(3) The scope of their functions should include advice and consultation in the two major areas of general personnel policies and individual employee grievances.

#### GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

The policy questions raised by the establishment of the grievance procedure recommended in the previous section are discussed below.

(1) Should the procedure be advisory or binding? Individual employment problems could be handled through a grievance procedure with definite internal steps and appeal to final and binding arbitration. We suggest that the Faculty Advisory Committee model, which provides a flexible investigative and mediatory approach, is more appropriate for academic administrative and professional employees. This function would be performed by the campus PAC or similar employee organization. As is the case with the Faculty Advisory Committee, its recommendations would rest upon its persuasive and moral authority and its reasoning.

(2) How should the goal of the grievance activity be defined? Consistent with the mediatory approach suggested above, we believe PAC members involved in the grievance procedure should seek to promote the best interests of the

\* For certain individuals, a question may arise as to whether the appropriate grievance channel should be the Faculty Advisory Committee or the Professional Advisory Committee. These jurisdictional matters are best left to the two organizations to work out on a case-by-case basis.

University and all of its employees rather than serve as a representative or advocate of the individual. However, they clearly would have the responsibility to seek proper and equitable treatment for the grievant.

(3) Are there general and widely acceptable standards available to guide the parties in grievance activities? We suggest that there are five basic sources against which the behavior of individuals or the circumstances of employment can be evaluated.

(a) The contract of employment.

(b) Overriding legal requirements, such as those prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, religion, or sex.

(c) Generalized concepts of good management practice, such as those which would dictate that employees be adequately informed of their duties and of the quality of their performance.

(d) Generalized concepts of the traditional responsibilities of employment, such as those which would dictate that employees perform their assigned tasks in a conscientious and competent manner.

(e) Generalized concepts of appropriate and traditional reciprocal courtesies which should attend professional employment, such as those which, affirmatively, would dictate a spirit of mutual respect and cooperation, and, negatively, would proscribe conduct that would interfere with the effective performance of the duties and responsibilities of others.

(4) What kind of individual problems should be handled through the grievance procedure? Most of the problems probably would consist of allegations of unjust, illegal, inequitable, or arbitrary treatment in the employment relationship. However, we believe that it would be unwise to try and specify permissible and prohibited problems. These jurisdictional issues are best resolved by the grievance committees themselves, perhaps largely on an ad hoc basis.

(5) What are the major issues relating to the structure of the grievance procedure? Since considerable material is available from campus reports and the operation of the Faculty Advisory Committee, only a few items have been selected below for special emphasis.

(a) Unlike the general policy area, PAC members would not act on their own initiative in regard to individual employment problems. They would act only on the request of an employee, or of an administrative officer who seeks advice concerning actions he or she should take with respect to an employee.

(b) There should be written Articles of Procedure for handling grievances and these should be approved by the Chancellor of each campus.

(c) The handling of grievances within the procedure should be informal and flexible, provide opportunities for full presentation of views by all parties concerned, and protect the confidentiality of any information obtained.

(d) The PAC should have the option of forwarding recommendations to the Chancellor in cases in which they have not been able to resolve the grievance.

(e) An annual report by the PAC should be made to its constituency on activities in the individual grievance area. This report should not include details of individual cases but should concern itself with the volume and nature of the workload.

#### Recommendations

1. The PAC or similar employee organization on each campus should provide a mechanism for the resolution of individual employee problems relating to the employment relationship.

2. The procedures should be advisory in nature and mediatory in approach.



3. The general goal guiding the activities of the grievance committee should be the overall welfare of the University and its employees.

4. In evaluating grievances, generalized standards should be drawn from contractual and legal obligations, as well as from generalized notions of good management practice, of traditional responsibilities of employment, and of traditional and reciprocal courtesies attending professional employment.

5. Within the general constraint that the problem relate to the employment relationship, the PAC's should define the issues that lie within the jurisdiction of the grievance procedure through experience.

6. The procedure itself should have certain characteristics, noted above, which would insure informality, flexibility, confidentiality, and due process.

7. The activities carried on in this area should be reported to the constituency on an annual basis.

#### JOB DESCRIPTION AND JOB STRUCTURE

With the exception of a few units, adequate information is not now available on the content of, and relationships among, academic administrative and professional positions in the University. The securing of this information is critical to many other aspects of the development of the personnel system.

For example, job descriptions are important for placement (whether by outside recruitment, transfer, or promotion), for equitable performance evaluation, and as the basis for classifying positions in the job structure. The job structure itself is basic to manpower planning, to the establishment of promotional ladders, to staff development, to rationalization of job titles into a smaller number of functional titles, and to rationalization of the compensation system in line with the job structure. In addition, information about job descriptions and the job structure can make an important contribution to the University's affirmative action program.

### Alternative Approaches

Of the several approaches to this problem reviewed by the SCPP, two appear to be worth further consideration. They vary in their comprehensiveness and may involve different demands in terms of time and budgetary expenditures.

(1) The most comprehensive approach would involve a centralized study with personnel experts writing or reviewing job descriptions and using these as a basis for the establishment of a formal job classification system. The University of Michigan recently completed such a study using outside consultants. The resulting job classifications were then tied into salary grades for compensation purposes. In addition, separate systems were developed for research personnel. It should be noted that the University of Michigan study included some employees who, at the University of Illinois, would already be covered by the Civil Service System. However, a similar study just for academic administrative and professional employees at the University of Illinois would probably also require the use of outside consultants.

(2) A less comprehensive approach could involve the following: (a) The development of a uniform job description format and the subsequent preparation of job descriptions for all academic administrative and professional employees by the individual administrative units. (b) The preparation of simple organizational charts to indicate job relationships. (c) The establishment of a review mechanism to insure consistency. Even in this study, those responsible for the review function might find it desirable to work with an outside consultant at critical points in the development and implementation of the study.

### Recommendations

Regardless of which approach is followed, we wish to emphasize both the

high priority that the committee places on rationalization of the job structure and our belief that it cannot be accomplished without a strong University commitment in terms of effort and financial resources.

The first approach is preferable because it has the advantage of dealing systematically with the complex of description, classification, and salary problems and of providing an integrated and operational personnel policy in these areas. However, it probably will involve substantial consultant and implementation costs. Certain aspects of the classification and cost problems that relate specifically to wages and salaries are discussed in the section on Compensation below.

If the first approach is not feasible, then the second approach should yield some useful results if the study is done on a released-time basis. We do not believe that a casual study performed as an additional duty will be very fruitful. The uniform job descriptions would permit some comparative analysis within and especially among units, and the organizational charts would yield the first solid information on the nature of job relationships. Together they would provide a minimal factual base for future personnel planning. In operational terms, it would probably permit partial rationalization of the job classification and salary structure.

In adopting these or any other new approaches, extensive participation by the employees and administrators affected is essential. No other changes in the personnel system are likely to create more anxiety than reorganization of the job and salary structure. Employee status and pay and administrative autonomy are at stake. Only extensive participation is likely to yield a final product that most persons will support as fair and workable.

### RECRUITMENT AND HIRING

The ability to recruit and hire competent and often highly specialized personnel has been one of the strengths of the current academic administrative and professional employee system. The hiring process is very flexible. Decisions are made on a decentralized basis. There are no geographic or other limitations on recruitment. Units are, for the most part, free to define the positions, to slot them into their job structure, and to set the compensation levels that they believe are most appropriate for their needs. They also are free to move promptly in the hiring process with relatively few constraints on their selection procedures. The goal of any future personnel policy should be the removal of inequities and the rationalization of the current system without impairing its obvious advantages.

Historically much of the expansion of the academic administrative and professional employee group has resulted from the relative difficulty of hiring under the more restrictive Civil Service procedures. In addition, lack of flexibility in regard to the utilization and compensation of employees also has been an important contributing factor. Future studies should review the hiring procedures for higher-level positions in the Civil Service system with an eye to providing greater flexibility. If this were done, the hiring process would be a lesser factor in determining the distribution of employees between the two personnel systems. However, that subject is beyond the scope of this report.

The following comments emphasize the major policy issues relating to recruitment and hiring:

1. It is currently impossible to engage in any manpower planning for academic administrative and professional employees on a campus or University basis in regard to hiring, layoff, or career guidance. This matter is

discussed in the section on Administrative Control.

2. The major responsibility for hiring should remain decentralized at the level of the employing unit. Given the diversity of positions in this employee group, centralization of hiring decisions is likely to result in delay and frustration without any significant compensating contribution to the quality of the decisions being made.

3. The hiring process is often the point at which anomalies and inequities in job relationships and compensation become established. Such actions can be avoided if hiring takes place within a more rationalized system. Suggestions for accomplishing this are discussed in the sections on Job Description and Job Structure and on Compensation.

4. The affirmative action employment program has introduced new constraints into the hiring process and these have been the subject of new personnel policy statements in recent years. We would simply point out that the recommendations in this report reinforce these existing policies. The job descriptions and analyses recommended are an important tool for assuring the relevancy of the selection process to the actual job content. And the final job descriptions provide the basic data for use in the job search itself.

5. Some existing recruitment procedures unnecessarily narrow the career opportunities for current employees by depriving them of knowledge of job openings outside of their own unit. Suggestions for the publicizing of vacancies are discussed in the section on Transfer and Promotion.

A related problem involves the difficulty of employees laid off in one unit securing access to job opportunities in other units. Suggestions for procedures that go beyond a simple publicizing of vacancies are discussed in the section on Involuntary Termination.

### Recommendations

The recommendations here and in various other parts of the report that

relate to recruitment and hiring may be summarized briefly as follows:

1. Forecasts of manpower needs should be developed for purposes of manpower planning and career guidance.

2. The major responsibility for hiring should remain decentralized.

3. A more rationalized job structure and compensation system should be developed, in part to prevent the introduction of anomalies and inequities through the hiring process.

4. A few procedural constraints on the hiring process are justified in terms of broader legal and personnel policy objectives:

a. The existing policies on affirmative action are necessary to meet the University's legal and moral commitments in this area.

b. Job vacancies should be announced to current employees. In the case of current employees subject to layoff and recent former employees already laid off, there should be an internal employment clearinghouse. Units hiring new employees should be required to consider listed employees with the appropriate skills on the basis of relative merit and consistent with affirmative action guidelines.

#### PERFORMANCE REVIEW

That employees should have a clear understanding of their employer's job expectations and of their own performance and career opportunities appears to be stating the obvious. In practice this important information often is transmitted incompletely and obliquely with resultant frustration and misunderstanding. For academic administrative and professional employees the problem is further complicated by the nonroutine nature of many of their positions. Tasks tend to be added or deleted in response to changing demands on the unit and the capabilities of the individuals involved.

While evaluation and feedback should take place throughout the year, the main concern here is with the establishment of a periodic and formal performance review. Evaluation of past performance is a proper function of such a review. However, its most constructive and beneficial use would emphasize job goals and expectations for the coming year and the development of the employee's skills and career opportunities.

### Recommendations

A system of performance reviews should be established for academic administrative and professional employees. The key issues that have to be considered are frequency, type, and procedures.

- (1) Frequency. An annual review should be adequate for ongoing employees. More frequent reviews are unlikely to yield sufficiently more valuable results to justify the time involved. However, more frequent performance reviews can be helpful for new staff members.
- (2) Type. Existing evaluation systems are available that could be adopted and applied uniformly throughout the University or uniformly on each of the campuses. These systems employ a variety of rating devices to rank employees on, for example, such items as work performance, cooperativeness or other attitudes, and potential for advancement. We do not believe that these structured rating systems are either necessary or desirable for academic administrative and professional employees. A more flexible approach (constrained only by the procedural requirements below) is less likely to be applied in a perfunctory manner and more likely to provide a constructive milieu for the performance reviews.

(3) Procedures. The following procedures should be part of the annual performance review:

- (a) That the review include (but not be limited to) a personal interview with the employee to discuss job performance, goals, and expectations.
- (b) That the supervisor provide the employee with a brief written report of the evaluation

#### TRANSFER AND PROMOTION

While no statistics on interunit and intercampus mobility were available to the committee, our impressionistic view is that decentralized hiring of academic administrative and professional employees has limited such movement. In any case, there is no procedural arrangement that would serve to encourage it. In addition, it should be recognized that individual units might not welcome such procedures for fear that they would complicate or delay the hiring process and encourage interunit raiding of personnel.

Nevertheless a strong case can be made that both the University and its employees would gain from policies that increase mobility within the system. The basic argument for such mobility is that it opens up ladders of promotion that otherwise are not available, that it permits employees to find a better job "fit" even in a lateral transfer, and that both of these lead to a better use of employees' capabilities and to a more productive and satisfied labor force.

#### Policies to increase mobility

The key elements in a mobility policy would be the timely announcement and widespread dissemination of job vacancy information and the encouragement of employees who believe that they have the appropriate qualifications to transfer



or promote into the available positions. It should be noted also that certain fringe benefit policies, particularly vacations and sick leave, create obstacles to transfers between academic and nonacademic positions (hereafter referred to as intersystem transfers). It is possible that a review of these policies might reduce these obstacles and encourage intersystem transfers. This problem is discussed in greater detail in the section on Fringe Benefits below.

The major impact of the above changes probably would be on intracampus transfers within the academic administrative and professional group. However, they might also create some opportunities for intercampus and intersystem transfers as well. It should be emphasized that these policies do not involve any change in the existing hiring authority of the appropriate unit heads.

#### Promotion policies

Promotions resulting from interunit transfer present no special problems as long as hiring authority remains decentralized. Unit heads would evaluate the qualifications of both current University employees and outside applicants for the vacant positions.

However, most promotions undoubtedly take place within units, are initiated by the unit head, and require approval of the appropriate campus officer. This campus approval function is mainly administrative in nature to assure that the proper procedural steps are followed and that the required funds are available.

This differs sharply from both the faculty system of promotion committees and the nonacademic system employing formal testing procedures. In our opinion, the former would be unnecessarily burdensome. Most academic administrative and professional positions have neither the job requirements nor tenure implications to justify such action. The latter would impose an

enormous administrative burden to develop and implement a testing program and probably would reduce the flexible utilization of this group of employees.

A middle ground between the current situation of no external review and these more formal systems might be the institution of a brief "Statement of Justification for Promotion" to accompany the request for approval of a contract change. This statement would indicate the requirements of the new job, as well as the employee's formal qualifications and past performance as reflected in performance reviews.

The major gain from such an innovation would be the encouragement of a deliberate and thoughtful approach to the promotion of academic administrative and professional personnel by unit heads. At the same time, it would provide an opportunity for the campus review officer to raise questions in a few cases about which there may be serious reservations. Should there be future changes in the organization of employees or the centralization of personnel decisions, this policy would serve as a bridge to these more formal operating procedures. Finally, the combined effect of the regularization of the promotion system, performance reviews, and job vacancy announcements, (particularly if they are combined with the adoption of a job classification system) should be to increase the number of promotional opportunities among academic administrative and professional employees.

#### Recommendations

The University should explicitly adopt a policy that encourages internal mobility. Job vacancy information should be widely disseminated and announcements should be made sufficiently in advance of the desired hiring date to allow serious consideration of current employees. Obstacles to inter-system transfers created by certain differences in fringe benefit policies should be reviewed with an eye to minimizing their impact on internal mobility.

It is desirable to institute at least some minimal formal review of promotions for academic administrative and professional employees. This might take the form of a brief "Statement of Justification for Promotion" to accompany the request for a contract change. The statement could include the requirements for the new job, as well as the employee's formal qualifications and past performance as reflected in performance reviews.

#### COMPENSATION

The problem of compensation policy is intimately related to that of Job Description and Job Structure discussed earlier. There are only a few units within the University that have attempted to develop careful job descriptions and structures and related compensation policies for their academic administrative and professional employees. For most units, the current practice involves the establishment of personal rates for individuals rather than any analysis of job content and the relative value of these positions in the unit. While rationalization of occupational salary relationships within units is clearly underdeveloped, similar rationalization across units on a campus or University basis is, for the most part, nonexistent.

Few areas of personnel policy have received more attention, both in the private and public sectors, than the development of equitable compensation policies. There is general agreement that the use of personal rates is unsatisfactory for large organizations. The usual solution to this problem has involved the following steps: (1) The description and evaluation of existing positions on the basis of their relative value to the organization. This process takes into account the skills required to perform the job; the training, education, and experience necessary to meet these requirements; and the historical salary relationships among jobs within the organization.

(2) The simplification of the many job titles into a smaller number of grades that group positions of roughly similar level. And (3) the establishment of salary grades that reflect the job structure and market rates. Ordinarily a rate range is established for each class of positions. Differential ability among individuals occupying particular positions is recognized by placement within the rate range, either at time of hire or through merit increases.

The consequences of instituting such a compensation plan can be illustrated by referring to the recent University of Michigan study discussed in the section on Job Description and Job Structure. Again it should be noted that that study encompassed a larger group of employees, including some who would be covered by the Civil Service System at the University of Illinois. If the consultant's recommendations are adopted, approximately 13 percent of the professional and administrative employees would fall below the minimum of their salary grade. These employees would have to be brought up to the newly-established minima. About three percent of the employees would fall above the maximum of their salary grade. The report recommends salary increases substantially below the average (or, in some cases, no increases) for individuals above the maximum of their salary grade.

The University of Michigan report recommends taking a firm stand against establishing individual salaries in excess of the rate range maxima. However, it would be possible to establish a procedure for exceptions to this rule in the case of individuals with very specialized skills or of unusual personal stature who cannot be recruited or retained at or below the maximum of the relevant salary grade.

As an alternative to the rate range system, it is possible to establish minimum salaries only for each grade. Placement of individuals above the minima would operate according to the same principles as in the case of rate

ranges, but there would be no maximum salary constraint. This has the disadvantage of providing no clear administrative guidelines as to the generally accepted maximum value of a class of positions to the University. However, it does solve the problem of above-grade salaries for exceptional individuals.

As already noted in the section on Job Description and Job Structure, it is important that employees and administrators have extensive input into the job and salary rationalization process. To be workable, the system has to be considered fair and acceptable by both employees and administrators. They should be specifically involved in the description and classification, should be informed and understand each of the steps being taken, and should have the opportunity to file objections to tentative decisions.

#### Recommendations

Rationalization of the salary structure is so intimately related to the job structure that the two should be considered together for purposes of personnel policy. In any case, it would make little sense to try and pursue any overall compensation policy without first attacking the job structure problem.

The goals should be a simplified job structure that provides reasonable relationships among occupational positions, is consistent across administrative units, and is realistically tied into market rates through related salary grades. A majority of the committee believe that a system of rate ranges for each salary grade would be the preferable policy. They consider it important to have guidelines that indicate the maximum value of a position to the University in terms of both the internal wage structure and competitive rates in the job market. And they view this as a useful form of administrative control to prevent the development of out-of-line salaries. However, they would permit unit heads to request exceptions to this policy under special

circumstances. Should this recommendation not be adopted, these members would consider a system of minimum salaries only for each grade as a first step in rationalizing the wage structure, which would be a distinct improvement over the existing situation.

A significant minority of the committee believe that a system of minimum salaries only for each grade would be the preferable policy. They are convinced that it is undesirable to establish a salary maximum, particularly at the upper grade levels. By preventing employing units from compensating certain individuals at rates which they believe justifiable, these individuals may be forced to make career decisions (either to leave University employment or to go into other positions) that neither the individual nor the employing unit considers desirable.

The performance review recommended earlier will assist in placement of individuals either within rate ranges or above the salary-grade minima. Finally, it is particularly important that there be extensive employee input in accomplishing these goals, including the opportunity for comment by the campus PAC's.

#### FRINGE BENEFITS

Fringe benefits are not the same for both academic and nonacademic employees. For example, they differ in holidays, vacations, tuition and fee waivers, sick leave, and sick leave application towards retirement. Similarly, the academic administrative and professional employees are not eligible for such faculty benefits as sabbatical leaves. We do not believe that the mere existence of a difference in benefits creates an inequity. Equity is a complex judgment that must take into consideration the overall interests, status, compensation, and benefit structures of the various

groups. The major issues relating to fringe benefits for academic administrative and professional employees are discussed below.

1. Certain benefits, such as convention travel, clearly differ among units. These depend on non-salary funds allocated to (or generated by) the units and there are substantial variations in the availability of such funds. We suggest that the distribution of these resources among the various employees appropriately belongs to the head of the employing unit.

2. Most fringe benefits for academic administrative and professional employees are uniform on a University-wide basis. These include the following:

- (a) vacations
- (b) holidays
- (c) sick leave
- (d) retirement
- (e) health and other insurance

While the committee has made no formal study of actual practice, our review leads us to believe that there are some differences among units in the implementation of these policies. In particular, some units may be more stringent than others in limiting employees to the specified holidays or in requiring the filing of sick leave claims.

3. The similarity in working conditions and in job content between many academic and exempt nonacademic administrative and professional employee positions suggests the desirability of a review of their relative fringe benefits. One of the major consequences of having two fringe benefit systems is the effect on accumulated benefits when an individual moves from a non-academic to an academic administrative and professional position. Specifically, such a move may result in the loss of substantial sick leave

accumulations that can be earned under the nonacademic personnel system but not under the academic one. This accumulated leave, in turn, can make a substantial difference in retirement benefits. It appears that some non-academic employees have never been informed of this loss upon being offered an academic position. This is clearly unacceptable and should be remedied. In addition, there are two more fundamental policy questions that need to be considered: (1) Should individuals making such a move be allowed to retain sick leave already accumulated during their nonacademic service? (2) Should the benefit policies of one or both of the systems be revised in the direction of greater uniformity?\*

The answer to these and to similar questions about other differential fringe benefits is beyond the scope of the committee's expertise. They require judgments not only about the substantive merits of the policies but also about political feasibility and costs. The guidelines should include the soundness of the particular policy; the equity of continuing differential policies in light of the overall interests, status, compensation and benefit structures of the two systems; and the desirability of encouraging internal mobility, as noted earlier in the section on Transfer and Promotion.

4. Consistent with our earlier suggestions on manpower planning and performance review, we suggest that consideration be given to the development of a policy on in-service education and training opportunities. Such a policy would encourage participation in courses or other structured learning activities directly related to professional improvement with the approval of the head of the employing unit.

\* The problem is further complicated by the fact that a benefit such as sick leave applied toward retirement is currently the same for both faculty and academic administrative and professional employees. Thus any decision on policy changes for the latter raises still another question. Are there circumstances in which it may be desirable to consider differentiating certain currently uniform benefits for faculty and academic administrative and professional employees?



### Recommendations

1. Decisions on certain fringe benefits, such as convention travel, funded from widely-varying non-salary sources should continue to be made by the head of the employing unit.

2. Existing uniform University-wide fringe benefits should be administered consistently in all units.

3. There should be a review of the problems created by differences in fringe benefits between academic and exempt nonacademic administrative and professional employees. The review should include the substantive merit of the existing policies, equity, and internal mobility.

4. Consideration should be given to the encouragement of career development through in-service education and training activities on a part-time basis, consistent with the needs of the employing unit.

### INVOLUNTARY TERMINATION

A staff member's employment relationship may be involuntarily terminated either by dismissal for cause prior to the termination of his or her contract or by nonrenewal of contract. The function of personnel policy in these cases is to define the rights and responsibilities of both parties. The objective is to avoid actions that are arbitrary, inequitable or illegal and to provide a mechanism to rectify any such decisions that may be made.

#### Dismissal for Cause

Dismissal for cause is the most serious action that can be taken against an employee. From the point of view of personnel policy, the main problem is devising and enforcing clear and appropriate procedures that are designed to avoid hasty or arbitrary action, to protect the rights of the employee, and to provide a means for the protection of persons and property when that

is necessary. These objectives can be accomplished by requiring administrative approval of the dismissal decision before it is formalized, giving the employee proper notification, and establishing administrative and grievance appeals procedures. Some dismissal procedures require mandatory use of suspension or reassignment until the dismissal issue is resolved. We believe that they are not necessarily appropriate for many cases but should be available for use at the option of the employing unit.

### Nonrenewal of Contract

The issues relating to nonrenewal of contract can be summarized under the headings of general procedures, notification requirements, and employment assistance.

1. General procedures. Where a contract is not renewed, the employer clearly does not assume the same burden of proof in defending his action that he does in dismissal cases. Good personnel practice would provide for timely notification of nonrenewal, a general statement of the reasons for the action, and administrative review. The opportunity to utilize the grievance procedure also should be available. While the burden of proof for nonrenewal is minimal, the employee should still be entitled to protection against obviously arbitrary or discriminatory actions.

2. Notification requirements. The timing of the notification in non-renewal cases presents an especially difficult policy problem. It is our view that tying the period of advance notice to some combination of length of service and level of position would best serve the interests of both the University and the employee. Two examples of such notice systems are presented below:

- (a) University of Maryland. Employees are classified into four groups in order of ascending skill level. The schedule requires the

following amounts of advance notice (in months):

<u>Length of Service</u>	<u>Group I</u>	<u>Group II</u>	<u>Group III</u>	<u>Group IV</u>
1-3 years	3	6	9	12
4-7 years	6	9	12	12

Over 7 years (Removal only by reassignment or dismissal for just cause).

(b) Fleming Report, University of Illinois. The report recommended that employees be classified into three groups. The schedule requires the following amounts of advance notice (in months):

Senior Professional . . . - 12

Associate Professional - 6

<u>Staff Professional:</u>	<u>Length of Service</u>	<u>Notice</u>
	Under 1 year	1
	1-3 years	2
	3-5 years	3
	5-7 years	4
	7-9 years	5
	10 or more years	6

The statutory amendment proposed recently to the Board of Trustees\* requiring notice by March 1 for academic administrative and professional employees whose contracts are not being renewed is a first step toward providing appropriate protection for this group of employees. While the level of protection is generous for employees with short service and/or lower-level positions, it falls short of what should eventually be provided for those with longer service at higher-level positions.

\* The proposal was presented as an amendment to Section 38 (e) of the University Statutes. Under the newly-revised Statutes, it would become paragraph (e) of Article IX, Section 4.

3. Employment Assistance. When contracts are not renewed (and especially when the basis for nonrenewal is budgetary in nature), the University should make special efforts to place employees who are being released. Within the University, publicizing of job vacancies already suggested will provide an important source of information about alternative positions. In addition, an internal clearinghouse should be established to maintain a list of all employees subject to layoff or recently laid-off. Units engaged in hiring should be required to consider listed candidates with the appropriate skills, though the final hiring decision should continue to be based on relative merit.

In aiding employees to secure positions outside the University, the employing unit can often be the most effective source of contacts. This is particularly true in the case of highly specialized personnel. This activity should be supplemented by similar aid from the campus personnel officer.

#### Recommendations

Dismissal for cause: When a unit seeks to dismiss an employee for cause, we suggest the following procedures:

- (a) The decision to dismiss should be reviewed at the next higher administrative level (usually the Dean or his equivalent) prior to the notice of dismissal. The employing unit should have the option of suspending or reassigning the individual pending dismissal.
- (b) The employee should be notified in writing of the reasons for the dismissal.
- (c) If the employee protests the dismissal and it cannot be resolved satisfactorily at the administrative review level, he should have the right to initiate a grievance under the advisory grievance procedure established on each campus.

Nonrenewal of contract: When a unit decides not to renew a contract, we suggest the following procedures:

- (a) Non-reappointment recommendations should not be announced until the responsible supervisor has notified the next higher administrative level (usually the Dean of a college or his equivalent).
- (b) The employee should be given a general statement of the reasons for nonrenewal.
- (c) The employee may request a review of the non-reappointment by the Dean or his equivalent.
- (d) If the matter cannot be resolved at that level, the employee has the right to initiate a grievance under the advisory grievance procedure.

Should the proposed statutory amendment on advance notice be adopted, we would not recommend the establishment of a more complex interim policy at the present time. This decision should await the completion of the job classification study recommended elsewhere in this report. Once the position levels are known, a more informed judgment can be made about the appropriate amount of advance notice.

Special procedures should be developed to aid employees whose contracts are not being renewed. These should be designed to help such employees secure new positions both within the University and in other organizations.