

InTouch: UNC Employee Forum News

Volume 8, Number 1 January 2007

[Address to Board of Trustees, November 15, 2006](#)

[UNC Eyes Using Time Clocks for Staff Employees](#)

["Fear of Frying?" Survey Results](#)

[Committee to Study Workplace Wellness Needs, Opportunities](#)

[Call for Nominations: 2007 University Awards for the Advancement of Women](#)

[Delegate Rosters](#)

From the Chair, Ernie Patterson ...

Address to Board of Trustees, November 15, 2006

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with the Board of Trustees. The Employee Forum appreciates the opportunity this provides staff to inform the Board of Trustees about issues and concerns.

Recent events have highlighted the need to re-build the covenant of co-governance that has served our University well since the formation of the Forum under Chancellor Hardin.

The upcoming decisions that have to be made in light of Erskine Bowles' PACE (President's Advisory Committee on Efficiency and Effectiveness) study provide the administration with a chance to re-affirm the covenant. We must work together to assure that changes positively impact and support our core mission of education, service and research.

We have a choice about how to initiate and implement change within the University. We can make changes that maintain the system at its current level of performance by solving specific problems or just reacting to special circumstances. Or...

We can make changes designed to improve the system beyond historical levels. These changes would require us to consider strategies that call for the design or redesign of systems, fundamentally altering how each system works and what people do. Changes at this level will have an impact far into the future.

We need to solicit, develop and implement innovative, cost-effective strategies that can both address the underlying causes of problems and improve workplace efficiencies in general, rather than latching onto and implementing stopgap strategies that simply treat the symptoms of problems. We must act boldly by not limiting ourselves to current resource constraints and ways of thinking about problems. We must be on the cutting edge of technological and organizational innovations that result in systemic changes and sustainable improvement.

If we choose to pursue higher yield change strategies, we must expect and value critical and creative thinking from everyone. One sure way to discover the innovative solutions that will carry us into the more efficient and effective future envisioned by the PACE study is through the involvement of everyone at the University. Staff employees, who do the daily, hands-on work of the University and know its systems and problems in very practical ways, should be used as a wellspring of information and ideas. This means that we need to establish structures and policies that will support encourage and value the contributions of all employees.

One of the most important of those structures and policies involves communication. We must understand that, when given a choice between two approaches to change, one of which they understand and the other of which is new or innovative, most people will prefer what they know. This is even more likely in the absence of open and honest communication with all employees. Employees deserve information! They need accurate, up-front information about the costs of the present systems, about the impact of those costs on University priorities, and about the reforms and modifications that need to be considered to improve our bottom line.

Adoption of this strategy would position UNC as a leader in collaborative enterprise -- engaging all UNC employees in identifying and implementing solutions to existing and future problems at UNC, whether or not addressed by PACE.

Finally, we must remember that PACE is not a Bible that we should follow absolutely and unyieldingly. It represents a guideline for change to improve University operations so that we remain competitive in today's academic marketplace.

I want to assure you that the Forum and the more than 7500 employees it represents is ready and willing to step up and work with our administration to make UNC the best it can be.

UNC Eyes Using Time Clocks for Staff Employees

Administrators at UNC-Chapel Hill will soon decide on a method for employees to use to electronically record their work hours. They will choose between simply automating how employees now report their hours or requiring employees to "clock in" electronically each day, which will build greater accountability into the timekeeping system.

Last spring, the University purchased a new time and attendance system called Kronos that is designed to electronically collect timesheet data and feed it directly into the University's payroll and benefits systems, thus reducing paper usage and manual data entry time. With Kronos, employees will electronically record their daily work hours and the program will automatically calculate their work time to the nearest tenth of an hour, as well as their personal and sick leave balances. Employees and supervisors could obtain this information on demand.

The University must still decide which of two methods employees will be required to use to record their hours.

The first approach, "Time Capture," requires punching in and out each day using a computerized time clock or a computer at a work station. In some cases, employees could use a telephone to clock in, although current plans call for only five telephone lines to serve the entire campus, which means permission to use this method will be limited. The Time Capture method will allow supervisors to enter their employees' start and stop times manually and to edit their timesheets, but employees would not enjoy this privilege.

The second time recording approach, "Time Entry," essentially computerizes the current paper-based time reporting system. This approach would allow employees (as well as their supervisors) to enter and edit their time records manually.

Current plans are to require the Time Capture method for all temporary and student employees. Because "exempt" employees (exempt from the State Personnel Act) have different time reporting requirements, they will use the Time Entry method. This means that all faculty and administrators and a small portion of regular staff will record their hours in the same manner as before, only via computer.

The University must still decide the method that the majority of the University's staff employees, who are non-exempt, will use to record their hours.

Some managers and administrators favor the Time Capture method of data entry, because it gives managers up-to-the-moment information on the presence or absence of hourly employees and greater control over weekly work totals, thus reducing overtime and comp time expenses. Its ability to render precise time measurements and command a higher level of accountability from hourly employees is also a valued feature.

Other managers have pointed out that SPA employees are a very large group of people with quite varied job duties, some of which may not lend themselves easily to the Time Capture method. In addition, they have noted, if the Time Capture method is selected as the University standard for work time reporting, it is not likely to be well accepted among staff employees, many of whom operate on a trust standard when recording their hours. Accordingly, morale may suffer.

If the Time Capture option is adopted, individual departments would have the opportunity to make a formal application to use the Time Entry method, if they choose.

The final decision about which method staff employees will use will be made in mid- to late-January 2007 by Vice Chancellor for Information Technology Services Dan Reed, Vice Chancellor for Finance Richard Mann, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources. These positions, who "own" the system and will administer its application, will base their decision on the recommendation of the Time and Attendance project's Core Team. The Team is seeking input from University managers as it formulates its recommendations, but has declined an offer of assistance in soliciting input from the wider University community.

"Fear of Frying?" The Survey Results

Many departments and divisions at UNC are staffed from the top, down with decent human beings who do high-quality work, treat both their superiors and their subordinates with respect, and never do anything that could bring shame or potential legal trouble to the University. Some, however, are not.

When employee mistreatment, questionable management practices, or outright wrongdoing occur, witnesses to (or victims of) these events may feel that although they would like to see the situation corrected, they don't know where to turn...or are afraid to turn there.

Two months ago, the *InTouch* newsletter asked employees to share their thoughts on and any experiences with reporting problems at UNC. The resulting survey is not scientific; it is not a random, unbiased sample of UNC staff employees. Rather, it reflects the attitudes and experiences of a self-selected sample of 56 people who were sufficiently motivated to respond. These are the results.

Nearly two-thirds of the respondents to the "Fear of Frying" survey (62.5%) said that they thought UNC employees are "very reluctant" or "scared to death" to report problems or wrongdoing.

1. In general, how reluctant do you think UNC Employees actually are to report workplace problems or wrongdoing?	
Not at all reluctant	5.4%
A little reluctant	8.9%
Moderately reluctant	23.2%
Very reluctant	51.8%
Scared to death	10.7%

Nevertheless, many of them (42.9%) said that this should not be the case—largely on philosophical grounds. Most felt that it is our individual right as employees to report problems, and also that it is the institutional tradition at UNC to respect free speech and uphold fairness in the workplace. Honest employees, they said, should expect both co-workers and supervisors to live up to high standards of honesty, and reporting problems should not be frightening because most managers at UNC, like most employees, want our workplace to be great.

More than half of the respondents (57.1%), however, said that employees are probably right to be afraid to report problems because it is so easy for supervisors to retaliate in subtle ways, such as making the whistleblower's work life miserable, sabotaging his or her later career advancement, or arranging to have the individual's position be eliminated due to "budget cuts." Respondents who recommended caution pointed out that in some cases anonymity or confidentiality are impossible because the nature of the problem being reported makes the identity of the whistleblower obvious.

Another reason not to report a problem, they said, is because in the end, nothing will really be done about it anyway. "Nothing will change in the unit," wrote one respondent, "because managers are rarely held accountable."

“The University needs to take a look at some of the managers that are in the positions they are,” advised one respondent. “Many managers get away with things that the ordinary employees would never dream about. It’s because of the positions they are in. Departmental chairs don’t want to be bothered with [the day-in and day-out] departmental things and many managers take full advantage of this. Managers come and go as they please because for them, there is no one to report to. They take vacation and sick days without having to report the time taken as other employees do, because the department chairs don’t keep up with things like this.”

2. Should employees at UNC be afraid to report workplace problems or wrongdoing?

No	42.9%
Yes	32.1%
It depends	25%

3. Why? (briefly)

“No” answers explained

Ideas should be accepted and valued.
 There are established avenues for reporting problems/wrongdoing in confidential ways. These ways need to be widely broadcasted. That is the only way to improve the workplace.
 The Ombuds Office makes it easy and anonymous.
 To correct a problem - you have to know what it is.
 In my dealings with the university administration over 30 years, I have always found fairness to be important!
 It would be wrong not to.
 Because more management want the workplace to be great than those who are creating or perpetuating the problems.
 Fairness and openness should be the rule.
 Seem to be a number of confidential channels for reporting.
 We have a strong cultural tradition of respecting free speech here. As an employee through several administrations I have NEVER seen an example of retaliation where the complaint was valid.
 It is our right.
 Everyone ought to be cared about and treated with dignity, respect, and as a valued resource.
 Because anyone that is honest wants to hold fellow employees to the same level.
 It is ethically and morally wrong to watch bad things happen and not try to do something about it.

“Yes” answers explained

Subtle clues from the manager indicate her displeasure, and one has no idea what this relates to.
 The principal of it.
 Could be a "career limiting" move.
 It is the only way to make the University work efficiently.
 Could lose job.
 People in management cannot be trusted. I've had two of my supervisors stab me in the back and now I don't trust anyone.
 Fear of reprisal.
 Most supervisor staff don't want to deal with problems in workplace. They would rather see a smooth-flowing stream than listen to a bunch of waves crashing and have to do something about it.
 As in many traditionally managed organizations, the messenger often bears the brunt of the response to an issue, UNC is no different in this respect...
 Numerous instances of retaliation.
 Even if not formal/written consequences, management can make work extremely difficult and uncomfortable.
 Nothing will change in the unit because managers are rarely held accountable and the employee will likely suffer negative consequences (e.g., layoff due to 'restructuring', negative evaluation, etc.).
 Things will happen - hiring blacklist, nondisclosure of negative employer recommendations - these are things that have personally happened to me.
 Retaliation from supervisors.
 Retaliation disguised as other things; or it just does no good.

“In depends” answers explained

Fear of retribution/reprisal.
 Job security.
 Repercussions and the need for a good recommendation from one's current supervisor.
 They should be bale to, but don't for fear of their future employment.
 Some of the "rules" our bosses allow us to break, become the very thing employees are fired for and filing a grievance is useless.
 Sometimes the situation is such that it's going to be obvious who told, even if it's kept confidential.
 Upper Management have different ways to retaliate.
 Targeted.
 Lose their job or be made miserable from now on.
 There are times when even if the reporting is anonymous, that the person you are reporting about will be able to figure out who reported. We work in small departments and there are few secrets.
 Ramifications despite!
 If there is a vindictive manager (one who takes things personally on all issues), then I would think that that person would make (your remaining) life in your job completely miserable.

Some survey respondents (39.3%) were speaking from personal experience in having reported workplace problems, but most (60.7%) had never done so.

4. Have you ever reported a workplace problem or wrongdoing to the Ombuds Office, the University Compliance Line, the NC Office of the State Auditor, or some other resource?

No	60.7%
Yes	39.3%

Not ever having been a whistleblower tended to make respondents somewhat more likely to recommend that course of action, but on the whole there was a surprising amount of agreement between those with firsthand experience in reporting problems and those without. Coming forward to report problems, their answers suggest, is important to do, even if it may be a bit risky.

Experience with whistleblowing and perceptions of danger		
	Those who have reported a problem	Those who have NOT reported a problem
Should employees be afraid to report? ↓		
No	38.1%	44.1%
Yes	33.3%	32.4%
It depends	28.6%	23.5%

Being a Whistleblower

Employees who have reported workplace problems at UNC have used a combination of all of the resources that are available to State employees for this purpose—and creatively called upon a variety of others. The Ombuds Office has been a resource for more than half of those who have been whistleblowers. Another important avenue for addressing workplace problems has been UNC's Human Resources department, which was cited in half of the responses given in the "other" category.

5. Which reporting track(s) did you use?

UNC Ombuds Office	55%
University Compliance phone line/web site	5%
NC Office of the State Auditor's phone line/web site	10%
Other	50%

HR, legal counsel,
supervisor, University
Counsel, University
Internal Auditor,
school's
administration, Public
Safety, Environmental
Health

Despite fears that are sometimes expressed about how confidential or anonymous problem reports will really be, most whistleblowers (75%) indicated that they were satisfied with the level of confidentiality they had received when using the reporting resources they had accessed. They were noticeably less satisfied, however, with how the problem they had brought up was ultimately handled (only 45% satisfaction). And in the long run, more than half (52.4%) felt that they did in fact experience negative repercussions from their actions. These ranged from being reprimanded for filing their report to being ostracized by supervisors and co-workers.

6. Were you satisfied with the level of confidentiality or anonymity that you received?

No	25%
Yes	75%

7. Were you satisfied with how the problem situation was dealt with as a result of your filing the complaint?

No	55%
Yes	45%

8. Did you feel that you experienced negative repercussions later on that were due to your having formally brought up the issue?

No	47.6%
Yes	52.4%

9. What happened? (briefly)

My supervisor was informed even though the person I spoke with said that would not happen. My supervisor chastised me for going forward with my concerns.
Less trust from men after sexual harassment issue was raised.
Letter of warning.
Was actually told by the HR person handling the grievance that filing a grievance was a "career ending decision;" don't think the committee, which was supposed to be unbiased, was actually unbiased.
While the Ombuds gave me great suggestions, I don't work in a department where logical and professional solutions are effective.
Grievance filed in xxxx; outcome resulted in reinstatement and charges negated — however, two years later when trying to apply for new position, negative recommendation(s) given; no source provided.
Felt like outcast from other co-workers, job duties are being redefined.
Almost two decades ago, in xxxx, I reported a verbally abusive work situation, my supervisor. I was encouraged to pursue action that went nowhere, and I ended up leaving UNC.
Ostracized by my management.

Being Reluctant

Quite a few respondents (61.8%) indicated that while they had thought about reporting a workplace problem or wrongdoing at one time or another in the past, they had not followed through. In some cases it was because the individual did not know what kinds of resources were available to help them make a report. In other cases, it was because of the "fear of frying"—sometimes based on previous personal experience with bringing a complaint. One consideration that affected a number of respondents' decisions was a conviction that nothing constructive would really be done as a result of making a report, so there was not much point in doing so.

10. Have you ever just thought about reporting a workplace problem or wrongdoing at UNC—but not actually done so?

No	38.2%
Yes	61.8%

11. What prevented you from reporting the problem or misdeed? (briefly)

I didn't believe I could remain anonymous, and I lacked support and "proof."
Concern for my job.
Fear of negative repercussions; manager is poor at communicating; her first mgt. job; is very critical while she's smiling—big trust issue
Fear of Reprisal.
Don't know who to contact.
Possible complexity of situation and belief that very little would be done, and manipulation of information by others.
Scared.
My previous experience from filing the grievance.
Potentially career limiting.
The last time I was told that people don't change and are not going anywhere so it would be better if I quit.

The realization that the Ombuds office is really there to keep a lid on things, not to do anything. They have no power.
 I got a different position which took me to an entirely different department, thus away from the supervisor who I was thinking of filing a grievance against.
 Reporting alone would not solve problem; Ombuds office not structured to really solve problems but just to let employees talk.
 Fear of frying.
 I decided it wasn't serious enough or the problem was resolved.
 Fear of being laid off.
 FEAR!!!! Retribution w/ impudence is regularly practiced by the current sanctimonious Administration.
 Even the grievance process is directed against the employee by no REAL due process.
 See fifth amendment.
 Black listed.
 Supervisor reprisal.
 Repercussions on others.
 Fear of it being made a racial issue, which it was not.
 Fear of person figuring out who reported them.
 Fear, and not wanting the hassle.
 Would come back to haunt me. No consequences for wrongdoing at administrative/faculty level. I would have suffered for reporting!
 Previous layoff experience—don't ever want to repeat it because layed-off employees are treated like sub-humans by all.
 Retaliation from supervisors.
 Well, frankly because if the issue has already been brought to the attention of several deans (from faculty) and nothing's been done, why would anything be done if the complaint came from a staff member?
 Nothing has been done in the past, even though an HR person reported the information.
 Either haven't found the right avenue yet or know that the problem won't be addressed.
 Loss of job.
 Further negative repercussions from my management.

Final Thoughts

The information provided by this informal survey needs to be improved upon by a more formal, properly designed study of employee use of and satisfaction with the problem-reporting mechanisms that exist at UNC. Until that happens, our results here suggest that while employees at UNC may be understandably reluctant to report workplace problems, they do not always refuse to do so, and the results of doing so are not uniformly negative for them.

“Keep your cool,” advised one respondent, but if you’re having problems or know of situations that need to be exposed, “don’t put up with it... [Departments at UNC may] vary on fairness, but I truly have seen significant advancement in communications and professionalism in the past 20 years.”

“I do not have a problem with reporting issues,” said one respondent, “because I was taught to do so in an assertive, evidenced-based way and to prepare my issue in such a way that inappropriate response was minimized or eliminated.... There are well known processes that workers can learn in order to have a ‘voice.’”

But deciding to report problems does carry its risks. A couple of respondents indicated that they had seen others who were whistleblowers wind up losing their jobs in short order. One person reflected, “Most of my co-workers are scared to death of administration in [my area], so they won't report wrongdoing. There are a lot of long-time workers here who would be in dire straights without a job. We have seen ‘whistle-blowers’ lose their jobs here before. Three people were ‘laid off’ because of ‘budget constraints’...yet their positions were posted and filled within one month of this supposed ‘layoff.’ These three people were also very vocal about administrative issues.”

As bad as such situations sound, it is worth remembering that there are at least two sides to every story. Our survey did not attempt to address questions about the severity or the legitimacy of the problems that people report. As one respondent notes, the assumption here has been that whistleblowers are reporting genuine problems and deserve protection, without exception. In fact, says the respondent, “In my experience well over half of the time people who are reporting alleged problems are really employees whose performance is bad, and they are trying to protect themselves from facing the consequences of their own inadequacies. These people suck up a lot of time and energy from management and debase the REAL whistleblowers, who often display lots of courage in reporting problems.”

In a similar vein, the reasons people *fail* to report problems may also have as much to do with themselves as with inequities in the system and the perceived dangers involved in reporting. “Sometimes, people don't report problems,” observed one person, “because they would rather gripe and grouse than actually do something to solve the issue.”

In the end, the decision whether to report or to keep quiet about a workplace problem is a very personal decision and must be based on a number of important considerations. “My advice,” said one respondent, “is to talk to the Ombuds Office, be a good employee, and do what you have to do to have peace of mind: Report or don't report. Think hard, and try not to make the wrong decision.”

12. If you have any other thoughts you'd like to share on this topic, please do so.

As long as people don't believe that they are safe from negative repercussions, they won't report their concerns.
 I've seen several people whose jobs were eliminated or marginalized after reporting problems. It can be risky to go forward with job-related concerns.
 Ideally I believe managers aim to develop their staff. Ours goes to professional development conferences related to our discipline, but doesn't tell us the conference exists, nor suggests we go. As professionals, we need hours of in-service time to renew our licenses. Since we're on the road most days (research position), we're not around a computer to find out what is being offered on campus, so we feel totally isolated from the university. We miss employment appreciation activities and discounts, holiday parties, and the communication with other professionals which would enhance our productivity—as well as access to classes that others may know about and be attending through their communication loop. If we mention these things to the manager, she just shrugs and says, “Oh,” and the issue is closed. Thanks for listening.
 I have worked in other jobs in which I wished I could have reported wrongdoing. I had no one to turn to OR I thought I had no one to turn to. It is extremely important to advertise on a CONTINUAL basis the availability of this service for UNC employees. Don't assume that once, twice, three or four times is sufficient. We have new employees all the time. Additionally, people may not pay attention until they

really need this type of service.

Why does this University allow HR to handle grievances from its own staff? Why are people who behave in an extremely unprofessional manner allowed to continue to work here?

Some employees think SPA employees are harder to get rid of than EPA; they think they have more job security, but it does not seem to be the case. From what I've seen, if a department really wants to get rid of you, there are a thousand ways to do it and by the time you realize what they are up to, it's too late. One thing I have discussed with the new University Equal Opportunity Officer is how departments "pre-select" so many employees. If that is the way our recruitment is going to be, why waste money on advertising or even putting it on the HR website. In my department, of the last 10 EPA and EPA-Non faculty positions advertised...9 of them were pre-selections.

When an out-of-state relative died a couple of years ago, I went to my supervisor to ask for a week's vacation to travel there and attend the funeral and wake. (I had enough vacation leave accumulated.) The first words out of her mouth were, "Well, I guess I can't really tell you not to go, but I really don't want you to." This is a person who regularly calls in "sick" at least one day a week, herself. Awww... This place just really gets me down.

For every track available for reporting, there needs to be genuine track to address problem.

Sometimes, people don't report problems because they would rather gripe and grouse than actually do something to solve the issue.

The worst treatment I ever had here was as a temp. I've seen broken promises, unjust treatment, and an institutional culture (in this one office, not UNC-wide) where temp employees were pressured to work unpaid overtime, which is illegal. I think Tar Heel Temps is great--better than commercial temp agencies. Temping here is how I got my permanent job at UNC, which is great. But as we struggle for staff rights, we must not forget those among us who are most vulnerable, who do just as much to keep UNC going, but who have almost no rights at all--temps. The rule about not temping for a year straight (having to take 30 days off every year) was conceived to help workers, but it doesn't. It just makes people who are barely getting by already face a period of compulsory unemployment. And it's also possible to get around the rule by having the same person hire on through a commercial temp agency for a month, then go back to Tar Heel Temps. I've seen this done. It would be much better if the burden of this rule fell on the employer instead of the employee. Why not have a rule that no position could be filled by temps (whether the same person or a series of different people) for more than a year? If a job needs to be done for that long, it should be a permanent (even if fixed-term) regular job, so that the person who does it can get all the rights and benefits of a regular worker. Temps not only don't get benefits, but they have every incentive to keep quiet about mistreatment, illegality, or inappropriate practices in their workplace, because they can be fired from one day to the next without notice and without a reason--which has happened to me as a temp at Carolina, so I know what I'm talking about. There are lots of good reasons to hire temp workers, but there's also lots of abuse of the system. Let's not forget the temps.

I had to go to my boss's boss's boss to get satisfaction in a supervisor-gone-bad situation. My advice: talk to Ombuds Office, be a good employee, and do what you have to do to have peace of mind: report or don't report. Think hard, and try not to make the wrong decision.

Some in upper management WILL find a way to get rid of you if you report anything negative and they will do so in a legal way that will not show a connection - such as being laid off due to budget cuts.

I do not have a problem with reporting issues because I was taught to do so in an assertive, evidenced-based way and to prepare my issue in such a way that inappropriate response was minimized or eliminated...there are well known processes that workers can learn to have a "voice", a great example of which is this survey.

What is the legitimate grievance procedure on supervisor mistreatment of employees? How can an employee be protected from an unfair or unreasonable manager? Counter an unfair performance review? This information should be made VERY accessible to all employees.

Your survey appears to assume that people deserve protection no matter what they choose to report. In my experience well over half of the time people who are reporting alleged problems are really employees whose performance is bad and they are trying to protect themselves from facing the consequences of their own inadequacies. These people suck up a lot of time and energy from management and debase the REAL whistleblowers, who often display lots of courage in reporting problems. Maybe the Forum should try to be more balanced in its view of these situations.

We have culture issues. In my department, there is little respect for staff employees. The only effective solution in my department--get out. I'm just trying to keep the peace so I can get a decent reference when I find a new job. The problems start at the top....

As a staff person with little personal power, the Employee Forum is my 'voice' and my 'conscience'. I encourage the Forum members to continue to work for improvements in communication and cooperation between staff and faculty as a means to balance the improper use of power by the administration. When staff members who provide support services are mistreated, ultimately the faculty and students suffer more than the EPA administrators. It would be great if all EPA administrators and managers and SPA exempt managers and supervisors had to take mandatory ethics and leadership training every year and be tested on their leadership skills and their understanding of ethics (both financial and human), but I doubt this will ever happen without support from those who would be subject to the training and test.

While we may become 'great,' it's unlikely that we'll ever truly achieve 'good' now that money and economics trump character as a value, and that's the management culture we currently have system-wide (just look at the new 'corporate' signs going up around campus and consider PACE and ERP). We definitely aren't in Kansas anymore; the culture now is more like Wall Street but, unfortunately, Warren Buffet isn't our CEO. The MBAs (who aren't required to and rarely do study ethics) are in charge now, and the faceless minions better toe the line, keep heads down and learn to say "yes, massa" lest the flat world mentality outsource our jobs to 'save money.'

Talk, as they say, is cheap; to understand priorities and power, just follow the money.

The University needs to take a look at some of the managers that are in the positions they are. Many managers get away with things that the ordinary employees would never dream about. It's because of the positions they are in. Departmental Chairs don't want to be bothered with departmental things and many managers take full advantage of this. Managers come and go as they please because for them, there is no one to report to. They take vacation and sick days without having to report the time taken as other employees do, because the department chairs don't keep up with things like this. Many managers state to employees that it is up to them to figure out who will cover the office in times such as holidays because "they" (the managers) will not be in the office. Managers should be there first and foremost!

I reported my problems to the Ombuds office and was referred to the grievance office. I did go and talk to someone about the grievance process. When all was said and done, I felt like I was back at square one.

What good would it do me to go and tell my story? I am afraid to bring it to my supervisor's boss's attention. I have been told that others have gone to the supervisor's boss before and nothing has changed.

My supervisor suspects I have been to the Ombuds Office. She told me once, "There is nothing the Ombuds Office can do for you." I feel like the only thing I can do is move somewhere else within the University and hope for a supervisor that treats everyone the same and doesn't believe in unmerited favoritism.

UNC is a large business basically and units vary on fairness but I truly have seen significant advancement in communications and professionalism in the past 20 years.

If you are having problems you must document carefully and keep your cool, but you should not put up with it.

I think this a great concept. I also think that managers/faculty-in-charge should be required to take updated supervisory courses ("CE") to refresh & remind them how to deal with people.

Normally the one person causing the problems within the department always continues to look for ways not to do his/her work but to get others to do it.....a sad state of affairs.

Most of my co-workers are scared to death of administration in my school so they won't report wrongdoing. There are a lot of long-time workers here who would be in dire straights without a job. We have seen "whistle-blowers" lose their jobs here before. Three people were "laid off" because of "budget constraints"...yet their positions were posted and filled within 1 month of this supposed "layoff". These 3 people were also very vocal about administrative issues. One of them filed a lawsuit and lost. In most people's eyes, this just proves that you will lose no matter how just the cause. It's very, very sad, but I think it happens everywhere.

"Rule with unfettered authority" is an accurate description. It is a shame what this place has fallen to be as a place of employment in the last several years.

The Ombuds Office has proven itself basically worthless to me. They say: "There's good and there's bad management all over campus", and not much can be done in many cases

I answered everything as I honestly felt and know. AS YOU PROMISED - this must be keep anonymous. Please publish your results.

Committee to study worksite wellness needs, opportunities

The Chancellor's Task Force for a Better Workplace identified worksite wellness as a priority for improving the health and well-being of University employees.

In response to the task force recommendations and current workplace trends, a University Steering Committee for Worker Health, Safety and Wellness was convened last June to promote a coordinated and comprehensive worksite wellness program.

The purpose of the 16-member committee is to assess the health promotion needs, assets, interests and expectations of UNC employees. The committee will also assess the social and physical environment on campus, identify existing resources, services and supports currently in place, identify needs and gaps in programs/services, assess primary healthcare claims costs, and to learn from other peer institutions who have had success with worksite health and safety initiatives. The committee will develop a report for the provost with recommendations for worksite health and safety that are tailored to the unique work environment at Carolina.

Dr. Alice Ammerman, director of the Center for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention, chairs the steering committee. Members represent a variety of departments and units, including Campus Recreation, the Department of Environment, Health and Safety, the School of Public Health, Human Resources, the Department of Exercise and Sports Science, Employee Occupational Health and Auxiliary Services. Others are from the Faculty Athletic Committee, the Employee Forum, Faculty Council, Facilities Planning, the Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, University Relations and Active Living by Design.

As part of this assessment effort, the committee is interested in hearing from campus employees (both staff and faculty) regarding their thoughts and opinions on worksite wellness at UNC-Chapel Hill. A series of focus groups will be held with employees who have a wide range of job responsibilities and work schedules will be invited to participate. The focus groups will be held in January and February, and while space is limited, all interested employees are invited to contact Ben Birken, Steering Committee Coordinator, at birken@email.unc.edu or 966-6085.

Call for Nominations: 2007 University Awards for the Advancement of Women

On behalf of the Offices of the Chancellor and the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, the Carolina Women's Center is pleased to announce the call for nominations for the 2007 University Awards for the Advancement of Women. This award recognizes contributions to the advancement of women at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Each year, three individuals—one faculty member, one staff person, and one undergraduate/graduate student/postdoctoral scholar—may be selected to receive the award. The faculty and staff recipients each receive \$5000 and the undergraduate/graduate student/postdoctoral scholar recipient receives \$2500. Awardees are honored in an award celebration during the Carolina Women's Center's annual Women's Week Celebration.

Please submit nominations for women and men who have contributed in one or more of the following ways:

- Mentored and supported women students, staff, faculty, and/or administrators;
- Elevated the status of women on campus;
- Helped to improve campus policies affecting women;
- Promoted and advanced the recruitment, retention, and upward mobility of women;
- Participated in and assisted in the establishment of professional development opportunities for women; or
- Participated in and assisted in the establishment of academic mentoring for women.

To submit a nomination, please use the online form at:

http://ir.unc.edu/women/women_nomination.html

All faculty and staff nominees must be permanent employees.

The deadline for nominations is **February 26, 2007 at 5:00 p.m.**

Please contact Dr. Donna M. Bickford, Director of the Carolina Women's Center at dbickford@unc.edu or (919) 962-8305 if you have questions about the awards or nomination process.

***The link to the nomination form is also available on the Provost's website at www.unc.edu/provost and the Carolina Women's Center website at womenscenter.unc.edu.

Return to the [Employee Forum Home Page](#)
Contact a Forum Delegate via our on-line [roster](#)
[Return to Top](#)