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Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

University communities and civil courts have shown increasing concern for providing students with equitable due process procedures in matters of student rights, student discipline, and academic matters. Similarly, universities need to provide equitable due process procedures in student employment matters.

The basic purposes of the University of Northern Iowa are the enlargement, dissemination, and application of knowledge. A basic necessity for the achievement of these purposes is freedom of expression and communication. Knowledge is as broad and diverse as life itself, and the need for freedom is equally broad. Yet absolute freedom in all aspects of life means anarchy, just as absolute order means tyranny. Therefore, the University must always strive to strike that balance between maximum freedom and necessary order (Northern Iowan, 1982, p. 11).

A student employment grievance system is such a balance. It protects the rights of student employees, protects institutional university personnel from possible student retaliation, provides a structured channel for expression and communication, provides a process which identifies internal problems, and also facilitates internal problem solving and preventative intervention measures to help correct these identified problems.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

The reason for the study of the student employment grievance system was to develop a supported rationale for implementing a student employment grievance system. Factors needing to be considered were the passage of pertinent student rights legislation, the paralleled development of organized labor-management relations, and the increased job dissatisfaction experienced by student employees. The study will include
becoming familiar with the uniqueness of student employees as a population, identifying the more common causes of grievances, becoming more knowledgeable of the necessary counseling skills to effectively facilitate a grievance system, examining the evolution of the existing University of Northern Iowa's (U.N.I.) student employment grievance procedures, and exploring preventative methods through increasing supervisory and managerial skills and techniques.

LIMITATION OF STUDY

The study of student employment grievance procedures will attempt to explore the uniqueness of student employees as a population. Although the student employee shares many of the same concerns, complaints, and frustrations, as well as similar goals, ambitions, and work conditions as the "regular" full-time employee; it is student employees that will be the defined population of the study.

Five primary differences between student employment and regular employment, which contribute to the uniqueness of this population, will be discussed. The five differences are: 1) student employment is a secondary role, 2) student employment is temporary as well as part-time, 3) student employees are more youthful, 4) student employees are more inquisitive, and 5) student employees are more idealistic than the regular labor force.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Grievance - "A job oriented complaint stemming from an injury or injustice, real or imaginary, suffered by an employee for which redress or relief from management is sought," (Bittel, 1980, p. 386).

Student Employment Grievance - "A difference, complaint, or dispute regarding the interpretation or application of established policies and/or
procedures governing terms of employment, working conditions, hours of work, or compensation," (Northern Iowan, 1982, p. 11).


Employment Investment - "The status factor which an individual member of a work group brings with him from his past or puts into his work," (Dickson and Roethlisberger, 1966, p. 135).

Employee Rewards - The status factor which the employee expects to derive from his/her job (Dickson and Roethlisberger, 1966).

Supervision - "Determining or interpreting work procedures for a group of workers, assigning specific duties to the worker, maintaining harmonious relations among them, and promoting efficiency," (Little and Chin, 1981, p. 31).


Allegations - "A claim made against someone, not supported with records or testimony," (Trotta, 1976, p. 128).

Assumptions - "A concept one assumes to be true without proof," (Trotta, 1976, p. 128).

Opinions - "Conclusions arrived at by persons who have technical or professional ability to evaluate the situation," (Trotta, 1976, p. 128).

Conflict Resolution - "Bringing the conflict to an end either through agreement among all parties or the defeat of one," (Filley, 1975, p. 9).

Quality Circle - "A small group of workers, usually seven to ten who meet regularly to identify, analyze, and solve a company's problems," (Bonner, 1982, p. 681).
Chapter Two

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Three significant contributing factors in the necessity of providing student employment grievance procedures are the passage of legislation protecting student rights, the development of organized labor-management relations, and the expressed job dissatisfaction experienced by student employees.

PROTECTION OF STUDENT RIGHTS

As a result of the unrest on campus during the era of the 1960's and early 1970's, a series of federal regulations and guidelines were passed to protect the rights of students.

Executive Order 11246 prohibiting discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex and national origin by all federal contractors.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibiting exclusion from participation in or denial of benefits, and discrimination under federally assisted programs on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972 prohibiting educational institutions that receive federal funds from discrimination on the basis of sex.

Buckley Amendment regulating and limiting the use to be made of information in student's files.

Rehabilitation Act of 1973 Section 504 prohibiting by sole reason of handicap the exclusion of individuals from participation in or the benefits of any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance (Shubert and Folger, 1980, p. 441).

These series of federal regulations and guidelines resulted in providing avenues of redress for alleged violations of student rights.

Pathways of communication were now being opened.

Students were no longer restricted to answering charges brought against them, nor did they have to rely on judicial proceedings to air their grievances. They now had available to them at the institutional level, mechanisms for airing grievances (Shubert and Folger, 1980, p. 441).
LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

During the past twenty-five years, a significant development in labor management relations was the handling of employee complaints.

It has been recognized that there is a need for the orderly processing of employee grievances. In the absence of such procedures, employee frustration and dissatisfaction can result in lower production and higher turnover. Although employee complaints are sometimes unjustified, or stem from misunderstandings, a great many grievances are justified. If there is no procedure for objectively considering and settling complaints, industrial unrest will inevitably result (Trotta, 1976, p. 102).

The dissatisfaction being expressed by an individual employee continues to fester and becomes contagious spreading to fellow employees.

An unsettled grievance is like one rotten apple in a basket. It spoils the good ones. The good ones do not make a good apple of the rotten one. An offended or angry employee tends to make other employees lose confidence in their employer (Bittel, 1980, p. 383).

Thus the protection of student rights coupled with the development of handling labor employee complaints were two significant contributing factors in the necessity of providing student employee grievance procedures.

STUDENT JOB DISSATISFACTION

The third contributing factor in implementing a student employment grievance system is the increased job dissatisfaction experienced and expressed by student employees in recent years.

In the last five years, there has been increased dissatisfaction by all parties with student employment programs. Graduate students have successfully organized at a number of universities to bargain collectively on wages and working conditions. A high turnover in employment of all students suggests low overall student job satisfaction. At professional meetings of administrators of programs, there are horror stories about the behavior of both student employees and the persons who direct their work (Little and Chin, 1981, p. 2).

If higher education institutions continue ignoring the expressed job dissatisfaction and do not respond to the horror stories, tension
will continue, resulting in conflict situations which possibly will adversely affect the student employee, the student's supervisor, and ultimately the functioning and productivity of the institution. These conflict situations between student employees and their supervisors and/or administrators demonstrate the need for resolution processes.

Conflict processes which are institutionalized (that is, for which acceptable resolution procedures have been established) function as preventative measures against more destructive outcomes. Grievance systems, for example, permit the step-by-step adjudication of differences to avoid major clashes between parties such as labor and management (Filley, 1975, p. 5).

Grievance procedures for student employees will not only protect the student and his/her rights but will also be beneficial to the institution. Problem areas in the individual institutional departments can be identified and brought to the attention of the appropriate institutional authority. Internal remedies can be initiated for the mutual benefit of the student employees, the student's supervisor, and the institution.

The main institutional goal in providing students with grievance procedures is to give the institution a mechanism for quickly identifying and correcting its own mistakes. Orderly grievance procedures also protect trustees and other high officials from the importuning of individual students who feel they have been treated unjustly but have no "channels" available for complaining. Finally institutional student grievance procedures may forestall judicial interference in the operation of the university (Shubert and Folger, 1980, p. 47).

UNIQUENESS OF STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

The first of the five primary differences between student employment and regular employment is student employees perceive their employment as a secondary role rather than a primary role. Although in many cases student employment is a necessity in meeting the financial expenses of attaining a higher education; class attendance, study time,
lab participation, and preparation for mid-terms and finals are given first consideration in student employees time allocation. "When work responsibilities conflict with student responsibilities, it is the work responsibilities which must be accommodated" (Little and Chin, 1981, p. 11).

Secondly, student employment is temporary, part-time, and short-term. A student employee works an average of approximately fifteen hours per week for an approximate thirty-six to forty-four week period during the year. This thirty-six to forty-four week period is divided by semester breaks, traditional holidays, and academic holidays. Employment tasks, therefore, need to be learned in a relatively short training period and a greater number of work shifts need to be trained in order to cover an eight hour working day. Thus the conditions of being temporary, part-time, and short-term have serious implications for structuring and managing student employees. "A student employee needs a carefully defined position. If a position is not well defined, the employment period will be over before a student experientially knows what to do and how" (Little and Chin, 1982, p. 9).

The third difference between student employees and regular employees is the chronological age difference. The population of student employees is younger in comparison to the older, regular employment force. Younger workers operate out of a different perception of time which causes different expectations from work activity. "Young workers think much can be accomplished in a short time period. When this does not prove true, they become inattentive or discouraged, lose motivation, or look for short-cuts to reduce the time required for a task" (Little and Chin, 1981, p. 7).
In addition, youthful workers also believe they can make a real difference, that change is possible, that these changes will be significant, and that they are capable of making an impact that is institutional wide. This fourth difference, the idealism of youth, presents a challenge to supervisors in structuring work assignments and in motivating their student employees (Little and Chin, 1981).

The fifth and final difference is the increased inquisitiveness of the student worker. Student employees want to know why, when, where, and how. An effective supervisor will respond appropriately to the student employee's questions and see this as a possible vehicle for motivating and training the student employee.

The search for self-realization and identification is particularly intensified during the college years. Unfortunately, too often, there is limited opportunity for rapport between the professional staff and the student body. A student can, through part-time employment, acquire a genuine view of the goals and the purposes of an educational institution. As a member of the university's work operation, he can see with clarity that he is a contributing factor to the complete functioning of the school. The merit of laboring and learning simultaneously is perhaps one of the most meaningful benefits which higher education can afford. The ingrained sense of self-responsibility, the hope to establish the merits of mutual efforts, an appreciation of other's abilities, and the emulation of purposeful activity are college employment program goals (Adams and Stephens, 1972, p. 5).

In addition, a long term significance for the institution is that by appropriately responding to the inquisitiveness of student workers, an investment in the future of the institution is made possible.

Colleges and universities have become very complex systems. Students see but a small part of the enterprise (classroom instruction) and are unaware of other activities and the support systems necessary for all activities. From the perspective of many students, the institution is a large bureaucracy of wasted resources in which individual students are unimportant. This is hardly a desirable perception to be held by alumni and taxpayers. Accordingly, responding to student's questions can be considered by supervisors as an investment in the future of the institution (Little and Chin, 1981, p. 9).
COMPLEXITY OF GRIEVANCES

Grievances or causes of dissatisfaction are highly complex affairs. They may arise out of conditions on the job, but many are not solely related to wages, hours, supervision, or working conditions. They result from conditions "outside" the job or within the individual. Employees's personal background experiences, different philosophies of life, emotional disturbances, family or health problems can all be influencing agents in causing job dissatisfaction or grievances. Thus it is necessary "to consider the person, as well as the thing he complains about, in dealing with the complaint" (Marting, Finley, and Ward, 1963, p. 227). "Grievances are symptoms of something wrong with the employee, or with working conditions, or with supervision (Bittel, 1980, p. 383).

Another complexing factor is not every employee who complains is expressing a real grievance and many employees with real grievances do not express their dissatisfaction in words but in behavioral changes (Marting, Finley, and Ward, 1963). Employees harboring grievances may experience a pregrievance pattern of behavior. Trotta (1976) outlined seven such behavioral changes: 1) loss of interest; 2) adverse change in attitude toward job, fellow workers, supervisors, department, company; 3) less willingness to cooperate; 4) increased absenteeism; 5) decreased quality or quantity of work produced; 6) more time spent away from work station; 7) tendency toward antagonism and nonacceptance of supervisor's authority (p. 44).

NON-JOB RELATED GRIEVANCES

As stated previously, employees experience personal conflicts or concerns. The concern is not with a specific working condition but
with an interpersonal concern such as ineffective communication, felt injustices concerning personal investments and rewards, threats to one's personal worth or self interest, or the mismatching of an employee's overall capabilities with specific job requirements.

A great number of grievances are caused by the failure of human beings to communicate properly.

Good communication takes place only when the concept the speaker's or writer's (sender's) mind creates the same concept in the listener's or reader's (receiver's) mind. If the receiver does not get the intended concept, the sender has not communicated effectively. The sender is responsible for ensuring that the receiver understands his message completely. A problem arises when a spoken or written word has one meaning to the sender and a different meaning to the receiver (Trotta, 1976, p. 6).

The possibility of misunderstanding increases if parties are separated from each other physically or by time, such as working different shifts. When the number of levels of authority is great, the difficulty of a variety of different sources (levels) sending conflicting messages also increases (Filley, 1975).

Concerns of felt injustices arise when the worker sees his investments as being greater than other members of the work group with whom he/she compares himself/herself, but regards his/her rewards as being proportionately less. The worker can either attempt to increase the rewards by demanding more pay, for example, or failing that, reduce the investments (Dickson, Roethlisberger, 1966).

In order to prevent oneself from conditions which threaten one's worth and self-interest, an individual employs the laws of survival. They may include blinding oneself to some of the actual conditions or interpreting them in such a light that one's own behavior does not appear too unworthy, not only before others, but in one's own feelings of personal worth (Marting, Finley, and Ward, 1963).
People are egocentric and each person will look at a situation in terms of how it will affect oneself personally. Each will think of ones own needs and give little attention to the needs of others. Conflict resulting in grievances is the inevitable result. Each side will then find reasons to support ones position and oppose the other side with righteous indignation (Trotta, 1976, p. 12).

The final personal dissatisfaction or grievance is the mismatch of employee capabilities to job requirements. An employee's overall capability, as indicated by mental capacity, temperament, and personality should match the requirements of the job or the employee will probably become dissatisfied and be unable to perform the work satisfactorily. If skill and ability is appreciably above the level required by the job, the employee receiving no satisfaction from doing the work will become bored and will eventually find something to complain about. When abilities and skill are below the level of job requirements, the employee becomes frustrated and usually becomes antagonistic (Trotta, 1976).

**JOB-RELATED GRIEVANCES**

Employees are most likely to be worried about job-related situations that threaten their security. "These situations include promotions, transfers, work assignments, layoffs, mechanization or elimination of jobs, and evaluations of their performances" (Bittel, 1980, p. 4).

An additional, significant source of grievances is inappropriate supervision. Supervisors or managers often resent having their decisions questioned and having to answer formal grievances. If a supervisor's attitude is antagonistic or arrogant, he/she is likely to act in a manner which is heavy-handed. This results in making the employee feel small and inadequate. The employee's personal dignity is offended.
In the case of weak supervision, the supervisor fails to command proper respect. Thus, many strong-willed employees may try to assume authority causing friction, disagreements, and bickering to develop among fellow employees.

Unjust discipline can be another source of complaints. This is almost always due to the supervisors failure to control his/her emotions or failure to get all the necessary facts. Supervisors must also be effective in treating employees fairly and impartially. It is not only important to be consistent but also to avoid any appearance of inconsistency (Trotta, 1976). Complaints of "distributive justice" could result if employees perceive a felt injustice in the treatment accorded him/her compared to others (Dickson and Roethlesberger, 1966).

Promises to employees should seldom be made but if promises are made, supervisors should fulfill them. Supervisors must be careful to avoid statements which can be interpreted as a promise. People are prone to hear what they want to hear (Trotta, 1976).

False accusations are yet another example of inappropriate supervision. There is nothing more demoralizing to a worker than a false accusation. If a person is unjustly reprimanded, it is difficult, (if not impossible) for a supervisor to counterbalance the effects of that reprimand and to restore the worker's confidence, respect, and loyalty. Consequently, supervisors can hardly overestimate the importance of being sure of themselves before reprimanding (Marting, Finley, and Ward, 1963).

If a supervisor acts in a manner which obstructs an employee's progress or otherwise affects an employee's best interest, a grievance may also result. It is therefore essential that supervisors know their institution's employee relations policies. Not only should the supervisor
know the policies and rules, he/she should make sure subordinates understand them. An effective supervisor welcomes questions as an opportunity to avoid misunderstandings which cause grievances (Trotta, 1976).

Another job-related conflict is ambiguous jurisdictions. When two parties have related responsibilities for which actual boundaries are unclear, the potential for conflict between the parties increases. "Conversely, when role definitions are clear, each party can expect a certain type of behavior from the other, and fewer opportunities for disagreements occur" (Filley, 1975, p. 11).

And the final job related conflict is an unresolved prior conflict. If a previous complaint or grievance is left unresolved through either suppression by control or uncommitted compromise, the prior conflict reappears as a demanding, current grievance (Filley, 1975).

**FREQUENCY OF GRIEVANCES**

In his book, *What Every Supervisor Should Know*, Bittle (1980) offered the most noted grievances listed in order of their frequency.

**Wages and Salary**

1) Demand for individual wage adjustments

2) Complaints about job classification

**Supervision**

1) Complaints about discipline

2) Objections to general methods of supervision

3) Disciplinary discharges

**Promotions**

**General Working Conditions**
GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

It is the intent of a grievance procedure to settle grievances at the lowest possible level. In keeping with this intent, most grievance procedures begin with an informal meeting between the grievant and his/her supervisor. To the extent that the supervisor has been involved in making some judgement which led to the grievance, the meeting between the two would seem to be useful to both. In those cases where some higher authority made a decision that precipitated the grievance, meetings between the grievant and the immediate supervisor are not necessarily productive in terms of resolving the grievance. In order to accommodate such situations some agreements provide for an informal meeting at an advanced step in the procedure (Ostrander, 1981).

If the grievance is not resolved at the informal level to the employee's satisfaction, he/she may initiate the formal phase by filing a formal grievance form. The formal phase consists of a number of appeals levels, which typically follow the progression of managerial authority. The number of possible appeal levels varies. Usually there are no fewer than three nor more than five (Ostrander, 1981).

TYPES OF GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

There are two general types of grievance procedures. One is a grievance stemming from the alleged violation of the employee's rights. In this type it is the employee's obligation or responsibility to show that management has deprived him/her of some right or privilege.

The second general type of grievance is one involving disciplinary charges. In a disciplinary case, it is the responsibility of the management to demonstrate that there is "just cause" and that the employee was given "due process" (Ostrander, 1981).
The first criteria for meeting the "just cause" standard is that the employee must have been warned of the consequences of misconduct. Warnings may be written or oral. An exception may be made for conduct so serious that an employee is expected to know it is punishable. Examples are drunkenness or stealing.

Secondly, management must investigate before administering the discipline. A distinction needs to have been made between facts and allegations. Allegations must then be investigated thoroughly. The investigation must be fair and objective, and produce substantial evidence or proof. It is not required that the evidence is conclusive or "beyond reasonable doubt" except where the alleged misconduct is of such a criminal or reprehensible nature as to stigmatize the employee and seriously impair his/her chances for future employment.

The third "just cause" criteria is rules, orders, and penalties must have been applied even handedly and without discrimination. If, in the past, the enforcement of these rules, orders, and penalties had been lax, sufficient warning must be given before a "crack down" is implemented.

And finally, the fourth "just cause" criteria includes that the penalty be reasonably related to the seriousness of the incident and the employee's past employment record (The Bureau of National Affairs, 1978).

DUE PROCESS

Because employees have a right to due process, the employee must be given notice of the charge or complaint filed against him/her and the supporting facts. Due process also ensures the employee a hearing at which there is an opportunity to answer charges or explain a
position. The employee has the right to confront and question the ac­
cuser and the right to call and cross-examine witnesses.

In addition, employees have the right to representation by legal
counsel, nonprejudicial time intervals, and a record of the hearing.
Decision making must be impartial and based solely on the evidence
presented at the hearing (Shubert and Folger, 1980).

PRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE

In discipline cases, it is customary for management to present its
evidence first. The employer has the burden of justifying the disci­
plinary action. If the grievant were required to present first, the
grievant would need to prove that he or she was guilty of no offense of
any kind, i.e. the universal negative. Therefore, by having management
proceed first, the assumption is maintained that the grievant is in­
nocent of wrongdoing until the evidence shows otherwise. The burden
of proving the affirmative of an argument rests with the party who
asserts it (Ostrander, 1981).

GRIEVANCE FACILITATOR

Because of the previously stated complexity of grievance procedures,
the possible volatile nature of grievance proceedings, and the neces­
sary provision for a power balance; a non-decision making facilitator
may be included to aid the processing of a grievance procedure. The
facilitator is the contact person for the employee who has an alleged
grievance. The facilitator listens, evaluates, and advises the employee
to the appropriateness of his/her alleged grievance and to the pro­
cedural steps of filing a grievance.

The facilitator also initiates and conducts the informal meeting
between the grievant and the management person directly responsible in
the grievance action. If the grievance is not resolved at the informal level, the facilitator directs the process through its levels and maintains the permanent grievance records. It is also the facilitator's responsibility to check institutional policies for information on previous practices, current interpretations, and present policies. The facilitator may also be responsible for examining the employee's records. Even though the final decision should be made on the facts of this particular grievance, employee records may help in the interpretation of the facts (Marting, Finley, and Ward, 1963).

In order to decrease the volatile nature of a grievance proceeding, a non-decision making facilitator's goal is to depersonalize the situation and therefore create a problem-solving atmosphere. Personalized situations are those in which the whole being of the "other party" is being threatened or judged negatively. Personalized situations create tension and anxiety. Depersonalized situations are those in which the behavior or characteristics are described as creating problems to be solved rather than judged as being responsible for the problem. Depersonalized situations lend themselves to problem solving (Filley, 1975).

A grievance procedure facilitator also attempts to provide an atmosphere which avoids coercion, control, and suppression; and promotes balance of power of the opponent or the accused. Coercion, control and suppression require clear superiority of power of one party over another, whereas, problem solving requires an equalization of power among parties. In dealing with employment grievance procedures, a balance of power ensures both the rights of the employee and the rights of the institutional personnel (Filley, 1975).
NECESSARY FACILITATING KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

The facilitator needs to have the most up-dated knowledge of the authorized, current grievance procedure. It is the facilitator's responsibility to know the technical aspects of the grievance procedure and to take special consideration not to overlook what may at first appear to be tiny, possibly even insignificant, technicalities. The grievance procedure's progress may well depend on how well all details are observed and followed. On the other hand facilitators must keep in mind not to become too engrossed with the process itself as to overlook the original, intended purpose; that is the settlement of the grievance procedure (Bittel, 1980).

With a student employee grievance procedure, the facilitator will in most cases be the initial contact for the student employee. It is very important that the student's grievance be properly received. The facilitator needs to focus his/her entire attention on the student employee and allow the student to express his/her entire story without interruption. Five thousand years ago an Egyptian ruler, Ptah Hotep, stated:

If you are in a position of one to whom petitions are made, be courteous and listen to the petitioner's story. Do not stop his words until he has poured out all that is in his heart and has said all that he has to say. A man with a grievance loves the official who will accept what he states and lets him talk out his trouble fully (Trotta, 1976, p. 80).

It is a good idea to have the employee then repeat the entire story while the facilitator takes notes. This reinforces to the student employee that his/her complaint is being taken seriously and proper consideration is being given. Then the facilitator should summarize in his/her own words the essentials of the employee's complaint. The
The facilitator should keep in mind to verbalize the summarization in a rational context, defusing explosive expressions of emotion (Marting, Finley, and Ward, 1963).

**DIAGNOSTIC TASK**

Only during the initial, preliminary stage does the facilitator evaluate the merit or legitimacy of the student's proposed grievance. The facilitator will in fact weigh the grievance and explore with the student employee the expected relief that is being sought (Marting, Finley, and Ward, 1963).

The facilitator should keep in mind that not all employee complaints will have the adequate facts to support a grievance procedure. As was stated earlier, employees may have a personal problem such as an emotional disturbance, family conflict, health concern, or academic difficulty that may be greatly influencing his/her ability to correctly perceive the complaint or dissatisfaction. In the event that this occurs, the facilitator not only attempts to clearly explain to the student employee the reasons why his/her proposed grievance is not legitimate or not supported by facts, but also to objectively demonstrate the apparent appropriateness or justness of the questionable action to the student employee (Bittel, 1980).

The facilitator, however, should not try to persuade the student employee to drop the grievance or discontinue the procedure by attempting to outsmart an employee with clever use of words and sharp debating tactics. Grievances are caused by facts or what an employee believes to be facts. Clever use of words and sharp debating tactics will not change the facts or dissolve the grievance (Trotta, 1976). A good facilitator will instead employ patience, sincerity, objectivity,
honesty, and fairness in his/her decisions of evaluations.

It has been clearly demonstrated that decisions often times are the result of a lifetime of experiences, culture patterns, economic status, role playing, assumptions, opinions, and so forth. And that in most cases the decision maker is not even aware of why he feels and acts the way he does and how his feelings enter into his decisions (Trotta, 1976, p. 11).

Therefore, it is wise if the facilitator avoids basing his/her evaluations on "gut reactions." They are often times misleading because they are personal opinions and attitudes which result from the individual's conditioning by his/her lifetime experiences and tend not to be objective (Trotta, 1976).

In order to be perceived as a honest and fair facilitator, he/she must be prepared to accept the logical conclusions that flow from the facts that are uncovered. This may mean making concessions in previously held attitudes and opinions or changing ones mind or way of doing things. The facilitator who has the flexibility for change and the ability to grow through change will gain the reputation for honest and fair evaluation (Bittel, 1980). He has equated a good facilitator to a good baseball umpire.

Be like a good baseball umpire. Call each one as you see it. An umpire who blows a decision is really in trouble if he tries to make up for it on the next call. It should be the same with a grievance. An employee either has a case or hasn't a case. Consider each case on its merits. And don't let the grievance become a political issue (Bittel, 1980, p. 379).
Chapter Three

U.N.I. STUDENT EMPLOYMENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

PROCEDURE

The historical review of the evolution of the University of Northern Iowa's Student Employee Grievance Procedure begins with a statement from J.W. Maucker, President, State College of Iowa, October 4, 1962. He was addressing all staff members, administrative, instructional, non-academic, and student employees as to the clarification of position of the college administration regarding student employee strike or walk-out. As was reported in his statement, he had met with student employees on September 26, 1962, and was asked what he would do if students were to go on strike for higher wages. This clarification of position was his formalized response to the student body. He stated that:

The laws of the state pertaining to collective bargaining, including the legal right to retain one's job status without penalty while striking under conditions defined by law, do not apply to college employees. And if a student employee fails to perform his job assignment by reason of participation in a walkout or strike, he does so as an individual and has no continuing legal right to the job. (Maucker, 1962)

President Maucker went on to state the current Board Policy regarding grievances.

On the other hand, in accordance with long-standing policies and practices of the State Board of Regents, the administrative officers of the college are expected to provide a fair hearing for any employees who feel they have a legitimate grievance, to accept and consider—more than that, to search out actively and weigh carefully relevant evidence, and to take such action or to make such recommendations to the president of the college and/or to the State Board of Regents as they deem to be in the best interests of the college and the state of Iowa, have due consideration for the welfare of all members of the college community, including students, staff, alumni and neighbors. (Maucker, 1962)
The president then advised his intended audience of the crucial considerations that must be present before a strike should be implemented:

The qualifying conditions are crucial—college employees would be ill-advised to strike unless they considered the situation extremely serious or dangerous or grossly unfair or discriminatory and then only if they had tried without success all other reasonable avenues for redress of grievances, including appeal to the administration and the governing board of the college. Certainly no group should strike while the college administration is engaged in good faith in the process of studying their grievances and considering what may be done to alleviate them. (Maucker, 1962)

The first written draft of a student employee grievance procedure was proposed in 1975. Student employees were defined as non-academic employees, who were students currently registered in an undergraduate or graduate program, who had no other employee grievance procedure available for use. The student employee was granted a reasonable time not to exceed four hours off from duties without loss of pay to investigate a grievance. The first step in the grievance procedure was the student employee presenting the grievance orally to his immediate supervisor. The second step was the filing of a written grievance to the immediate supervisor. Step three consisted of the written grievance being sent to the department head and or administrator designated by the Vice-President for Student Services. The fourth and final step was filing the grievance with the Vice-President for Administrative Services. A meeting would then be called by the Vice-President for Administrative Services of all parties who had previously participated in the case. This proposal did not contain a formalized grievance form which recorded the appropriate response for the different steps.

It appears that this early 1975 proposed student employee grievance procedure was not adopted. Three years later, in May 1978, a
committee consisting of two UNISA appointees, the Assistant to the Vice-President for Administrative Services, and the Assistant to the Vice-President of Student Services was formed to further study the matter of a Student Employee Grievance Procedure.

Revisions of the original draft were proposed. Graduate and teaching assistants were exempted from coverage by the general student employee grievance procedure. The rationale was that graduate and teaching assistants perform their assignments as direct extensions of their academic programs and a grievance should be pursued as an academic matter through departmental channels. The committee also recommended that allegations of discrimination be exempted from coverage because students who alleged discrimination on the basis of sex, race, or handicap have recourse to grievance procedures established in compliance with federal regulations.

In addition, the committee concluded that hourly compensations and assignment to the student payroll by the Student Financial Aids Office were the two primary conditions for establishing student employee status (Ad Hoc Student Grievance Procedure Committee Minutes, June 21, 1978). This proposed Student Employee Grievance Procedure was approved and adopted the spring of 1979.

The most recent revision of the University of Northern Iowa Student Employment Grievance Procedure occurred during the spring of 1982. The three major changes that were recommended were a direct result of experience gained from processing the first actual grievance using the existing 1979 procedure. First, it was discovered that step one which allowed the grievant to orally present his/her case was ineffective. The student employee and the direct supervisor had verbally discussed the disagreement previously and the attempt to orally present the case resulted in redundancy and increased the feelings of hostility between
the grievant and the direct supervisor. The oral presentation also appeared to be difficult to document.

Secondly, the grieving student had sought advice and counseling throughout the procedure. At different procedural steps, the form would be held up and not forwarded in a timely manner. The involved university supervisors and administrators were unclear of their responsibilities and the appropriate procedures.

And thirdly, revisions in student employment policies and the reorganization and restructuring of university departments and staffs caused the existing language of the grievance procedure to be outdated or inappropriate.

Therefore, the revisions proposed in 1982 addressed these three major concerns. The first revision was the oral presentation by the grievant to the immediate supervisor was no longer considered the initial formal procedural step. This process is now included at the informal level prior to initiating a formal grievance procedure.

Secondly, a representative from the Financial Aids Student Employment Office acts as the non-decision making facilitator during the informal proceedings between the grievant and the employing department's immediate supervisor and provides an atmosphere conducive to problem-solving. The Financial Aids Student Employment Office facilitator is also responsible for monitoring the grievance procedure. The facilitator will not only encourage resolution at the informal level but in the event of informal resolution failure, the facilitator will continue to facilitate the proceedings by distributing the grievance form to the student grievant, forward the grievance form to the appropriate procedural level, receive the completed grievance form, and maintain the permanent file of completed grievances. The availability of the
Financial Aids Student Employment Office representative or facilitator to consult not only with the student grievant but also with the employing department throughout the grievance procedure is being strongly emphasized.

The third major revision included the addition of another step in the appeal process recognizing organizational differences between various divisions of the university and the deletion of the student criteria: compensated for his/her work on the basis of an established hourly rate. It was recognized that a number of student employees were currently being paid a monthly stipend or salary and that these student employees should be included in the right to the student employees grievance procedure.

These recommended changes were approved and the current Student Employee Grievance Procedures were published in the University of Northern Iowa President's Bulletin, September 1982.
Chapter Four

IDENTIFICATION OF INTERNAL PROBLEMS

Student employment grievance procedures provide a structured process for identifying internal problems. This process can be fundamental in initiating preventative intervention. With the event of a student employment grievance proceeding, the opportunity is provided for supervisors to evaluate their role and the effectiveness of their managerial skills; for university personnel to examine their existing student employment discipline policies to see if they are equitable, consistent, publicized, and currently appropriate; and for supervisors and administrators to assess the institutional climate to determine if it is healthy, functionable, and productive.

ROLE OF SUPERVISION

The supervisor's role in a student employment program is one of great responsibilities. He/she needs to assume the responsibilities of overseer, teacher, interpreter, manager, and university representative/role model. Effective supervisors are infinitely more than the immediate supervisor who oversees duties. They must assume the role of teacher in employment training programs. Supervisors also interpret and give meaning to university policies, procedures, and practices. They should comprehend and be able to relate the interdependence between academic and nonacademic areas. "This practice of good supervision assures that the learnings which the student acquires in a job situation far exceeds the performance listed in the student's job description" (Adams and Stephens, 1972).
Effective supervisors must also be good managers. A good manager is one who can effectively utilize the human, mechanical, and material resources under his/her direction. Although the effective utilization of human resources is the most difficult managerial function, this ability to work with and through people is the good manager's greatest asset (Trotta, 1976).

Supervisors are also representatives of all employees of the institution. Their interpretation of the institution and its policies, procedures, and practices affect and possibly shape the values the student employee acquires regarding the institution (Wirth, 1982).

These many roles that a supervisor needs to play make the supervisory role very critical to a student employment program quality. Although some student employment supervisors have formal, advanced training in personnel management with significant experience in supervision, others have neither training or experience. Regardless of the experience or non-experience, in most university communities student employee supervision is but one of the many responsibilities held by the designated student supervisor. The most dedicated student employee supervisor can give but limited attention to increasing the student employee's knowledge or competence of a task. It is therefore very important that the supervisor use this limited attention in the most productive manner (Wirth, 1982).

**PREVENTATIVE SUPERVISORY TACTICS**

A preventative intervention that can be initiated by supervisors is the assessment of their managerial skills. Bittel (1980) outlines nine such general supervisory preventative methods:

1. Give employees prompt and regular feedback about how well they are doing their job. Uncertainty in this area is a major source of employee dissatisfaction.
2) Remove, or try to ease, minor irritations as they arise. The presence of unnecessary aggravations tends to magnify the more serious complaints when they occur.
3) Listen to and encourage constructive suggestions. Take action whenever it is reasonable and nondisruptive.
4) Make certain of your authority before making a commitment to an employee. Then be sure to keep your promises.
5) When making changes, take special care to explain the reasons and as far in advance as possible.
6) Assign work impartially. Try to balance the distribution of attractive and disagreeable work so that employees share it equally.
7) Be consistent in your standards of performance and the way in which you reward or punish those workers who comply or fail to measure up.
8) Render your decisions as soon as possible when responding to employee requests. A prompt no is often more welcome than a long-delayed yes.
9) If you must criticize or take disciplinary action, do not make a public display of it. Keep it a private matter between you and the employee (p. 387).

In evaluating the effectiveness of their managerial or supervisory skills, student employee supervisors may need to additionally concentrate on three specific areas: feedback, reprimands, and employee expectations. As was previously stated a major source of employee dissatisfaction is the employee's uncertainty of his/her job performance. Accurate feedback can be a valuable preventative tactic against this uncertainty. According to Little and Chin (1980), student employee supervisor's feedback needs to be descriptive rather than judgemental. Descriptive statements provide raw material for problem solving. Feedback should also be specific rather than general. "Effective feedback is facilitated when examples of specific instances of recent behavior are utilized rather than references to past general patterns of behavior" (p. 41).

Since the purpose of feedback is to help the student employee, the feedback must therefore focus on things the student employee can change or control. Feedback may also need to be appropriately timed. If the
student employee is feeling defensive or depressed, he/she will not benefit from an untimely disclosure. The feedback should be appropriately reserved until sometime in the future. However, if the student employee is open to feedback, it should be given at the time the behavior takes place and when its accuracy can be checked out with others. At all times the motive of helping or assisting the employee should be the consideration; self-gratification is not the intended purpose of feedback.

The next specific area a supervisor may additionally need to concentrate on is reprimands. For a reprimand to be effective, the supervisor must know and understand the individual concerned, be able to evaluate his/her character, his/her job, his/her past record, and his/her present attitudes concerning the job. The exact nature of the reprimand should be dictated by the supervisor's knowledge of the student employee and of the situation that necessitates the reprimand (Marting, Finley, and Ward, 1963).

Student employee supervisors should also concentrate on communicating effectively to their employees the expectations they hold for the employee's performance and the expectations of a satisfactory completed job. Student employees need to know what is expected of them, how he/she should act in specific circumstances and why.

During any type of reprimanding, student employee supervisors should be constructive and explain to the student employee how he/she can improve. At all costs, threats or intimidations should be avoided. The concluding step of an effective reprimand is the supervisor should get an agreement from the student employee. This is a sort of meeting of minds in which the student employee takes on the responsibility to improve his/her conduct in the future. "This agreement is the final objective of every reprimand. If you can gain his genuine and willing
cooperation on this point, you have a good chance of acquiring a loyal, enthusiastic, and dependable player on the team" (Marting, Finley, and Ward, 1963, p. 219).

EXAMINATION OF DISCIPLINE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

A student employment grievance procedure may also be instrumental in persuading university personnel to examine their existing student employment discipline policies, standards, and procedures. It is essential that discipline policies, standards, and procedures be regarded as corrective measures not as punitive measures. Therefore, rules governing student employee disciplinary actions need to be carefully and thoroughly explained to the student employee. Indoctrination courses, employee handbooks, and bulletin board notices are suggested to publicize these rules. It is equally important that all administrators and first-line supervisors know the universities disciplinary policies and procedures and conformably apply them. Employers should avoid arbitrary or hasty actions (The Bureau of National Affairs, 1978).

Disciplinary policies need to be clear, unambiguous, and up-to-date or attuned to contemporary mores and attitudes. They should be applied consistently, seriously, and without discrimination. Accusations must be supported by facts and circumstantial evidence kept at a minimum. Before any disciplinary action is taken, the student employee's motives and reasons for violation is investigated. The employee's past work record is considered but any previous offenses are not used against him/her unless a reprimand was issued at the time and the student employee was sufficiently warned that the previous offense could be used against him/her at a later date.
As was mentioned previously, university employers need to know the student employee disciplinary policies. This is especially true in cases of verbal and informal reprimands. A university adopted practice of a regular reprimand warning procedure needs to be worked out and applied. Some universities prefer to bring in the Student Employment Office or University Personnel Department into student disciplinary cases early. Copies of written warnings go to these offices to be kept on file (The Bureau of National Affairs, 1978).

And finally discipline must be carefully administered to recalcitrant employees whose cultural background and life style are different. If a student employee cannot understand the language spoken by his/her supervisor and other employees, he/she may become isolated or suspicious and misinterpret what is being said. It is therefore essential that a supervisor make sure that all student employees fully comprehend the reasons for the discipline. It may be necessary for the supervisor to ask assistance of the Foreign Student Affairs Office or a faculty member from the university's Language Department to further explain the disciplinary situation to this type of student employee (Trotta, 1976).

Trotta (1976) cautions that many employees belonging to minority groups that have been discriminated against for years are extremely sensitive and may claim discrimination when none exists (p. 38).

**INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE**

The institutional climate, meaning the character of interpersonal relationships that permeates the entire university or institution, is the final assessment that a student employment grievance procedure may help define. Although this climate is sometimes rather intangible and difficult to define, it is an important element in providing job
satisfaction and pleasant working conditions. The institutional climate has a marked effect on the incidence of grievances. Employees prefer to work for an institution which has a healthy, functionable, and productive climate and where supervisors are considerate of them as individuals (Trotta, 1976).

It has also been suggested that when a leadership design is developed to provide appropriate workplaces in which student employees are treated as adults, the institutional climate is greatly enhanced. Supervisors need to create adequate "elbow room" space for their student employees. This space should not have a sense of having an overseer breathing down the student employee's necks. Student employees desire a climate which offers opportunities for learning on the job. This opportunity should promote setting reasonable, attainable goals and getting feedback on improving performances. Student employees want an optimal level of task variety to avoid boredom and fatigue and to be able to settle into a satisfying rhythm of work. Institutional climate should also enhance conditions where student employees can and do get help and respect from workmates. Supervisors need to avoid creating conditions in which one person's gain is another's workmate's loss. The sense of value in one's own work is emphasized in a healthy work climate. Student employees do not want to view themselves as trained monkeys or industrial robots. It is very important for student employees to perceive their work as meaningful contributions to their institution (Wirth, 1982).

The concept of quality circles is yet another vehicle to promote a good institutional climate. Quality circles allow student employees to identify, analyze and solve university problems. They are structured to allow workers to take the "initiative" rather than merely reacting
to supervisory or administrative proposals. Participation in quality circles increase the student worker's marketability by improving their upward and lateral communication. If quality circles are to be successful it is essential that university administrators be committed to the idea of quality circles and to the reception of the upward flow of novel ideas, innovative proposals, and new strategies (Bonner, 1982).
Chapter Five

SUMMARY

In order to assess if the conditions have been met of providing a supported rationale for implementing a student employment grievance system, it is necessary to see if adequate answers have been provided to five crucial questions: 1) What is a student employment grievance procedure? 2) Why is a student employment grievance system necessary? 3) Who will benefit from such a system? 4) How is a student employment grievance system initiated? 5) When should an institution implement a student employment grievance system?

WHAT IS A STUDENT EMPLOYMENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE?

A student employment grievance system was stated as a balance between freedom of students to express their complaints, differences, and disputes; and the necessary order of the institution's operations. A review of grievance procedures took into account the complex nature of grievances realizing that grievances may be caused by conditions on the job or outside the job; and that not all complaints were real grievances nor were all real grievances expressed in words, but could be expressed in behavioral changes. In addition the two general types of grievance procedures were grievances stemming from an alleged violation of the employee's rights and grievances involving charges of unjust discipline.

WHY IS A STUDENT EMPLOYMENT GRIEVANCE SYSTEM NECESSARY?

It was noted that a student employment grievance system complies with the student rights legislation that was passed due to the unrest
of college campuses during the 1960's and 1970's. The examination of the previously instituted labor-management grievance system offered credence to the implementation of a similar student employment grievance system. It was also noted that the recently expressed student job dissatisfaction gave yet another reason for the implementation of a student employment grievance system.

WHO WILL BENEFIT FROM A STUDENT EMPLOYMENT GRIEVANCE SYSTEM?

Because of the unique qualities possessed by student employees, this student population would have access to a procedural system that could address their unique needs and concerns. A student employment grievance system was also credited with benefiting the institution with a means for identifying and defining problem areas in order to explore and develop preventative methods.

HOW WAS A STUDENT EMPLOYMENT GRIEVANCE SYSTEM INITIATED?

The initiation and evolution of the UNI's Student Employment Grievance System was discussed. Necessary counseling and facilitating skills were studied in order to appropriately initiate not only the formal procedural steps but also the informal proceedings.

WHEN SHOULD A STUDENT EMPLOYMENT GRIEVANCE SYSTEM BE INITIATED?

The rationale presented in the content of the study and this summarized defense of the rationale indicates that an immediate implementation would be timely. Additional reasons for an immediate implementation will be discussed in the following recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION

It would appear that with today's increasing room, board, and tuition costs coupled with the difficulty of attaining off-campus employment
due to high unemployment nation-wide; more students may find it necessary to attain on-campus student employment as a viable means for financing their education. The rise in student employee population plus the resulting increased demands placed on student employee supervisors could definitely increase the volume of expressed student employee grievances. Therefore a structured, institutionalized system of expressing and resolving these grievances needs to be implemented now.

Because of the increased demands placed on university personnel to supervise larger numbers of student employees, institutions may need to implement additional student employment programs to help relieve these increased demands. The Student Employment Office could offer training/orientation workshops for student employees. Large numbers of student employees could be orientated and trained at one time instead of individual supervisors orientating and training one or two student employees individually. Student employee handbooks which outline student employment policies and procedures could be distributed to all student employees for their personal reference. A student employee contract outlining what is expected of the student employee and what the consequences will be if the expectations are not fulfilled could be signed by the student and kept on file.

In addition, institutions could provide training workshops for student employee supervisors concentrating on managerial skills and techniques. As was stated in the study of student employment grievance systems, many student employee supervisors do not have supervisory skills as they were hired for some other major job responsibility but had student supervision included or possibly even added as the need arose. Therefore, structured training workshops could be a genuine benefit to
the supervisor as well as the student employee and a good preventative method to the occurrence of grievances.

Quality circles, not only at the individual university department level, but also at the university-wide level could be set up with student employee representatives and university administrators meeting on a regular basis. This would allow for valuable student employee input concerning student employee policies and procedures plus the promotion of innovative ideas.

It appears to this writer that by initiating and promoting as many preventative methods and techniques as possible, the necessity of having a student employment grievance system would still need to be ensured, but the number of actual incidents of a formal grievance being filed would be greatly diminished.
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APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A

U.N.I. STUDENT EMPLOYMENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

Grievances, disagreements, and complaints by student employees will be resolved in accordance with the procedures set forth below. These procedures will apply to, and be considered the right of, any University of Northern Iowa student employee who meets all of the following criteria:

1. A student must be currently registered as at least a half-time student (six hours undergraduate or five hours graduate),


A grievance is a difference, complaint, or dispute regarding the interpretation or application of established policies and/or procedures governing terms of employment, working conditions, hours of work or compensation. General wage adjustments are excluded from the grievance procedure.

Grievances arising out of alleged discrimination on the basis of race, sex, or handicap are subject to separate review procedures. For appropriate referral relative to such complaints, student employees should consult with the Office of Vice President for Educational and Student Services.

A grievance must be initiated within three (3) months of the date the grievant first became aware of, or should have become aware of the occurrence of such grievance. All complaints not filed within three (3) months of the actual incident shall be deemed abandoned.

The Financial Aids and Student Employment Office (FASEO) will be responsible for distributing the form to the grievant and for monitoring the grievance procedure. A representative of FASEO is available for consultation with the grievant as well as the employing department throughout the entire grievance process.

At each step of the procedure the student employee may seek consultation and has the right to be accompanied by one representative of his/her choice. The grievance proceedings are confidential and closed to the public unless both parties associated with the grievance agree to open hearings.

A student employee alleging a grievance will seek initially to resolve such a complaint by informal means. A representative from FASEO is available for consultation with both the employee and the employing department at the informal level. A student employee and supervisor are encouraged to resolve complaints and disagreements at the informal level.

Failing resolution by informal means, the formal grievance procedure may be initiated. The procedure for filing a formal grievance must be initiated no later than twenty (20) calendar days following the failure of resolution by informal means. All supervisory personnel involved shall consider grievances as
soon as is reasonably possible and within the time limits specified. An extension of the time limit specified in the grievance procedure may be made when mutually agreed upon by the employee and the administrator to whom the grievance is being addressed. Forms for initiating a formal grievance are available at the FASEO.

FORMAL GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

Grievance actions will be resolved in conformity with the following review levels.

Initial Action: Student employee obtains Grievance Form from the FASEO. Student employee completes Statement of Grievance and cites the relief sought. The Grievance Form is returned to the FASEO within five (5) calendar days.

Level I

Immediate Supervisor receives Grievance Form from the FASEO. The Immediate Supervisor shall conduct an investigation giving the grievant, and/or a representative of his/her choosing, the opportunity to present the case orally. The Immediate Supervisor responds in writing indicating his/her disposition and reasons for same. The Grievance Form is returned to the FASEO within five (5) calendar days of receiving the form.

Student's Response:

If the grievant is satisfied with the decision rendered at Level I, the grievant marks the "hereby accept" response, signs and dates the form, and returns the form to the FASEO.

If the grievant is not satisfied with the decision rendered at Level I, or if the decision is not rendered in a timely manner, the grievant marks the "hereby decline" response, signs and dates the form, and returns the form to the FASEO within five (5) calendar days.

Level II

The Department Head or Director receives Grievance Form from the FASEO. The Department Head or Director shall conduct an investigation giving the grievant, and/or a representative of his/her choosing, the opportunity to present the case orally. The Department Head or Director responds in writing indicating his/her disposition and reasons for same. The Grievance Form is returned to the FASEO within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the form.

Student's Response:

If the grievant is satisfied with the decision rendered at Level II, the grievant marks the "hereby accept" response, signs and dates the form, and returns the form to the FASEO.

If the grievant is not satisfied with the decision rendered at Level II, or if the decision is not rendered in a timely manner, the grievant marks the "hereby decline" response, signs and dates the form, and returns the form to the FASEO within five (5) calendar days.
Level III

Dean or Designated Representative receives Grievance Form from the FASEO. The Dean or Designated Representative shall conduct an investigation giving the grievant, and/or a representative of his/her choosing, the opportunity to present the case orally. The Dean or Designated Representative responds in writing indicating his/her disposition and reasons for same. The Grievance Form is returned to the FASEO within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the form.

Student's Response:

If the grievant is satisfied with the decision rendered at Level III, the grievant marks the "hereby accept" response, signs and dates the form, and returns the form to the FASEO.

If the grievant is not satisfied with the decision rendered at Level III, or if the decision is not rendered in a timely manner, the grievant marks the "hereby decline" response, signs and dates the form, and returns the form to the FASEO within five (5) calendar days.

Level IV

Division Vice President or Designated Representative receives Grievance Form from the FASEO. The Division Vice President or Designated Representative shall conduct an investigation giving the grievant, and/or a representative of his/her choosing, the opportunity to present the case orally. The Division Vice President or Designated Representative responds in writing indicating his/her disposition and reasons for same. The Grievance Form is returned to the FASEO within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the form.

A decision at this level of review is considered the final internal remedy. Any subsequent request for review shall be governed by procedures specified by the Board of Regents and published in the University Policies and Procedures Manual under the heading, "Appeals by Employees to Board of Regents." A copy of these procedures is available from the FASEO.

(Vice-President for Educational and Student Services)
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA
STUDENT EMPLOYEE GRIEVANCE FORM

This form is designed to identify procedural steps followed in the Student Employee Grievance process and to serve as a summary record of the grievance action. Attach separate sheet if more space is required. Further details on the procedure are found in the Student Policy Handbook.

Date of Filing Formal Grievance: ____________________________

Name of Student Employee: ____________________________
(Last) (First) (Middle)

Student ID Number: ___________ Student Social Security Number: ___________

Job Title/Description: ______________________________________

Employing Department: ___________ Immediate Supervisor: ___________

STUDENT EMPLOYEE STATEMENT (To be completed within five calendar days.)

Date of Occurrence: ____________________________

Statement of Grievance: (Include time, specific location, and pertinent circumstances.)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Adjustment/Relief Sought/Corrective Action Requested: ____________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Student Employee's Signature ____________________________ Date ___________

Return to the Financial Aids Student Employment Office by ____________________________
Level I (To be completed by the Immediate Supervisor within five calendar days.)

Date received by Immediate Supervisor: ________________________________

Disposition of Grievance by Supervisor: ________________________________

Supervisor's Signature __________________________ Date: __________

Student response to Level I

I hereby _____ accept _____ decline my Immediate Supervisor's decision.

Student Employee's Signature __________________________ Date: __________

Level II (To be completed by the Department Head or Director within ten calendar days of receipt of Grievance Form.)

Date Received by Department Head or Director: _______________________

Disposition of Grievance by Department Head/Director: ____________________

Department Head/Director's Signature __________________________ Date: __________

Return to the Financial Aids Student Employment Office by ____________________
Student's Response to Level II
I hereby ___ accept ___ decline the employing Department Director's or Department Head's decision.

Student Employee's Signature ___________________ Date: ____________

Return to the Financial Aids Student Employment Office by ____________________

Level III (To be completed by Dean or Designated Representative within ten calendar days of receipt of Grievance Form.)

Date Received by Dean or Designated Representative: ________________

Disposition of Grievance by Dean or Designated Representative: ________________

Dean or Designated Representative's Signature: __________________________

Date: ____________

Return to the Financial Aids Student Employment Office by ____________________

Student's Response to Level III
I hereby ___ accept ___ decline the employing Dean or Designated Representative's decision.

Student Employee's Signature ___________________ Date: ____________

Return to the Financial Aids Student Employment Office by ____________________
Level IV (To be completed by Division Vice President or Designated Representative within ten calendar days of receipt of Grievance Form.)

Date Received by Division Vice President or Designated Representative: ____________________________

Disposition of Grievance by Division Vice President or Designated Representative: ________________

________________________________________

Division Vice President or Designated Representative’s Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Return to the Financial Aids Student Employment Office by ____________________________