From Red Tape to Green Tape: Improving Grievance Procedures in Local Government Organizations

Leisha DeHart-Davis, Associate Professor, UNC-Chapel Hill William Horne, City Manager, Clearwater, FL Reina Schwartz, Director of General Services, Sacramento, CA Karen Thoreson, Alliance for Innovation



Agenda for Today

- Introduction to the LGRC
- First Research Project
- Panel Discussion
- Audience Q & A



Local Government Research Collaborative

- Two Year Pilot managed by the Alliance for Innovation, Arizona State University and ICMA
- Comprised of 20 Local Governments and Three Universities
- Collaborating to identify and fund research on emerging practices in local government
- Providing a critical link between academic researchers and local governments
- Convert research to education/technical assistance for local government managers across the globe



Local Government Research Collaborative

Mission

Proactively pursue research on issues that matter;



- Focus on new concepts and ideas or on items that have been researched, but where implementation by local governments has not occurred, or occurred well;
- Produce research that is actionable, influential and, ultimately, results in positive change in our communities; and,
- Actively disseminate research through outlets provided through AFI, ASU, ICMA and other partners.



Local Government Research Collaborative

- Arvada, Colorado
- Auburn, Alabama
- Austin, Texas
- Catawba County, North Carolina
- Clearwater, Florida
- Decatur, Georgia
- Dubuque, Iowa
- Edmonton, Alberta
- Evanston, Illinois
- Flagstaff, Arizona
- Fort Lauderdale, Florida
- Grande Prairie, Alberta
- Kansas University
- Milton, Georgia
- Navajo County, Arizona

- Oak Ridge, Tennessee
 - Olathe, Kansas
 - Phoenix, Arizona
- Sacramento, California
- Sarasota County, Florida
- Stafford County, Virginia
- UNC-Chapel Hill
- UC Denver



Leisha DeHart-Davis Associate Professor UNC-Chapel Hill

Preliminary Findings



Why Study Grievance Procedures?

- Litigation alternative
- Conflict resolution
- Employee voice
- Managerial quality
- Diversity
- Red tape

Research Objectives

- Identify and evaluate promising practices in due process rules that can be considered by other local government organizations across the nation
- Identify non due-process program elements (training, juries, mediation) that reduce workplace conflict*
- Assess the influence of due process on organizational performance

Today

- Status Update
- Extremely Preliminary Data Analyses
- Next Steps

Research Design

- Survey 100 counties in North Carolina
- Conduct 20 interviews
- Synthesize relevant scholarly and professional literature

Due Process and Grievance in NC Counties

- NC counties can have employees with and without property rights in job
- Property right granted when employees can only be fired for cause

Status

- Conducted Qualtrics survey in June/July 2014
- 63% response rate
- Representativeness
 - Slightly over-represents larger organizations
 - Represents three tiers

Preliminary Results

- WARNING: Premature interpretation is hazardous to your intellectual health
- Correlation ≠ Causation
- Results are suggestive and subject to change

Statistics

- Descriptives
- Bivariate
- Multivariate

Organizational Outcomes of Interest

- Turnover (resignations, terminations, retirements)
- Grievances
 - Absolute numbers
 - Rates*
 - Upheld
 - Resolved at department level
 - Timing

Proportion of Counties Adopting Managerial Tools

- Probationary Employment Period (78%)
- Employee Performance Appraisal (69%)
- Employee Assistance Program (59%)
- Workforce Planning (18%)
- Succession Planning (19%)
- Mentorship (5%)

Proportion of Counties Using Employee Involvement

- Employee Opinion Surveys (47%)
- Grievance Input into Grievance Policy Design (29%)
- Employee Advisory Committee (24%)
- Ombuds Office (2%)

Proportion of Counties Offering Training

- Supervisory (64%)
- Policy (57%)
- Leadership (48%)
- Customer Service (41%)
- Diversity (33%)
- Conflict Management (29%)

Grievance Policy Elements— High Adoption Rates

- Opportunity for employee to present evidence (83%)
- Grievance policy purpose (83%)
- Final decision made by the county manager (78%)
- Retaliation protection (75%)
- Maximum Timeframes (69%)
- Pre-Disciplinary Conference (64%)

Grievance Policy Elements— Medium Adoption Rates

- Bypass Supervisor (54%)
- Different procedures for discriminatory vs. nondiscriminatory actions (48%)
- Mediation opportunity (46%)

Grievance Policy Elements— Low Adoption Rates

- A final hearing from someone other than the county manager (33%)
- External review by personnel board or civil service commission (27%)
- Grievance committee of peers (24%)

Descriptive Statistics

- Counties range in size from 62 to 6282 employees
- Grievance policies range from 38 years old to brand new
- 38% of counties have separate grievance policies for employees with property rights
- 63% of counties had an employee grievance filed last year

Grievance Rate Correlates (Preliminary & Subject to Change)

- Full-Time Employees (+)
- Green tape (-)
- Retaliation Protection (-)
- Supervisory Training (-)
- Policies/Procedures Training (-)
- Design with a wider range of stakeholders (-)
- Percentage of male employees (+)

Grievance Rate Correlates (Preliminary & Subject to Change)

- Performance appraisal (-)
- Employee assistance programs (-)
- Involvement of County Attorney in Grievance Policy Design (-)
- Involvement of HR in Grievance Policy Design
 (-)
- Involvement or more stakeholders (-)

Uncorrelated With Grievance Rates (Preliminary & Subject to Change)

- Rate of employees with property rights
- Number of grievable issues
- Rate of minority employees
- Innovative practices: mediation & peer review

Interpreting The Data: An Example

- Retaliation protection is strongly and negatively correlated with grievance rates
- Interpretation: retaliation protection builds employee trust in management, which lowers grievance rates
- Rival interpretation: local governments with high-trust cultures are more likely to protect employees from retaliation and also have lower grievance rates

Potential Recommendations From This Snapshot of Data

- Involve stakeholders, particularly human resources and legal
- Design and implement good grievance rules that employees and managers will follow
- Making grievance easier (grievable issues, property rights, retaliation protection) appears to reduce workplace conflicts, possibly by eliciting employee trust

Caveats

- Extremely small sample size
- Missing data to fill in
- Lots of work to do

Next Steps

- Identify and evaluate promising practices in due process rules that can be considered by other local government organizations across the nation
 - Contemplate survey of Alliance members
 - Gather information from question posted on AFI knowledge network for innovative ideas
 - Begin lit syntheses
 - Conduct interviews post-surveys

Next Steps

- Identify non due-process program elements (training, juries, mediation) that reduce workplace conflict*
 - Backfill missing data in county sample
 - Simplify the survey and expand sample to NC cities
 - Continue analyzing the data
 - Multivariate modeling
 - Turnover

Next Steps

- Assess the influence of due process on organizational performance
 - Model key organizational outcomes as a function of property interest and grievance characteristics



William Horne, City Manager, Clearwater, FL

Reina Schwartz, Director of General Services, Sacramento, CA





Questions/Comments?

For more information on the LGRC contact....
Toni Shope, Strategic Initiatives Director
Alliance for Innovation
tshope@transformgov.org





Charlotte Mecklenburg County SEPTEMBER • 14-17 • 2014