

# **The Value of Value: What Counts to UCAR Employees**

**Report of the 2006 Leadership Academy Diversity Action  
Learning Team**

**Brigitte Baeuerle  
Barry Gamblin  
Tim Hoar  
Linda La Brie  
Krista Laursen  
Anita Monk-Ryan  
Helen Moshak  
Jielun Sun**

*Presented to the UCAR President's Council  
8 June 2006*

## Introduction

As members of the 2006 Leadership Academy (L/A) Diversity Action Learning team, we elected to pursue the following topic proposed by the UCAR President's Council:

*'At a recent UMC meeting, there was a discussion about UCAR culture. An observation was made that a "second-class citizenship" exists at UCAR. When the group was asked if they agreed, many strongly agreed that this existed but there wasn't much discussion about who was second-class or how they were impacted. It might be useful to have a better sense of this (real or perceived) and what, if anything, we might need to do about it.'*

In deciding how best to address this topic, we arrived as a group at the following mission statement:

*"The L/A Diversity Team will explore the value system of the institution with the intent of raising awareness of the importance of fairness, equality, and mutual respect in the workplace."*

This was accompanied by our guiding mission statement:

*"Our goal is to research and increase clarity regarding the equitable treatment of all employees and how they are valued within the organization."*

In the following sections of this report, we provide a description of the process used to examine how employees feel their contributions are valued within UCAR, NCAR, and UOP and we present key findings, observations, and recommendations stemming from our review and inquiry process.

## Process

After selecting the study topic outlined in the Introduction, we decided that further clarification on the topic was needed from the President's Council. We sat down with Tim Killeen and Jack Fellows to engage in a discussion about the context of the "second class citizenship" question and to brainstorm together on ideas regarding how we as an Action Learning Team (ALT) could address the topic in a manner that would be of greatest value to UCAR, NCAR, and UOP.

Following this meeting and additional team planning discussions, we elected to pursue a study comprised of the following three components:

- 1) A review of the UCAR Policy and Benefits manuals and a discussion with Bob Roesch of HR to gain a better understanding of current benefit, compensation, and human resource procedures and policies ;
- 2) A literature review to examine how scholars and other organizations/institutions approach related issues; and
- 3) An appreciative inquiry designed to gain confidential feedback from UCAR, NCAR, and UOP personnel regarding how they feel their work is valued by the organization.

Prior to engaging in the Web-based third (appreciative inquiry) component, it was necessary for our team to present our inquiry plans to the UCAR Office of General Counsel (OGC) and the UCAR President's Council for review and approval. Their guidance helped us frame both the nature of the questions asked during the inquiry process and the methods used to ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of all inquiry respondents. Permission to proceed with the inquiry portion of the study was received from the President's Council in late April 2006.

The appreciative inquiry process was comprised of a Web-based, anonymous survey and confidential face-to-face interviews by team members with volunteers selected from within NCAR, UCAR, and UOP. Both sets of questions were identical, and the inquiry period for both activities ran from 25 April to 15 May 2006. A copy of the inquiry document is provided in Appendix A of this report. A total of 100 Web and interview responses were received over the course of this phase of our study.

Following the completion of the inquiry process, the team met to review the collected responses and to identify common themes appearing in the feedback received. As we discuss in later sections of this report, we arrived at the following five themes as being important to employees' sense of value within the organization: workplace environment, compensation, empowerment, career development, and recognition.

Before proceeding with more in-depth discussion of the three phases of our study, we wish to recognize the contributions of Catherine Shea to our team's project. She provided sound counsel and strategy guidance at key points during our project effort. We also wish to thank Chris Sansone of Chain Reaction Partners for serving as our team facilitator. Chris was instrumental in helping us stay on track and focused as a team and also provided critical process guidance as needed.

## Literature Review

Working with research librarians at both the NCAR and CU Norlin libraries, we conducted a literature search for topics identified as workplace issues affecting the effective functioning of organizations and the satisfaction, interactions, and contributions of employees. Management scholars have identified and studied the role of fairness as a factor in the workplace – a topic broadly described as “organizational justice”.

Organizational justice is divided into three categories - *distributive justice* focusing on the ends or outcome, *procedural justice* focusing on the means or system, and *interactional justice* focusing on the interpersonal treatment employees receive at the hands of organizational decision makers or supervisors. Researchers have studied these topics in many contexts including compensation and benefit practices, performance appraisal, work group incentive plans, team structures, reward systems, dispute resolution procedures and outcomes, workplace decision making systems, organizational citizenship behavior, workplace attitudes, power-distance relationships and gender, budgetary procedures, and employee voice systems. Studies indicate that organizational justice strongly impacts employee performance, loyalty, and evaluations of their superiors and organizations.

Organizational justice impacts are identified as “organizational social capital”; broadly defined as employees’ collective goal orientation and shared trust. Organizational social capital results in increased individual commitment to the collective good, a flexible work organization, manageable collective action, and intellectual capital. Research indicates that it is created by investments in collaborative work, training, job security, and learning; competitive and group-based compensation; rewarding and promoting in line with organizational values and goals; and organizational justice. The emphasis on collective goals and actions may result in significant increases in employee performance, productivity and satisfaction. On the downside, overemphasis can result in reduced risk taking and innovation.

Organizational social capital is directly impacted by all three categories of organizational justice – **how** (procedural) and **what** resources, power, and rewards, (distributive) are allocated **by whom** (interactional). Please refer to the reading list at the end of this report for more information on these topics.

## UCAR Human Resources (HR) Benefits and Policy Review

In researching issues of workplace justice, scholars distinguish between conceptualizations of justice that focus on content (distributive justice) and those that focus on process (procedural justice). We initiated the second component of our project, the Human Resource interview and policy review, to learn more about whether, in the area of UCAR employment benefits, there is a factual foundation to the perception of second class citizenship based on the fairness of benefits and policy content. Linda La Brie, Anita Monk-Ryan and Jielun Sun met with Bob Roesch, Human Resources Director, to interview him about these policies and their origins. The following is a summary of the benefit and policy categories provided by employee group.

Benefit	Ladder Track Scientists	Management	Staff
PTO Accumulation	Maximum Rate	Maximum Rate	Graduated rate reaching Maximum Rate after 8 years
Retirement	Phased Retirement	SAME	SAME
Severance Pay - available only for Reduction in Staff (RIS)	All Ladder Track Scientists receive one year notice. Scientist Is & IIs are eligible for severance pay if RIS and no notice. Scientist IIIs and Senior Scientists receive both notice and severance pay if RIS.	If regular employee and RIS – Severance pay, if term employee – only 30 days notice, no severance pay.	If regular employee and RIS – Severance pay, if term employee – only 30 days notice, no severance pay.
Sabbatical Leave (up to 6 months salary + benefits + dependent family travel)	Scientist IIIs and Senior Scientists	Division or Program Director, Facility Manager	Project Scientist III, Software Engineer IVs and Engineer IVs with focus on research + 6 years service
Professional Development Leave (up to 6 months salary + benefits)	Employees at or above Division and Program Director level after four continuous years of service in one or more of the respective positions. Other staff eligibility – proposals reviewed on ad hoc basis.	SAME	SAME

Flexible Work Time and Location	Job Dependent	Job Dependent and Supervisor Approved	Job Dependent and Supervisor Approved
Appointments – subject to availability of funding	Scientist Is – 3 years, nonrenewable (up or out) Scientist IIs – 4 years, possible extension up to 3 years (up or out) Scientist IIIs – no term Senior Scientists – no term	Term or Regular appointments – employment at will	Term or Regular appointments – employment at will
Promotion	Scientist I and IIs – Division/Lab review Scientist III -- ARG review, NCAR Director Appointment and Senior Scientist – ARG review, NCAR Director Appointment and Board approval	Job Based - Based on job description and limited to established categories and ranges	Unique review and approval procedures for Project Scientist III appointment/promotion only. All other position based on job description and limited to established categories and ranges
Salary – Ranges based on benchmark jobs and market surveys. Individual salary based on qualifications and Compa Ratio (CR).	Scientist Is – 1.0 CR Scientist IIs - .97 CR based on committee recommendation and university community survey  Scientist IIIs and Senior Scientist – Qualifications and CR	Qualifications and CR	Qualifications and CR

According to Bob Roesch, most universities have three packages for different job classifications (faculty, professional and managers, and classified state employees). Faculty typically do not have standard sick leave since they are off during school breaks (Christmas break, spring break, summer break, etc.). However, if faculty members need to be gone during the school year, schools are typically flexible on arrangements. All other University employees accumulate sick leave in a manner similar to UCAR/NCAR. In the areas of retirement plans, health benefits, and salary ranges, UCAR/NCAR is competitive and near the median offered by employers in appropriate comparison groups. For example, Boulder Valley School District provides free health benefits for all employees, but the cost of family coverage is higher. Bob Roesch also explained that there was an early retirement program (with a year of salary) for senior scientists that started in the early 1990s and ended in 2000. In 2001, a phased retirement program was established for all eligible regular employees.

Human Resources also explained that the classification of all positions at UCAR is either "job based" or "person based." The job-based classification is based on the duties relating to that job; all Staff, Associate Scientist, and Project Scientist classifications are job-based. The ladder Scientist positions are the only person-based classifications. These classifications are determined by the qualifications of the individual holding the position. Job-based positions may be stagnant; a division or program may never need more from that position than is currently required, and so promotion is not an option. In these cases, the only avenue for promotion is to apply for a different position. More often, as a supervisor determines that the individual holding the position is capable of more responsibilities than originally required, the job is expanded. When this widening of requirements and responsibilities results in a job which more closely resembles a higher level, a formal reclassification should be undertaken and the employee appointed to the new position if a higher level is available in the job classification category.

Based on – and limited to – this brief review, we find that UCAR/NCAR is constant in its goal to provide competitive and comparable benefit/compensation packages and policies. Management and Human Resources share the intent of ensuring that employees are treated equitably and consistently under UCAR/NCAR policies and procedures.

We observe that this differentiation between ladder track scientists/faculty, management and other staff job classifications (following the education sector norm) contributes to both the reality and perception of second class citizenship and distributive and procedural justice issues existing within our organization. We surmise that this differentiation may also support and exacerbate the perception and possible reality of second class citizenship issues in employee relations areas governed by individual laboratory/division procedures and practices or supervisor actions and discretion. These areas include space and resource allocation, division of duties, promotion, recognition, and group dynamics.

Having completed this review process, our next step was to gather more information on employee perceptions, realities, and ideas from our Web inquiry and interview processes.

## **Inquiry Summary Themes**

In the following sections we present summaries of key inquiry feedback received in each of the five identified major theme areas.

### ***Workplace Environment***

Comments received from inquiry respondents about the work environment at UCAR were generally positive. Personnel are appreciative of the family-friendly environment (flexible work hours, the Daycare center, Family sick leave), the fact that UCAR is environmentally-friendly (the recycling program), and that wellness events and work-out centers are provided to employees. There were many mentions of the UCAR parties (Spring Fling, Christmas Party, Children's Christmas Party, Up the Hill race). Employees report that these events and options offered by the institution makes them feel valued.

Some respondents indicated that they do not have the proper office space or computing facilities to adequately perform their work. In an institution in which computing facilities are often referred to as "world-class," this lack of suitable computing equipment was viewed by some respondents as demoralizing.

As we will discuss in later sections of this report, a common thread was the importance of the relationship between employee and supervisor. This can perhaps be termed the "people environment" within the organization and relates to interactional justice issues. Respondents reported that positive relations with their supervisors had significant impact on their performance and satisfaction. Conversely, if the supervisor-employee relationship is not good, respondents reported a negative impact on job performance and satisfaction. Respondents encouraged UCAR to put more emphasis on the importance of the supervisor-employee relationship and on supervisor training in order to ensure that supervisors know how to effectively relate to and work with their employees. We will return to this topic later on in this report and in our recommendations.

### ***Compensation***

In designing the inquiry questions, our goal was to elicit information about employees' experiences and their perceptions of how the value of their work is demonstrated to them within the organization. In some cases, the responses received indicated (as we anticipated might happen) that pay is an important indicator of employee value. However, most respondents provided much more specific – and quite often detailed – feedback regarding various aspects of compensation within UCAR, NCAR, and UOP. The majority of the responses focused not on distributive justice issues (pay and benefits) but on procedural and interactional justice issues around who

and how decisions are made. Among those responses that pertained to compensation, dominant issues that surfaced revolved around the following:

- How raises are determined and implemented;
- The determination and evaluation of factors governing promotions and general career advancement;
- How bonuses are awarded and merit award decisions are made; and
- Possible benefit inequities.

Employees responded favorably to the annual adjustment of salary ranges and salary increases/raises. The negative comments about raises primarily pertained to the belief that raises reflect the range-of-motion of the entire salary range and do not adequately reflect performance. A concern was also voiced that it can take a long time for an employee to increase his/her compa-ratio. Another compa-ratio issue expressed by some respondents was the need for the organization to explore if the compa-ratio is being used as intended or if everyone is being paid the same amount, regardless of performance (procedure). Division-by-division histograms of compa-ratios – rather than the analysis of just the mean compa-ratio for the entire institution – could perhaps be used to dispel rumors along the lines of “regardless of performance all employees in category X have a compa-ratio of 1.0.”

The current practice of talking about and implementing raises once per year (during the annual performance appraisal process) was considered by the majority of respondents to be very positive. More than one respondent was grateful to be relieved of the need to figure out when it was appropriate during the year to ask for a raise.

Our review of the inquiry responses indicated that issues pertaining to promotion and general career advancement are also compensation issues. Some inquiry respondents indicated that more information is desired regarding what is required to obtain a promotion. This latter point is directly related to a concern voiced by many respondents that well-defined career paths do not exist within certain job categories or that only very short career paths have been created in certain position categories.

Some respondents expressed the opinion that within a given job category, promotion happens only at the supervisor’s discretion: as supervisors vary, so does the possibility of promotion. A number of inquiry respondents also voiced the opinion that professional development courses taken by employees do not actually assist in the career development process within the organization. An additional sentiment that appeared among some of the responses was the belief that one is more likely to achieve a higher position by first *leaving* UCAR, working somewhere else, and then getting rehired by UCAR!

Increased procedural knowledge may mediate organizational justice issues if the procedural and distributive justice is both understood and evaluated as fair by

employees. Researchers report a positive relationship between employee knowledge of organizational procedures and evaluations of supervisors. Research also indicates that there is a positive correlation between organizational social capital and procedural knowledge only if the procedures are perceived as fair.

In general, inquiry respondents feel that the benefits provided to UCAR, NCAR, and UOP employees are very good and are one of the most favorable aspects of working for the organization. There was, however, an undercurrent of PTO inequity expressed by some of the respondents that is troublesome to some employees. More specifically, we received some feedback indicating discontent with the fact that the initial amount of PTO accrued by ladder track scientists is significantly higher than the initial amount accrued by staff.

### ***Empowerment***

Employee empowerment was another recurring theme within the inquiry responses. For the purposes of this report, we define empowerment as

*Increasing employees' abilities to "use more judgment and discretion in their work and to participate more fully in decisions affecting their working lives."*  
(Potterfield)

Employee empowerment relates to interactional and procedural justice in the workplace. What follows are the six major components of an "Empowerment Checklist" that appeared in a number of the inquiry responses. In general, respondents who feel empowered express a higher level of job satisfaction than respondents who feel they work in groups governed by a more "dictatorial" management style.

*(1) Decision making power:* Inquiry respondents who feel enabled or authorized to think, take action, and contribute to the decision-making process in autonomous ways are generally happier than respondents who work for supervisors who micro-manage or do not demonstrate trust. Many respondents expressed appreciation for the concepts of power sharing as a form of collaboration and the delegation of authority in addition to responsibility. Several respondents indicated that even in an employee-centered leadership style, the supervisor is expected to maintain a supervisory role to avoid being perceived as abdicating responsibility.

*(2) Open communications:* A significant amount of feedback was received regarding the positive impact of open communications. However, a number of respondents also commented on the lack of internal communication and open dialogue within their groups. In situations where employees are well informed, challenges, strategic plans, and information flow freely between employees and management. It is our belief that this contributes to greater job satisfaction. The presence of honest communications and the ability to participate in strategic planning, financial planning, and daily decision-

making were also viewed by respondents as highly desirable. Inquiry respondents indicated that they appreciate being well informed and being given adequate information, whether the information provided is good or bad in nature. This flow of information is viewed as being much more desirable than needing to rely on the rumor mill. Respondents emphasized a dislike of the following: restrictive and secretive environments, situations in which information is too tightly controlled, and environments in which information is shared only on a need-to-know basis.

*(3) Inclusion:* Respondents who are involved in the daily aspects of UCAR business – regardless of specific position or job responsibilities – generally expressed greater happiness with their work. Desired methods of inclusion identified by respondents were as follows: a) being provided with opportunities to speak comfortably in order to voice questions and concerns; b) being provided with the freedom to think outside of the box; c) being encouraged to provide honest feedback without repercussion; d) being asked for opinions and advice; and e) being asked to participate on UCAR-wide committees.

*(4) Access to resources:* Having access to sufficient resources (i.e., knowledge, training, authority, time, tools, support, and money) has a tremendous impact on an employee's self-esteem and self-worth and the ability of an employee to effectively contribute to the mission of UCAR, NCAR, or UOP. Inquiry respondents understand and acknowledged that resource cuts are necessary when financial resources are limited. However, the withholding of essential means and support needed to get a job done well was perceived by some respondents as demeaning and as an attempt to set personnel up for failure.

*(5) Advocacy:* Some inquiry respondents expressed a desire for their supervisors to be more proactive and to invest in employee technical, professional, and personal growth. Some respondents acknowledged receiving encouragement from their supervisors to manage and direct their own careers; particularly, to pursue new challenges and opportunities that will lead to personal and professional growth. In a more general sense, we received significant feedback indicating that supervisors need to act as an advocate for their staff by supporting staff decisions, following through on promises made to staff, and by communicating honestly and constructively. Respondents also emphasized that it is important for supervisors to show interest, enthusiasm, and appreciation for the work of their employees and to check in frequently and simply chat with employees.

*(6) Respect:* Empowerment can be viewed as an established mutual respect between management and employees in a collegial atmosphere involving all members of a team, regardless of position. According to Maslow, people need a sense of self-determination, autonomy, dignity, and responsibility in order to function in a healthy, growth-motivated way. We feel that UCAR is no different in this regard, and this was borne out by a number of the inquiry responses which emphasized the following: a) the

importance of respectful interactions as professionals and peers; b) respect for, and acknowledgement of, the importance of all job categories (not just scientific positions); c) giving credit where credit is due; and d) the demonstration of accountability, honesty, and integrity by upper management in order to foster mutual respect in the workplace.

In summary, staff empowerment provides employees with a sense of trust, importance, and capability. Inquiry respondents commented that when they are involved in work decisions and planning, their level of commitment increases and their level of motivation is raised. As a successful and highly respected organization, UCAR should maintain a commitment to create a work environment that fosters growth and opportunity for all employees.

### ***Career Development***

As discussed in preceding sections of this report, career development emerged as another common theme within the inquiry responses. One specific area highlighted by respondents dealt with the availability of clearly defined career paths. Specific feedback provided by inquiry respondents ran the gamut from indications that a clear career path has been provided to expressions of the belief that “my job is a dead end.” It became clear to us over the course of reviewing the inquiry feedback that staff at all levels within the organization want to see clearly defined career paths, even in the case of job categories that are considered highly specialized. Respondents also expressed a strong desire for identified career paths to be accompanied by the provision of suitable mentoring to encourage appropriate staff development. As expressed to us by a number of respondents, an essential component of defined career paths is the identification of opportunities for growth and advancement. In some cases, existing position matrices identify levels such as I, II, and III. However, if no jobs are available at the next level above an employee’s current level, the employee may feel stuck. Another concern expressed by some survey respondents was that it often difficult to tell when they are performing at the next level because the success/promotion indicators used to judge advancement suitability are either unclear or lacking. In this case, it is our opinion that the availability of increased supervisor advocacy and mentoring could be highly beneficial in addressing employee confusion about advancement opportunities and timing.

Training was another aspect of the career development process that was emphasized by inquiry respondents. In some cases, respondents indicated that they are receiving the training they need to do their jobs. However, other respondents indicated that they are not being provided with the training opportunities they feel they need either due to budgetary constraints or because the training needed is not offered through the Staff Development program. Some respondents indicated that even though they have received training that they feel they need, they have not been provided with suitable opportunities to make use of newly-acquired skills and

knowledge. We emphasize, however, that we were unable to discern from the feedback provided whether these respondents feel unable to make use of their training because new jobs are unavailable or because they are not being provided with the opportunity in their current positions to make use of this training.

A final aspect of career development cited by some inquiry respondents pertains to resource allocation. In brief, the issue highlighted by some respondents relates to having the tools required to do the job properly. Office space, available equipment, and available staffing were all cited by respondents as resource allocation considerations. Respondents who identified office space issues either typically have offices that are not conducive to performing their work (e.g., having to work in cubicles, being located away from others in the group, being in an office when lab space is required, etc.). Respondents citing equipment concerns often indicated that they are required to work on antiquated/outdated equipment that prevents them from doing their work more efficiently. A specific staffing concern voiced by some inquiry respondents centers on the observation that the staffing made available to certain projects/efforts is sometimes insufficient.

It was apparent to all of us on the team that UCAR, NCAR, and UOP personnel take a tremendous amount of pride in their work and want to be able to do the very best job for the organization. The unavailability of needed resources places additional stress on employees and, as was indicated to us by some of the inquiry respondents, can lead to job performance outcomes that are below employees' own expectations.

## ***Recognition***

A significant number of inquiry respondents emphasized the importance of recognition in enhancing an employee's sense of value within the organization. In general terms, the forms of recognition identified and discussed by respondents can be categorized as either one-on-one or public. Recognition relates to interactional and procedural justice issues in the workplace.

### One-on-One Recognition

The following three forms of one-on-one recognition were highlighted by respondents as being very important and having a significant impact on an employee's sense of value:

- Praise
- Acknowledgment
- Expression of interest in and enthusiasm for an employee's work

The annual performance appraisal process was also identified by a number of respondents as an important mechanism for employees to receive feedback. However,

it was also noted by many that in some instances, the annual performance appraisal is the only source of feedback received by some employees.

Some respondents cited situations in which only negative feedback is received from supervisors and/or colleagues. Such situations are viewed as very demoralizing by employees.

### Public Recognition

In addition to valuing the forms of person-to-person recognition outlined above, inquiry respondents also indicated that receiving public recognition for their accomplishments and achievements is also important. The following two forms of public recognition were identified as desired and appreciated.

*Awards:* Specific examples cited here included the UCAR F&A STAR program, Special Recognition awards given out within divisions or programs, and the annual UCAR Outstanding Achievement Awards. We note, however, that some feedback was received during the survey and interview process to indicate that improvements to the awards system should be made. More exploration is needed to better define and understand the changes that some employees feel to be necessary.

Merit and special recognition awards were repeatedly mentioned by respondents as highly favorable forms of compensation. In particular, the UCAR F&A STAR program is viewed as a huge success: STAR awards carry a modest cash value in the cafeteria and a significant recognition value to many recipients. With the STAR awards, employees have a way to recognize and appreciate the achievements of their peers. Anita Monk-Ryan explained that many of the recipients exhibit their STAR awards, choosing the recognition value over the monetary value.

Respondents suggested improvements to the bonus and merit award processes including:

- Increased clarification regarding what is required to initiate the award nomination process (procedural and interactional justice); and
- Ensuring that merit awards are also made to non-scientific personnel (procedural and distributive justice).

In regard to the latter point, there is the perception that most of the awards given out during the annual Holiday party are made to scientists.

*Acknowledgment:* Forms of acknowledgment that were identified as important include write-ups (in divisional or program newsletters, etc.), "press" (in *Staff Notes*, *UCAR Quarterly*, etc.), Web site highlights, and recognition of achievements and contributions in meetings (from team up to UMC meetings).

All of the above forms of recognition are very appreciated by employees. However, it was emphasized by survey respondents and interviewees that more venues/opportunities for public recognition need to be provided. Additionally, we received a significant amount of feedback indicating that the organization as a whole must do more to increase the amount of recognition given to administrative, computing, education, engineering, and operations personnel.

## Observations

Based on our review and analysis of responses received during the inquiry process, we offer the following key observations:

- The nature and quality of an employee's working relationship with colleagues and the supervisor has a strong impact on the employee's overall sense of value within the workplace (interactional justice).
- In general, UCAR, NCAR, and UOP are considered very good places to work. Employees commented on – and particularly value – the family-friendly work environment, the organizational focus on environmental stewardship, and the hosting of wellness and social events for personnel (distributive justice).
- The differentiation between ladder track scientists/faculty, management and other staff job classifications (following the education sector norm) contributes to both the reality and perception of second class citizenship and distributive and procedural justice issues existing within our organization.
- Many staff members feel that a culture of scientists as the elite employees does exist within the organization. To a degree, this sense may be understandable given the scientific mission of UCAR, NCAR, and UOP. However, it bears considering that some of the existing benefits and policies (for example, different PTO allocations for ladder track scientists) may be fueling this belief and contributing to the feeling among many that non-scientific personnel are not valued as highly as scientific personnel (distributive and procedural justice).
- More mentoring in all position categories is strongly desired (interactional justice), and a significant number of employees feel that greater career path clarification is needed (procedural justice).
- The level of employee empowerment and general job satisfaction is highly variable and spans a wide range. In other words, while a number of respondents feel empowered to do their work and are very satisfied with their current work situation, others do not feel that they have adequate control over their work and career and are not satisfied with their current employment situation (interactional justice).
- The value of acknowledgment and recognition cannot – and should not – be overemphasized and factors strongly into an employee's overall sense of worth and importance within UCAR, NCAR, or UOP. Here, we emphasize that the forms of acknowledgment and recognition offered need not be big: even relatively small gestures such as praise, the mention of a job well done in

meetings, and the presentation of even small awards (e.g., F&A STAR awards) have a significant, positive impact on an employee's sense of value (interactional, procedural and distributive justice).

## Recommendations

Reflecting upon the observations provided in the preceding section, we conclude this report by offering the following recommendations to UCAR, NCAR, and UOP management:

- **Invest in supervisor training.**

The organization as a whole should explore and implement supervisor training procedures that require current and potential supervisors to develop and learn how to use effective people management skills (e.g., one-on-one communications, mentoring, etc.) to address interactional and procedural justice issues.

- **Evaluate and reward supervisors on their team-building and communications skills.**

This will ensure that supervisors are held accountable for establishing and maintaining effective working relationships with employees and for serving as appropriate advocates and mentors for those individuals reporting to them (interactional and procedural issues).

- **Review the differentiation between job classifications in the benefits and policies areas to maximize the positive and reduce the negative impacts.**

This will confirm or improve UCAR distributive, procedural and interactional justice and increase organizational social capital by ensuring that the differentiation is appropriate, intentional and fair (organizational justice).

- **Increase the diversity of management backgrounds within NCAR, UCAR, and UOP.**

Inquiry respondents indicated that management positions in many cases appear to only be offered to scientific personnel, even though other personnel (engineers, etc.) may be suitably qualified for the same positions. Wherever appropriate to do so, non-scientific expertise can and should be promoted (interactional and organizational justice).

- **Improve internal communication and procedural knowledge at all levels within the organization.**

Effective communications and procedural education and knowledge are essential to the successful pursuit and accomplishment of organizational goals

and the attainment of strong interactional relationships. Improved internal communications will help to strengthen peer-to-peer and employee-supervisor working relationships and will also enable UCAR, NCAR, and UOP managerial personnel to better address questions and concerns that arise about various policies and procedures and perceived cases of inequity (procedural and interactional justice).

- **Treat all employees with dignity and as professionals in their fields. Recognize and value the contributions of all employees.**

We view this as a general charge to all UCAR, NCAR, and UOP personnel and feel that all employees should be challenged and reminded to continually strive for a work environment in which the contributions of all are respected, valued, and recognized (interactional and procedural justice).

- **Develop a mentoring system that serves all employees.**

We note that the organization has made significant progress in establishing clear mentoring guidelines and career paths for some personnel (i.e., ladder track and other scientific personnel). These efforts must now be expanded to include suitable mentoring structures for personnel in all position categories and must also involve efforts to better define career development pathways and opportunities for employees in all job categories (organizational justice).

- **Expand and improve the current awards and recognition system.**

As was noted earlier in this report, more research will be needed to determine what the specific improvements/changes are that employees wish to see made to the awards system. Nevertheless, we do offer the general recommendation that more venues for recognizing the contributions and achievements of personnel within all position categories must be identified and fostered (organizational justice).

## Reading List

Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C.A., Chen, P.Y., 2002: Using Social Exchange Theory to Distinguish Procedural from Interactional Justice. *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 27 No. 3 324-351.

Dulebohn, J.H., Martocchio, J.J., 1998: Employee Perceptions of the Fairness of Work Group Incentive Pay Plans. *Journal of Management*, Vol 24, No. 4, 469-488.

Greenberg, J., 1990: Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 16, No.2, 399-432.

Harlos, K.P., 2001: When Organizational Voice Systems Fail. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 37, No. 3, 324-342.

Hodson, R., Roscigno, V.J., 2004: Organizational Success and Worker Dignity: Complementary or Contradictory? *AJS*, Vol. 110, No. 3, 672-708.

Kark, R., Waismel-Manor, R., 2005: Organizational Citizenship Behavior: What's Gender Got to Do With It? *Organization Articles*, Vol. 12, No. 6, 889-917.

Konovsky, M.A., 2000: Understanding Procedural Justice and Its Impact on Business Organizations. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26, No. 3, 489-511.

Leana, C.R., Van Buren, H.J., 1999: Organizational Social Capital and Employment Practices. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 24, Issue 3, 538-555.

Little, H.T., Magner, N.R., Welker, R.B. 2002: The Fairness of Formal Budgetary Procedures and Their Enactment – Relationships with Managers' Behavior. *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 27, No. 2, 209-225.

Maslow, A., with Contributions and Commentary by D.C. Stephens and G. Heil 1998: *Maslow on Management*. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Potterfield, T.A., 1999: *The Business of Employee Empowerment*. Westport, CN, Quorum Books.

Schappe, S.P., 1996: Bridging the Gap Between Procedural Knowledge and Positive Employee Attitudes. *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 21, No. 3, 337-364.

Sinclair, A.L., 2003: The Effects of Justice and Cooperation on Team Effectiveness. *Small Group Research*, Vol. 34, No. 1, 74-100.

Wolf, W.C., Fligstein, N.D., Sexual Stratification: Differences in Power in the Work Setting. *Social Forces*, Vol. 58, No. 1, 94-107.

# Appendix A: Leadership Academy 2006 Diversity Survey

## Introduction

As participants in this year's Leadership Academy (L/A) we are serving on a team exploring the workplace environment within the institution. The mission and goal of our team is:

*To explore the value system of the institution with the intent of raising awareness of the importance of fairness, equality, and mutual respect in the workplace. Our goal is to increase clarity regarding the equitable treatment of all employees by investigating how individuals are valued within the organization.*

As one facet of our investigation, we are inviting employees from throughout UCAR, NCAR, and UOP to complete this survey either in web format or in a face-to-face interview with a member of the Interview Team. The survey will end on May 15; the findings will be presented to the President's Council and the rest of Leadership Academy on June 8.

Please note that this voluntary survey is not the UCAR Employee Survey that has been distributed by *ModernThink* as part of the *Best Companies in Colorado* initiative.

If you would like to participate in a face-to-face interview, please fill out [test.image.ucar.edu/staff/thoar/LADiversity/RequestInterview.shtml](http://test.image.ucar.edu/staff/thoar/LADiversity/RequestInterview.shtml) or contact anyone in the Diversity Team.

We appreciate your participation and thank you for your time and contributions to our study.

Sincerely,

Brigitte Baeuerle, Barry Gamblin, Tim Hoar, Linda La Brie, Krista Laursen, Anita Monk-Ryan, Helen Moshak, and Jielun Sun

## Survey Confidentiality

This is a confidential survey. As part of this voluntary survey, all participants are asked to self-report on position category, full- or part-time status, gender, and years of employment at UCAR. This demographic information will be reported in aggregate, not in connection with any specific individual interview responses. The Web and face-to-face survey are identical and differ only in delivery format.

The web survey is anonymous (the information gets mailed directly to Tim Hoar from a hardwired fictitious email address) and the face-to-face participants' identity information will be destroyed upon conclusion of the interview and only the demographic information will be retained. No other identification information or references such as names, email or IP addresses, locations, or workgroup information will be collected or retained. Any identification information and the original face-to-face interview notes will be destroyed. All interview responses will be stored in a secure format and location. At the conclusion of the project, all individual survey responses will be destroyed.

*In the event a participant chooses to disclose a violation of UCAR policy during an interview, all the interview information is required to be reported to HR Director Bob Roesch for further action.*

Questions regarding the processes used to conduct this survey should be addressed to Tim Hoar, [thoar@ucar.edu](mailto:thoar@ucar.edu), ext. 1708 or Helen Moshak, [moshak@ucar.edu](mailto:moshak@ucar.edu), ext 1504.

## **The start of the survey**

To begin, please provide the following background information.

1) What is your (closest) position category?

- **Computing** (i.e. System Administrators, Software Engineers, Network Engineers, Computer Operators, ...)
- **Management** (i.e. President, Vice Presidents, Directors, Associate Directors, Division- Institute- and Program- Directors, Section Heads, Managers, ...)
- **Scientist** (Scientist I, II, III, or Senior Scientist ...)
- **Associate Scientist or Project Scientist**
- **Engineer** (i.e. Research Engineer, Engineer I, II, III, and IV, Technician, Facilities Engineer, Health and Safety Engineer, Instrument Maker, Aircraft Mechanic, Flight Engineer/Mechanic, ...)
- **Education** (i.e. Educational Designer, Graphic Artist, Writer/Editor, Librarian, Library Tech., ...)
- **Administration** (i.e. Accountants, Budget Analysts, Contract Administrators, Program Specialists, Division/Program Administrators, Administrative Assistants,

Meeting Planners, Executive Assistants, Food Service Generalists, Shuttle Drivers, Carpenters, Electricians, Maintenance Mechanics, ...)

2) Are you a full-time or part-time employee? [full-time, part-time]

3) What is your gender? [Female, male]

4) How many years have you worked here?

- less than a year
- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- more than 10 years

5) Do you have work experience elsewhere? [no,yes]

6) In what ways is the value of your work demonstrated to you by your group and/or your supervisor?

7) In what ways is the value of your work demonstrated to you by your division/program?

8) In what ways is the value of your work demonstrated to you by the institution?

9) In what ways could your group, division, program, and/or the institution better demonstrate the value of your work to you and to others within the organization?

10) Do you have any additional information or comments you would like to share with us?

**Thank you for your time and participation!**

Please review your answers before you hit 'submit', there is no ability to change them after you hit submit. Thanks.

**Submit**

For problems with the page, contact Tim Hoar - [thoar 'at' ucar.dot.edu](mailto:thoar@ucar.edu)