

<b>NON-STANDARD GRIEVANCE FORM</b> SSA-2048-U3		<i>(Use additional pages for any section of this form, if necessary)</i>	
NAME OF EMPLOYEE:		OFFICE TELEPHONE: (580) 242-1272	
OFFICE LOCATION: ENID, OK	POSITION: CR	GRADE: GS-11	
REPRESENTED BY: AFGE Local 2505	REPRESENTATIVE NAME: RALPH C. de JULIIS	REP TELEPHONE: (918) 641-2409ext	

**DESCRIPTION OF GRIEVANCE: What article(s) of the Agreement are involved?**

On or about October 30 at 10 AM, I received my PACS appraisal rating. I received one 5. In the rest of the elements, I was rated a 3.

My work review and mid-term PACS review had no criticisms and no suggestions for improvement consequently, I was deceived and misled by management that I was not told how I could or that I needed to improve on anything. That is a 5 in everything, NOT a 3!! Furthermore, I was told that because of workloads, no one can be rated all 5s. That is arbitrary, capricious and totally contrary to the PACS system which is supposed to be based on my contributions, not outside considerations of staffing and workload.

At the PACS discussion, [redacted] said my ratings were based on (1) my coworkers not liking my tone. This is the first I have ever heard that. (2) On not having turned in enough appeal reviews in October. The appraisal was for the period ending 9/30. Performance 10/1 and beyond is in the current appraisal period, not the one for which I received a rating. (3) I didn't give enough suggestions to make ENID and our work processes better. I made suggestions when we had our workflow meeting when Heather was leaving for maternity leave. She has repeatedly run ideas by me as [redacted] and asked for suggestions. I have given them to her orally. (4) She kept talking about the backlog of wages and appeals and how some people were behind. I am current. I should not get a lousy appraisal because others aren't current in their work assignments. (5) She said my numbers were good but I sometimes rush and miss little things. The only write backs I have received are on appeals, like everyone else, which is why every one is being reviewed. Please note that many of the write backs did NOT contain POMS references because their criticisms were not POMS violations. I noted I had received NOTHING from DQB. I only received general, office wide reports. I never received an individual report about my work quality. Despite the problems the general reports, the office scheduled NO office, unit or individual training.

**CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE**

**RELIEF SOUGHT:**

(1) A rating of 5 in each element. (2) an overall rating of 5 (3) the award commensurate with an overall rating: a Quality Step Increase. (4) An apology for not having two members of management present at my mid-term review. (5) A written admission that SSA's current PACS plan for CRs is illegal. (6) A written apology for SSA taking reprisal against me for my exercise of my right to engage in protected activity.

*I hereby authorize my representative to examine any appropriate official document, personnel record, or medical information which may be related to the grievance.*

EMPLOYEE SIGNATURE: [redacted]	DATE: 11/13/2007
-----------------------------------	---------------------

<b>STEP 1 SUBMITTED</b>			
SUPERVISOR: [redacted]	TELEPHONE: 580242127	ORAL PRESENTATION REQUESTED? (Y/N) YES	DATE RECEIVED 11/14/07

## CONTINUATION

In other offices and other parts of the country, SSA had TWO members of management present when employees received their mid term review. I only had one supervisor present. I was disadvantaged and not treated fairly and equitably by the failure of Enid to have two members of management present.

I asked if this rating would keep me from getting a ROC. She told me she didn't know and didn't make those decisions. I looked at the contract. The ROC criteria is a 4 or higher. I feel she purposely misled me.

Ever since I've been a CR, I have gotten a ROC. My knowledge, performance, production and quality are better than they were last year. I should NOT have received an appraisal that precludes me from getting a ROC!

My mediocre performance appraisal was reprisal for my protected activities. I am current he . . . . . for AFGE Local 2505. In my capacity as Local Representative, I represented an employee in her reprimand grievance. The reprimand was removed from her file at step 3 of the grievance process. I also believe I received a lousy rating because I will go on maternity leave soon and what would I care about my appraisal rating and the awards my lousy rating exclude me from getting?!

I have also never received a formal copy of my performance appraisal. My score was only told to me verbally.

My appraisal rating violates Article 1, Section 1; Article 2 A and B, Article 3, Sections 1, 2 and 10, Article 18, Section 1 and Article 21, Sections 1, 2, 5 and 6.

The performance standards are also illegal.

Each one of my PACS elements has several sub-elements and sub-sub-elements. SSA never explained to me how each would be weighed to determine by overall rating in each element. All of the PACS elements are mechanically averaged. In other words, each has the same weight. Yet, common sense tells anyone that each element does not have the same importance and weight as the others. Depending on what work assignments I am given during the course of the year, I could and did more in some elements than in others. Yet, the weight given in my final, over all rating was the same.

For instance, as I noted above, I was told that I failed the two sub elements of making suggestions to improve processes in Enid. No one EVER told me that failing to do any sub-element would result in my not being able to be higher than a 3 in that particular element. No explanation was ever given to explain the balancing of the individual sub-elements and how the overall element rating would be figured.

<b>DISPOSITION OF GRIEVANCE</b>	NAME OF EMPLOYEE <b>[REDACTED]</b>
---------------------------------	---------------------------------------

**STEP 1 DECISION BY:**

TITLE <b>[REDACTED]</b>	SIGNATURE <b>[REDACTED]</b>	DATE 4/4/08
----------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------

DECISION (Enter disposition summary here and check block if narrative attached)

*[REDACTED]'s rating in the Step 1 element will be changed from a rating of three to a five. By changing this rating, Mitchell's overall rating for FY 2007 will be a 4 which will make her eligible for ROC Consideration.*

RECEIPT ACKNOWLEDGED BY EMPLOYEE OR UNION REPRESENTATIVE <b>[REDACTED]</b>	SIGNATURE <b>[REDACTED]</b>	DATE 6/5/08
---	--------------------------------	----------------

Grievance Resolved     Proceed to next Step     Oral Presentation Requested     Photocopy to Union

AS NEEDED, DESIGNATE STEP 2 OFFICIAL →	NAME	LOCATION	TELEPHONE
--	------	----------	-----------

**STEP 2 DECISION BY:**

TITLE	SIGNATURE	DATE
-------	-----------	------

PERSON SERVED	<input type="checkbox"/> MAIL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DIRECT	DATE
---------------	-------------------------------	--	------

DECISION (Enter disposition summary here and check block if narrative attached)

RECEIPT ACKNOWLEDGED BY EMPLOYEE OR UNION REPRESENTATIVE	SIGNATURE	DATE
--	-----------	------

Grievance Resolved     Proceed to next Step     Oral Presentation Requested     Photocopy to Union

AS NEEDED, DESIGNATE STEP 3 OFFICIAL →	NAME	LOCATION	TELEPHONE
--	------	----------	-----------

**STEP 3 DECISION BY:**

TITLE	SIGNATURE	DATE
-------	-----------	------

PERSON SERVED	<input type="checkbox"/> MAIL	<input type="checkbox"/> DIRECT	DATE
---------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	------

DECISION (Enter disposition summary here and check block if narrative attached)

RECEIPT ACKNOWLEDGED BY EMPLOYEE OR UNION REPRESENTATIVE	SIGNATURE	DATE
--	-----------	------

Grievance Resolved     Yes     No     Photocopy to Union

FOR LABOR AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS STAFF USE →	Grievance Code:	Disposition:	Disposition Level:
--	-----------------	--------------	--------------------