

Recommendations from Fac. Affair committee re HR policies 3.2019

- 3.16 Nepotism v10
- 3.XX Children in the Workplace v4
- 3.xx Promotion Demotion Transfer Policy v5
- 3.xx Reduction in Force v8
- 3.xx Rehire Eligibility v4

Procedure and definitions are mostly clear.	To whom exactly does this apply: all employees with terminal contracts, or some special circumstances of a personal nature leading to a hiatus? What distinguishes "rehire" from mere "hiring"? Why is something distinct needed for "rehire," if, as it seems, it's just a further assessment of hiring desirability? Agree with Deepak's point as well: won't a further review take place automatically. And does this mean HR is going to consider reversing Departmental hiring decisions if they are "rehire"?	Clarify information to left? Or perhaps there are obvious answers that I'm just not familiar with . . . Why should we wait for one year? Why not leave the decision up to the hiring manager. FAR checkbox?
To the point	PROCEDURE 3d seems invalid after 3c since "Employees deemed "Not Recommended for Rehire" remain in such status for one (1) year from separation date". Why would we need 3d in that case?	
		N/A (approve)

Mostly clear.	What is a "midpoint"? Is a "demotion" considered as moving to a new position, or simply a reduction of the existing position? Does a "demotion" then require an application through the ATS, as a transfer does? It seems as if a transfer would entail the usual hiring procedures being followed and the candidate competing with external applicants, if it is an open position, while the other two scenarios may be distinct?	Again, not sure about all this, but just trying to think it through: perhaps clarify any distinctions between the three scenarios vis a vis hiring/implementation procedures.
To the point.	PROCEDURE #2 may not be correct for demotion cases. This policy does not seem to address leader initiated cases - relies on employees to apply.	Should we consider cases "within" the same unit and/or "under" the same leader?
		N/A (approve)

Clear and makes sense.	Typo in Definition 1: "Individuals . . . who IS."	Make either singular or plural. Echo Deepak on "charis."
To the point.	Only covers parents for the children.	Consid

"PROCEDURE":
 #1b could be removed/reworded to indicate that they could not use their authority to do so but otherwise (friendly) requests may be okay.
 #4 may be limiting and not necessary.

