

## Kim Harrison, CETPA CTO Mentor Candidate

### CONTEXT:

To demonstrate my understanding of Personnel Management, I have created the Progressive Intervention Documentation artifact which signifies my familiarity with the practices for the documentation and remediation of unsatisfactory employee performance and the FRISK memo that demonstrates my ability to apply skills using the FRISK method for employee reprimand as evidenced in.

### LEARNING OUTCOME:

This artifact addresses the following Learning Outcomes from the *Personnel Management* class.

**PeM-08. Demonstrate a working knowledge of recommended practices for the documentation and remediation of unsatisfactory employee performance.**

**PeM-09. Demonstrate the ability to apply skills using the FRISK method for employee reprimand.**

### REFLECTION:

The FRISK memo and Progressive Intervention Document artifacts demonstrate my working knowledge of personnel management and represents the application of the practice of documenting and remediating unsatisfactory employee performance through the FRISK model. The Progressive Intervention Documentation artifact sets the context by describing the employee performance and the course of action that I have taken to provide direction in correcting this behavior. This artifact details the type of behavior that has been observed over time and explains why the two events cited in the FRISK memo were chosen. The conference summary memo follows the FRISK model and describes the actions that lead to the conference with the employee with a clear statement of the facts substantiated with written documentation. Expectations for behavior are clearly identified, the negative impact of this employee's behavior on the department is shared, and suggestions are made to correct the employee performance. Finally, the conference summary concludes with a written statement notifying the employee of their rights and how the memo will be incorporated into the personnel file.

I created both artifacts specifically for this assignment and used the presentation and notes from the class session and the FRISK Documentation Model Handbook sample memos as a guide. Although the memo was created for this particular artifact, I plan to review this means of progressive intervention

with the Director of Human Resources and gather feedback on how this type of intervention aligns with standard practice in my district. If this is the correct next step, then I will prepare a similar memo following the second, follow-up conference of the bi-annual evaluation documenting the employee's performance. In my district, we have a specific, agreed upon Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) template that is used to provide corrective action for low performing employees and I will ask for clarification on the timeline for a follow up to the bi-annual evaluation review in which the employee has been rated with a "Requires Improvement" rating. I am unclear of the next step at this time.

The Progressive Intervention Documentation and FRISK memo artifacts demonstrate progress toward mastering the practice of documenting and remediating unsatisfactory employee performance. I have not fully mastered the practice of documenting employee performance because I am unclear as to the process within my district and the relationship that it has with the employee bi-annual evaluation. In circumstances where the conference summary is not the result of the evaluation, I recognize that the process would be to have a conference to address unsatisfactory performance, provide a memo summarizing the meeting, and create a PIP to provide a structure to remediate. Because my situation involves the bi-annual evaluation as the source of the conference, I will need to clarify with the Human Resources department what the next steps would be as it relates to the employee contract. I am confident in my ability to use the FRISK method for reprimanding an employee in writing but not as confident to do so in person.

Prior to this class, I was familiar with the FRISK method but had never used it to reprimand an employee. The situation that I chose for this artifact is only my second experience in disciplining an employee. The chief difference between the two experiences is the amount of emotion I felt in giving the corrective feedback to the employee and how I responded emotionally to the employee while giving the feedback. The two situations were entirely different in a number of ways, yet I felt more self-assured and comfortable using the FRISK model and writing up the conference summary. For my first experience, I should have had notes or a script, be more factual and concise, and less emotional. Providing this type of feedback is uncomfortable, but it should not be emotional. As the person giving the feedback, I should not feel responsible for the behavior that is being corrected. For my second experience of reprimanding an employee, writing the conference summary memo provided a way to reflect on the activities that lead up to the meeting, the discussion that was had, and expectations going forward. It brought a sense of relief as I reflected on the process and validated that I was correct and appropriate in making these remarks that corresponded with the "Requires Improvement" rating. I was anxious and uncertain

when I started the memo, but as I followed the FRISK model, I realized that the facts supported the observable behavior in need of correcting.

During the class, I appreciated the practical implications for using FRISK and the opportunity to observe the role playing of the different scenarios. Seeing how my classmates responded to the roleplaying confirmed how difficult it is to have these types of conversations without a model to follow. As I worked on my artifacts, I was struck by the impact that the FRISK method has in carrying out this step of progressive discipline because it is very factual and devoid of emotion. In reflecting on the role playing from class, it is clear that each conversation would have been much different had the “supervisor” followed the FRISK method. The model addresses the substantiated facts about the behavior and provides the structure for communicating to the employee how their behavior is not appropriate, impacts the organization, and can be improved, making it very clear and easy to follow.

My knowledge of the FRISK model increased substantially as a result of the information presented in class and the process of completing the letter of reprimand and the explanation of the progressive intervention. Through the creation of these two artifacts, I recognize the value of the FRISK model as a management tool to use when all other corrective measures for employee performance have been exhausted. The FRISK model provides a structure that succinctly and factually addresses concerns and formalizes a process that alerts the employee to the seriousness of their performance. As a CTO, this tool of last resort allows for a process to document and potentially fire an employee that repeatedly violates the CSEA bargaining unit agreement that negatively impacts the productivity and efficiency of the department. As I look at the overall performance of my department, I can informally apply the FRISK model methodologies to continuously address concerns as they present themselves in order to avoid an escalation to a formal FRISK of an employee.