

UNITED NATIONS DISPUTE T

Introduction

1. The Applicant, a former Language Service Assistant, with the Department for the General Assembly and Conference Management (DGACM), contests the decision not to renew her temporary appointment, alleging that her negative performance appraisal was incorrect and that the non-

Dispute Tribunal, the case was assigned to the undersigned
Judge on 20 January 2020.

Consideration

scope of the case

6.

15. If a staff member on a temporary appointment disagrees with the performance rating given at the end of his/her temporary appointment, in accordance with sec. 6.2 of ST/AI/2010/4/Rev.1, s/he may within seven calendar days of signing the completed performance appraisal form, submit a written explanatory statement to the respective Executive Office at Headquarters, or to the Chief of Administration elsewhere. The performance evaluation form and the explanatory statement shall become part of the official status file of the staff member .

2018 by [the current FRO] will not be part of your official records. I leave it up to you whether you would like to keep the first P.333 evaluation.

17. The Applicant responded, I choose to have two evaluations from two separate FROs She further submitted an explanatory statement in response to the performance appraisals.

18.

21. The FRO provided some positive comments and identified certain

[The Applicant] has been a cooperative staff member, willing to learn and take up jobs when told to. She can do the basic jobs in the front office when told to. [The Applicant] is somewhat passive. She needs to be a more proactive and faster learner in order to be able to handle a myriad of front desk functions.

22. The SRO concurred and provided further information on performance shortcomings, [The Applicant] is encouraged to be more active and proactive in dealing with all [Front Desk] functions so as to provide high-quality administrative

25. The Tribunal finds that the 5 March 2018 emails do not support the
they

replace staff on leave, particularly in April 2018. She also submits that she was unaware that she was allowed to write a self-evaluation and skipped that part of the process. The final grade was unfair and arbitrary in her opinion. She refers to the praise received by a new programming officer and by another colleague who she replaced while she was on leave. According to the Applicant, this colleague appraised
contends that she was told that greeting

34. The Respondent provided copies of correspondence from the FRO and SRO during this reporting period.

35. On 4 April 2018, the SRO emailed the Applicant in reference to two conversations: one before the expiration of her previous contract and another on the day of the email. He described six areas where he deemed performance required improvement and advised guidance.

36. In an email to the SRO dated 8 June 2018, the FRO reported to the SRO the content of seven meetings he had with the Applicant from 1 April to 27 June 2018 where he identified aspects of her work requiring improvement.

37. On 19 September 2018, the SRO requested feedback from the colleagues on her performance during the reporting period while she covered for them during their leave in May 2018. The two colleagues reported a number of failures from the Applicant during that period.

38. On 16 August 2018, a colleague emailed the Applicant identifying an error she had committed in one of her tasks. The SRO was copied in this email.

39. In an email in July 2018, the FRO reported to the SRO an error committed by the Applicant.

44. The Tribunal therefore finds that the Applicant has failed to establish that the rendered it unlawful. The decision not to extend her temporary appointment beyond 364 days because of poor performance was therefore justified.

Conclusion

45. In light of the above, the application is rejected.

(Signed)

Judge Joelle Adda

Dated this 11th day of