

**Results and Report on  
National Council of EEOC Locals, No. 216  
Survey for Employees: interfacing with the National Call Center (NCC)**

- 1. Timeframe of Survey Results: March 2005 through February 2005  
(survey ongoing)**
- 2. Number of responses: 116**
- 3. Locations of Survey Participants:**

Albuquerque	1
Atlanta	1
Baltimore	1
Buffalo	10
Charlotte	8
Chicago	4
Cincinnati	2
Cleveland	3
Dallas	1
Denver	3
Detroit	8
Greensboro	1
Greenville	7
Honolulu	1
Houston	5
Indianapolis	2
Kansas City	1
Louisville	11
Memphis	2
Miami	9
Minneapolis	10
Milwaukee	4
Nashville	1
New Orleans	1
New York	1
Norfolk	1
Phoenix	2
Pittsburgh	1
Raleigh	5
Richmond	1
Seattle	5
Tampa	1
Washington, D.C.	2

**4. Positions of survey participants:**

*87% of participants were investigators:*

Administrative Judge	2
Attorney	1
Investigator GS 12	93
Investigator GS 11	1
Investigator GS 9	1
Investigator GS 7	4
Investigator (no grade specified)	2
Investigator Support Asst. GS 7	2
Office Automation Assistant GS 5	5
Office Automation Assistant GS 7	1
Other (GS-7)	2
(GS 12)	2

**5. Since the implantation of the NCC, has the numbers of calls you need to return:**

Increased	41 (35%)
Decreased	16 (14%)
Stayed the Same	58 (50%)

**6. What was the subject of the call: (more than answer can be selected)**

- a. Caller was seeking general information regarding location, hours, or making an appointment. 18 (16%)
- b. Caller wanted to file a charge of discrimination. 85 (73%)
- c. Caller had a complex question that the NCC forwarded to EEOC for resolution. 25 (22%)
- d. Caller wanted to find out the status of a pending charge. 20 (17%)
- e. Caller wanted to resolve a problem with a pending charge. 10 (9%)
- f. Other. 29 (25%)

**7. Describe the quality of information that you received from the NCC about the caller, including information contained in E-assessment questionnaires:**

I was given information from the NCC that has proven to be accurate.	12 (10%)
I was given information that I do not know yet whether it was accurate.	30 (26%)
I was not given any useful information.	65 (56%)

**8. Describe the time savings, if any, that resulted from the caller initially contacting the NCC:**

It saved me time that the caller initially contacted the NCC.	3 (3%)
I don't know whether it saved me time that the caller initially contacted the NCC.	4 (3%)
The call took the same amount of time that it would have taken if the caller had not initially called the NCC.	39 (34%)
The call took more time than it would have taken if the caller had not initially contacted the NCC.	66 (57%)

**9. Describe the quality of information that the caller received from the NCC.**

The caller was given information from the NCC that has proven to be accurate.	4 (34%)
The caller was given information that I do not know yet whether it was accurate.	36 (31%)
The caller was not given any useful information or assistance.	59 (51%)

**10. Describe the caller's experience with the NCC.**

The caller had a good experience with the NCC.	1 (1%)
The caller did not mention his/her experience with the NCC.	65 (56%)
The caller expressed frustration regarding his/her experience with the NCC.	30 (26%)

**11. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = lowest; 5 = highest) please rate the performance of the NCC:**

1	59 (51%)
2	32 (28%)
3	12 (10%)
4	0 (0%)
5	2 (2%)

**Comments:**  
**NCC Information Not Accurate**

Date of violation indicated that the violation would occur in July 2005. It was really 2004 so timeliness was at issue. Had I relied on the information given jurisdiction could have been lost.

The call center inaccurately took down a callers home phone number. Plus, to add further injury to this matter, the call center lists the CP's as living in Savelle, OH 44273. That zip code is actually for Seville OH, I checked with the post office online. The call center got the spelling of the city wrong as well.

This caller had contact with the NCC on the 297th day according to the DOV in the NCC Questionnaire. Upon my receipt of the inquiry, now 298 days from DOV, I noticed the NCC Questionnaire did not contain PCP's phone number and she lived several hundred miles away. I located PCP's phone number on the Internet (lucky it was listed) and called her immediately. What I learned was that the PCP was not calling to file a charge (as she was placed on disability by her doct. and will probably never work again) but she wanted a private attorney referral to assist her with an appeal of her long term disability claim. So, to summarize, the NCC indicated a DOV that was to fall in a few days without flagging the inquiry for immediate urgency, and did not provide a phone number for the caller.

I have received several calls from persons in Wisconsin who said they called the call center and were asked which office they were closer to and that is the office's number that they got, rather than giving the potential charging party the number of the office that would have jurisdiction over that state.

The call center sent a via EAS [To Cleveland]. The PCP lived in IN and never worked in OH. (R's headquarters was located in OH)

Caller was from Montana. He had contacted the NCC. NCC gave him the long-distance number for the Seattle District Office. This office does not have jurisdiction over Montana. The caller should have been referred to the Denver District Office.

The person doing the screening put down the wrong city and state so that the PCP was referred to the wrong office.

Wrong PCP address. Wrong Respondent name.

The call center had the wrong name for charging party.

Phone numbers are inaccurate, addresses are incorrect (ie:City in NY but addressed to NC)

I am assuming that the caller was given wrong info from the NCC because

the person was untimely to file with EEOC, but could have filed with FEPA.

Caller telephone call center on April 2005. Inquiry was sent to the wrong office. Info was transferred to correct office, being received on July 5, 2005 . One and 1/2 months later. This is not customer service

R name was inaccurate. CP alleged he was retaliated against for filing a previous EEOC Charge. NCC questionnaire stated CP never filed before. CP actually filed twice before.

The information the NCC provided regarding the CP's first name was incorrect.

Call center is giving inaccurate information to the charging parties and is unable to spend enough time with a caller to accurately assess what the real problem is. Thus the call is forwarded to this office and an investigator has to answer the questions and tell the person that they are not covered by the laws enforced by this agency, when the call center told them that they were because they apparently didn't listen or ask any questions.

Caller was calling from the state of Arizona and informed me that the Respondent was also in Arizona. A male employee at the NCC informed PCP that he needed to call the Albuquerque Area Office (in New Mexico) to file his complaint.

After speaking with this individual for over 1/2 and explaining the laws, I learned that the person was calling from Connecticut. When I asked him how he got the Buffalo, New York telephone number he stated that it was given to him by the National Call Center. Not only was the Call Center not able to answer the callers questions, but provided the wrong telephone number, which should have been Boston. This resulted time wasted time on my part and needless long distant call for the PCP.

There have been instances where there spelling of the city/street name has been incorrect.

### **NCC Information Not Complete**

Examples of inexcusable lack of information include: incomplete Questionnaires, such as a caller alleging to be discriminated against because of his age, but the field of DOB was not completed, nor was an age provided; caller terminated because of race, but race is not identified, nor is date of termination or reason of termination; caller terminated because of disability, which was not identified, nor was date of termination; and no information as to why the caller believes he was discriminated against, i.e. comparatives.

Our email 'questionnaires' are coming in with incorrect and/or incomplete information. Many times the info comes in with no phone numbers for contacting pcp. Extremely frustrating!

No date of birth was noted/sometimes phone numbers were not on Forms/disability questions were not screened enough to see if another department or agency could assist the callers.

I've found that the NCC did not fully elaborate PCP's allegations and in some instances, even a number of contact was missing...resulting in sending a follow-up letter by mail.

Not one of the questionnaires that have been downloaded could be filed as is. Key information is missing/and or inadequate.

I could not generate a charge from this inquiry. I had to contact CP to get SS and date of violation.

Person screening PCP did not ascertain if PCP was a QID, if he had a record of a disability and did not explore sufficiently if R regarded PCP as a QID.

Referral stated PCP had been retaliated against. Had to interview PCP since information was incomplete.

The call center does not identify any similarly situated employees. They only mention a basis and nothing to substantiate the protected group.

NCC failed to ask for number of employees. Company did not have the requisite number necessary for filing with EEOC. Referred to state agency.

The information I receive from them is sketchy, at best, and they have never shown any knowledge that Ohio has a work sharing agreement with the Ohio Civil Rights Commission.

Regarding the EAS questionnaires: I have found that the information located at the "description of action against person" sometimes does not contain a complete thought, it is difficult to follow the content.

### **NCC Creating Another Layer**

It seems like just an extra layer of processing that does not help at all.

cp attempted to contact me via a number outside my area code and got the NCC.

Recently a Charging Party sent a fax to the Phoenix office and called the national contact center to verify that the Phoenix office received the fax. The national contact center sent an incident report to the Phoenix office regarding this urgent matter. The incident report triggered a full scale investigation of the highest priority and I'm happy to report the fax was located.

I have found that potential charging parties that try to reach our office are simply given an extra step in the process while trying to get information. Many of our charging parties do not have access to long distance service and therefore are just trying to contact the local office for information. Many callers have told me that it took 30-45 minutes, just to give information to have their phone call returned. I have been with the Commission for 18 years and I do not feel that the call center provides good customer

service to individuals trying to reach our office. My phone calls have not decreased and I have found no benefit to the call center. Further, based upon numerous conversations with potential charging parties, charging parties and respondents, they would prefer being able to directly reach the field office. I have not had any positive feedback on the call center and I believe it is a huge waste of money.

The NCC is simply a time wasting hoop that potential charging parties have to jump through in order to schedule an appointment to file a charge of discrimination. The amount of time it takes me to handle inquiries has not decreased since implementation of the Call Center. Before the call center, a potential charging party would call our office, I'd ask them a few jurisdictional questions, and schedule an appointment for them. The caller had scheduled an appointment with one telephone call. Simple. Done. Now, however, someone who calls the NCC gets told to call us directly or is told they'll get a call from our office. So, the caller at best makes a second, more useful call to our office to schedule an appointment, or at worst, s/he waits for our office to get the information from NCC and then someone can call them to get answers from a real investigator (and not someone who is reading scripted answers) or schedule an appointment for them. I have not noticed that the number of inquiries I handle has decreased and I seriously doubt the NCC increases our customer service. It's simply a telephone purgatory that callers have to negotiate first before they can get answers and/or action from a field office.

A total waste of time because the call center does only a pre-screening call and then refers the PCP to the office where the charge is taken and repeat the process.

In my experience, the NCC has done nothing to reduce the workload on Investigators.

The assessments that the NCC has provided regarding their conversations with PCP's are not accurate (in some cases), at times provide incorrect information in which to contact the PCP (like mailing addresses and phone numbers), and their brief description of the PCP's complaint is no different from the Form 283's we use at Intake--we STILL have to do a full interview of the PCP, draft the charge, answer all the PCP's questions about our procedures, and in some cases, refer them to other sources ourselves. I just don't see any reduction in my workload, and I don't see the PCP's who have been "screened" by the NCC as being better informed.

I find the NCC not useful. I am still calling the individual and asking the same questions the NCC did. The info supplied is not complete for useful input. I complete data input and mail out questionnaire to be completed.

### **NCC Not Doing Their Job**

Also, several callers said they were told to call the field office for an answer to their question.

NCC did not screen the PCP they told her to call our office.

A potential CP came into our office who said that the NCC told him to contact us. He wanted to file because he was an ex-felon and felt that

ex-felons were protected under Title VII. He said NCC told him that they did not know if ex-felons were covered!!!!

Business person called the 800 number seeking information about the ADA. The call center told him he needed to call his nearest EEOC office. He wanted brochures about the ADA. I mailed them to him.

I am on intake this week and have not seen any reduction in calls. We continue to receive about 10-15 calls per day and several appointments. In addition, several callers have said that the call center just gave them our direct number. Finally, we have been informing charging parties to call the call center for charge status and they are calling us back saying that the call center just said to call us back to find out.

Rather than answer the questions, the NCC gave the caller my direct line to answer basic ADA questions about the definition of disability and reasonable accommodation. Furthermore, I would expect that since I am an AJ, I would get calls from federal employees involving the Rehab Act. This individual was not a federal employee.

Caller said that the NCC advised him to call the area office directly because we were closer to him geographically. The caller said that NCC told them to contact us about filing a charge and was not provided any assistance.

Caller states he called NCC and told them the same thing he told me and their response was " I don't know. You need to call the Greenville Local Office and leave a message to have someone call you."

During telephone duty the latter part of August, I noticed another increase in calls. Of interest to me was that several PCPs informed me that they had called NCC and were told to call us directly and were given our telephone number. My question is - why did NCC not attempt to handle the calls?

One PCP actually told me that as soon as she mentioned "Disability" or "ADA," she was automatically sent to the field office.

The Call center submitted this by email and stated that the "caller has asked, specifically, that the information we captured below be forwarded to your office for a direct reply". I asked the caller about his experience with the call center and he stated that they did not want to talk to him about his call. The call center told him that someone would call him and to talk to that person about his problem. This shows dishonesty and willful neglect of job duties of the call center.

The Call Center asked the caller if they were closer to Nashville or Memphis, then gave the caller the Nashville office number to call us directly. No information received thru the NCC.

I routinely get referrals which are incorrectly assessed by the NCC as well. Or, PCP's who appear to have only been provided our office telephone number without being assessed to start with. At first I thought that perhaps the quality or quantity of the referrals I was receiving would improve as the NCC staff gained more experience. This has not been the case.

### **NCC Frustrating Callers**

The caller is Egyptian. As soon as the caller tried to explain the problem, the NCC refused to listen; told him to call our office directly; and gave him our number, which is a long distance number that created an expense for the caller. The caller commented that the reception at our office was very friendly and assuring, unlike the NCC.

This caller, in Oregon, had called our 800 number, which was given to her by the "Department of Labor." She did not know she had been connected to a call center. She thought she had called the Seattle office. The call center provided the Seattle District Office with an e-assessment summary which was, frankly, useless. It indicated that the caller had been terminated from her employment. The e-assessment was dated April 7, 2005. Our office sent the PCP an intake questionnaire, and we received it back from the CP on April 20. I was assigned the IQ for follow-up on April 26. CP called the Seattle office directly, at her own expense, on April 28 and was very unhappy about the delay in processing her potential charge. She wanted to know what had happened to the information she gave the person she spoke to on April 7, and why there had been a three-week delay. The delay was entirely caused by what the Chair would call the "increased efficiency" of using the call center.! If there were not call center, and the 800 number connected her to her nearest office as it used to do, this would have been handled more quickly.

PCPs frustrated they can't call 800 number to reach investigators.

Caller had an FMLA issue but was directed to the field office by the NCC who incorrectly told her that it was an ADA situation. She was irate when told otherwise.

Caller to NCC was not given telephone number for Local EEOC office, resulting in the potential Charging Party driving three hours to the EEOC office, without being pre counseled. Caller was told that the Local Office was not taking calls.

The call or contact described above involved an individual who was allegedly told by a NCC contact that they "definitely" had a charge and that the employer "clearly violated" EEOC statutes. This caller was totally unable to establish a prima facie case, but because of the contact with the NCC, felt was though the NCC was somehow in control of the EEOC offices.

Callers are very frustrated that they have to speak with someone else. They assume that their charges are being filed, or documents are being received, only to have an

investigator call them later.

The majority of calls I answer from NCC are current CP's looking for a status on their charge who are using the free 800 number for information rather than spending money on a call to the office.

A recent incident with NCC: the NCC did not mention in their message to us that the caller spoke only Spanish. They did not provide a charge number, and the Charging Party's name on email printout from NCC was misspelled. I had to do extensive research to find the correct Charging Party's name and where the mistake was, then locate the file. When I returned the Charging Party's call, that was when I discovered that the Charging Party spoke no English, and I was very embarrassed trying to relay what my message was about. He specifically said, "Espanol"? That led to some confusion and delayed our response time by approximately another 3-4 days before getting a Spanish speaking mediator to return his call. Had I known this in advance, I would have been able to assist him much more quickly, as the only mediator who speaks Spanish had left for the day. But what really bothered me was that they didn't get the spelling of his last name (an easy task if one can speak that language) OR the charge number. They managed to find out which office was handling the case, and whose possession the file was in, and yet couldn't provide the charge number. (I don't understand that.) For a staff that's only job is to assist callers in several languages, that was very poor customer service in my opinion. This whole fiasco resulted in nearly a week before the call was answered.

### **NCC Creates More Work**

The information provided to the Detroit office has proven to be inaccurate and has increased our workload because of the constant follow-ups with the call center.

I have received several calls from persons who do not work in Minnesota, but were referred to us instead of the Milwaukee office (for instance, persons that work and live in Iowa). This makes more work because we have to return the call, forward the questionnaire, and then forward the questionnaire to Milwaukee for processing.

In addition to giving out inaccurate and non-useful information, the call center is requiring responses as to how we handled a call (for example, from the hotline). In one instance, all a caller wanted to do was to cancel an appointment!

Dealing with the call center takes more time and more reporting than dealing directly with the public, and it takes time away from the actual processing of the cases.

NONE of the information they provide streamlines the process - in fact, we are now receiving more information that requires additional steps by contacting the CP by phone or mail - which could be handled during one phone call or mail-in inquiry.

My work load had increased tremendously.

I believe the NCC has increased the work burden for investigator. Because of the format of form, I usually resort to filling out a blank charge questionnaire myself. Previously, I never filled out the questionnaire because Potential Charging Parties are always required to fill out a questionnaire before they are interviewed, even for unperfected charges.

There is no difference between the NCC and a clerk who answers the phone at our front desk. No time is saved. Actually, time is wasted since we have to re-interview the caller, which results in duplication of work and wasted resources.

Have seen no difference in reduction of calls taken locally.

The call center is just another tool that adds to the workload.

The caller states she called and said she wanted to file a charge. She states she gave detailed info as to her allegations and was told she would have to fax us a letter or go to the Charlotte District office. The caller said she called back before leaving to visit CTDO (2 hour drive) and was then told she would have to call or fax info to the Greenville office. Caller said she was frustrated b/c asked for our number and called directly. Caller was also given incorrect counseling by the NCC representatives as to her specific allegations and the investigation process.

I feel that the NCC's e'questionnaire has created more 'paperwork' for the investigators and ISAs.

It takes the same amount of time or even longer to complete an interview/charge forwarded from the NCC. More paperwork is generated.

They are creating work for us because we have to respond to requests for status of open charges which is not our job.

It has only increased the number of phone call received. Now I receive the local calls and the NCC calls. Receiving all of those NCC notices during the already hectic Intake week is very disruptive.

Call generated from the call center only increase my work load. They provide absolutely no information to any caller that I have spoken with.

### **NCC Funding Could be Better Used In-House**

I had high hopes for the NCC but its turned out to be nothing more than an "answering service." We could perform much more efficiently if we had just been provided with a receptionist and another clerk.

The money spent on the call center would have best been used to hire more investigators. This would have been the best way to reduce the inventory.

Seems to me that taxpayers dollars would be better spent upgrading our telephone systems and hiring OAAs or ISAs for each field office.

This call center is a huge waste of desperately needed resources out here in the field.

What a waste of time and money.

Since March 21, 2005, the date the NCC went nationwide, there has not been any information that has proven useful, nor did it save me or my co-workers any time. While I understand that the call center "representatives" are not meant to be actual Investigator's, their rather expensive "purpose" is questionable. Just exactly what are they doing to assist us in processing charges? ....or is that the 5 million dollar question?

This is simply an expensive message center, since Investigators must contact the caller because of insufficient , which is usually grossly insufficient, information provided by the NCC.

The NCC hasn't done anything more than take a phone message. What was the point of them supposedly getting trained on EEOC statutes? The NCC is not saving me any time b/c I have to do the same thing (call and interview the person or send an IQ) that I would have to do if anyone just took a person's name and number. What a waste of time and energy.

IN general, they seem to be a telephone answering service for us.

It would appear that the call center is no more than a voice mail machine that passes every call along to the various offices and provide no meaningful service to the public

This is really stressful, in addition to the lack of personnel to run this office.