

Issue: Group III Written Notice with Termination (client abuse); Hearing Date: 09/28/18; Decision Issued: 10/02/18; Agency: DBHDS; AHO: Carl Wilson Schmidt, Esq.; Case No. 11254; Outcome: No Relief – Agency Upheld.



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Department of Human Resource Management

OFFICE OF EQUAL EMPLOYMENT AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION

DECISION OF HEARING OFFICER

In re:

Case Number: 11254

Hearing Date: September 28, 2018

Decision Issued: October 2, 2018

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On June 20, 2018, Grievant was issued a Group III Written Notice of disciplinary action with removal for client abuse.

On July 19, 2018, Grievant timely filed a grievance to challenge the Agency's action. The matter proceeded to hearing. On August 7, 2018, the Office of Equal Employment and Dispute Resolution assigned this appeal to the Hearing Officer. On September 28, 2018, a hearing was held at the Agency's office.

APPEARANCES

Grievant
Agency Representative
Witnesses

ISSUES

1. Whether Grievant engaged in the behavior described in the Written Notice?
2. Whether the behavior constituted misconduct?

3. Whether the Agency's discipline was consistent with law (e.g., free of unlawful discrimination) and policy (e.g., properly characterized as a Group I, II, or III offense)?
4. Whether there were mitigating circumstances justifying a reduction or removal of the disciplinary action, and if so, whether aggravating circumstances existed that would overcome the mitigating circumstances?

BURDEN OF PROOF

The burden of proof is on the Agency to show by a preponderance of the evidence that its disciplinary action against the Grievant was warranted and appropriate under the circumstances. The employee has the burden of raising and establishing any affirmative defenses to discipline and any evidence of mitigating circumstances related to discipline. Grievance Procedure Manual ("GPM") § 5.8. A preponderance of the evidence is evidence which shows that what is sought to be proved is more probable than not. GPM § 9.

FINDINGS OF FACT

After reviewing the evidence presented and observing the demeanor of each witness, the Hearing Officer makes the following findings of fact:

The Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services employed Grievant as a Direct Support Personnel I at one of its facilities. No evidence of prior active disciplinary action was introduced during the hearing.

On June 4, 2018, Grievant began escorting Client W to the bathroom so he could be showered. Client W used a wheelchair. Grievant moved Client W towards the bathroom door. She positioned herself in front of the wheelchair and walk backwards attempting to pull Client W into the bathroom. Client W quickly raised his left arm. Grievant smacked his arm down as she continued to pull Client W into the bathroom.

Once Grievant and Client W were in the bathroom, Client W began swinging his arm and trying to bite Grievant. Grievant used her left hand to slap Client W more than three times on the left side of his face, shoulder, and head. Ms. C was in the bathroom at the same time and was standing a few feet from Grievant and Client W. Ms. C observed and heard Grievant slapping Client W. She believed the slaps were "hard" because she heard "loud slap[s] against the wet skin."¹

On June 4, 2018, Grievant took Client W2 into the bathroom to assist him with toileting. Ms. C was assisting a resident by taking him to his bedroom. As Ms. C

¹ Agency Exhibit 3.

walked down the hallway she turned her head to her left and looked into the bathroom. She heard Grievant say “stop grabbing me.” Ms. C observed Grievant hit Client W2 on his arm. Client W2 told Grievant “leave me alone”.

Agency staff are allowed to have physical contact with residents so long as that contact is consistent with the annual Therapeutic Options of Virginia (TOVA) training they receive. Slapping or hitting a resident is not training authorized by TOVA.

CONCLUSIONS OF POLICY

The Agency has a duty to the public to provide its clients with a safe and secure environment. It has zero tolerance for acts of abuse or neglect and these acts are punished severely. Departmental Instruction (“DI”) 201 defines² client abuse as:

This means any act or failure to act by an employee or other person responsible for the care of an individual in a Department facility that was performed or was failed to be performed knowingly, recklessly or intentionally, and that caused or might have caused physical or psychological harm, injury or death to a person receiving care or treatment for mental illness, mental retardation or substance abuse. Examples of abuse include, but are not limited to, acts such as:

- Rape, sexual assault, or other criminal sexual behavior
- Assault or battery
- Use of language that demeans, threatens, intimidates or humiliates the person;
- Misuse or misappropriation of the person’s assets, goods or property
- Use of excessive force when placing a person in physical or mechanical restraint
- Use of physical or mechanical restraints on a person that is not in compliance with federal and state laws, regulations, and policies, professionally accepted standards of practice or the person’s individual services plan; and
- Use of more restrictive or intensive services or denial of services to punish the person or that is not consistent with his individualized services plan.

For the Agency to meet its burden of proof in this case, it must show that (1) Grievant engaged in an act that he or she performed knowingly, recklessly, or intentionally and (2) Grievant’s act caused or might have caused physical or psychological harm to the Client. It is not necessary for the Agency to show that Grievant intended to abuse a client – the Agency must only show that Grievant intended

² See, Va. Code § 37.2-100 and 12 VAC 35-115-30.

to take the action that caused the abuse. It is also not necessary for the Agency to prove a client has been injured by the employee's intentional act. All the Agency must show is that the Grievant might have caused physical or psychological harm to the client.

On June 4, 2018, Grievant slapped Client W at least three times and Client W2 at least one time. None of her actions were authorized under TOVA. Grievant's actions constituted battery thereby justifying the issuance of a Group III Written Notice of disciplinary action for client abuse. Upon the issuance of a Group III Written Notice, an agency may remove an employee. Accordingly, Grievant's removal must be upheld.

Grievant denied slapping or otherwise inappropriately hitting Client W and Client W2. The Agency presented credible testimony from Ms. C to establish Grievant's behavior. Grievant did not present any evidence to show that Ms. C had any motive to be untruthful.

Va. Code § 2.2-3005.1 authorizes Hearing Officers to order appropriate remedies including "mitigation or reduction of the agency disciplinary action." Mitigation must be "in accordance with rules established by the Department of Human Resource Management"³ Under the *Rules for Conducting Grievance Hearings*, "[a] hearing officer must give deference to the agency's consideration and assessment of any mitigating and aggravating circumstances. Thus, a hearing officer may mitigate the agency's discipline only if, under the record evidence, the agency's discipline exceeds the limits of reasonableness. If the hearing officer mitigates the agency's discipline, the hearing officer shall state in the hearing decision the basis for mitigation." A non-exclusive list of examples includes whether (1) the employee received adequate notice of the existence of the rule that the employee is accused of violating, (2) the agency has consistently applied disciplinary action among similarly situated employees, and (3) the disciplinary action was free of improper motive. In light of this standard, the Hearing Officer finds no mitigating circumstances exist to reduce the disciplinary action.

DECISION

For the reasons stated herein, the Agency's issuance to the Grievant of a Group III Written Notice of disciplinary action with removal is **upheld**.

APPEAL RIGHTS

You may request an administrative review by EEDR within **15 calendar** days from the date the decision was issued. Your request must be in writing and must be **received** by EEDR within 15 calendar days of the date the decision was issued.

³ *Va. Code § 2.2-3005.*

Please address your request to:

Office of Equal Employment and Dispute Resolution
Department of Human Resource Management
101 North 14th St., 12th Floor
Richmond, VA 23219

or, send by e-mail to EDR@dhrm.virginia.gov, or by fax to (804) 786-1606.

You must also provide a copy of your appeal to the other party and the hearing officer. The hearing officer's **decision becomes final** when the 15-calendar day period has expired, or when requests for administrative review have been decided.

A challenge that the hearing decision is inconsistent with state or agency policy must refer to a particular mandate in state or agency policy with which the hearing decision is not in compliance. A challenge that the hearing decision is not in compliance with the grievance procedure, or a request to present newly discovered evidence, must refer to a specific requirement of the grievance procedure with which the hearing decision is not in compliance.

You may request a judicial review if you believe the decision is contradictory to law. You must file a notice of appeal with the clerk of the circuit court in the jurisdiction in which the grievance arose within **30 days** of the date when the decision becomes final.^[1]

[See Sections 7.1 through 7.3 of the Grievance Procedure Manual for a more detailed explanation, or call EEDR's toll-free Advice Line at 888-232-3842 to learn more about appeal rights from an EEDR Consultant].

/s/ Carl Wilson Schmidt

Carl Wilson Schmidt, Esq.
Hearing Officer

^[1] Agencies must request and receive prior approval from EEDR before filing a notice of appeal.