

Issue: Group I Written Notice (failure to follow policy, unsatisfactory performance);
Hearing Date: 08/02/17; Decision Issued: 08/21/17; Agency: DOC; AHO: Carl
Wilson Schmidt, Esq.; Case No. 11017; 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: 11017

Hearing Date: August 2, 2017
Decision Issued: August 21, 2017

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On December 1, 2016, Grievant was issued a Group I Written Notice of disciplinary action for failure to follow instructions or policy.

On December 1, 2016, Grievant timely filed a grievance to challenge the Agency's action. The outcome of the Third Resolution Step was not satisfactory to the Grievant and he requested a hearing. On May 22, 2017, the Office of Equal Employment and Dispute Resolution assigned this appeal to the Hearing Officer. On August 2, 2017, a hearing was held at the Agency's office.

APPEARANCES

Grievant
Agency Party Designee
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 Corrections employs Grievant as an Electrician Supervisor. No evidence of prior active disciplinary action was introduced during the hearing.

Tools at the Facility are kept on a shadow board. Drawings of different tools are made on the board and each tool is hung on the board with its "shadow" image. If a tool is removed from the board, the employee receiving the tool is supposed to put a chit on the board in place of the tool. The employee must also write on the Daily Report which tool he or she removed. Grievant's Daily Report was a pre-printed form listing most of the tools on the shadow board and providing a space for Grievant to initial when he removed a particular tool.

The Agency required its employees to account for tools because once tools were brought inside the secured area, they could be used by inmates as weapons. It was significant to Agency managers to be able to identify missing tools.

On November 7, 2016, Grievant removed 12" Channel Lock Pliers. He initialed the Daily Report to show that he had removed 10" Channel Lock Pliers.

During a Facility audit, the Agency learned that Grievant reported removing 10" Channel Lock Pliers instead of 12" Channel Lock Pliers.

CONCLUSIONS OF POLICY

Unacceptable behavior is divided into three groups, according to the severity of the behavior. Group I offenses “include types of behavior less severe in nature, but [which] require correction in the interest of maintaining a productive and well-managed work force.”¹ Group II offenses “include acts and behavior that are more severe in nature and are such that an accumulation of two Group II offenses normally should warrant removal.”² Group III offenses “include acts and behavior of such a serious nature that a first occurrence normally should warrant removal.”³

“[I]nadequate or unsatisfactory job performance” is a Group I offense.⁴ In order to prove inadequate or unsatisfactory job performance, the Agency must establish that Grievant was responsible for performing certain duties and that Grievant failed to perform those duties. This is not a difficult standard to meet.

Grievant was required to account for each tool he removed from the shadow board. On November 7, 2016, Grievant removed 12” Channel Lock Pliers but initialed that he had removed 10” Channel Lock Pliers. This meant the Agency’s records regarding who possessed the 12” Channel Lock Pliers was in error. The Agency has presented sufficient evidence to support the issuance of a Group I Written Notice.

Grievant argued that he made a clerical error and the disciplinary action was excessive. Once the Agency has met its burden of proof, the only way the Hearing Officer can reduce the disciplinary action is if mitigating circumstances exist. The Agency has met its burden of proof in this case.

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”⁵ 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

¹ Virginia Department of Corrections Operating Procedure 135.1(VI)(B).

² Virginia Department of Corrections Operating Procedure 135.1(VI)(C).

³ Virginia Department of Corrections Operating Procedure 135.1(VI)(D).

⁴ Virginia Department of Corrections Operating Procedure 135.1(V)(B)(4).

⁵ Va. Code § 2.2-3005.

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 I Written Notice of disciplinary action 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.

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]

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

[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