

EMILY S. ELLIOTT DIRECTOR

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

Department Of Human Resource Management
Office of Employment Dispute Resolution

James Monroe Building 101 N. 14th Street, 12th Floor Richmond, Virginia 23219 Tel: (804) 225-2131 (TTY) 711

COMPLIANCE RULING

In the matter of the Virginia Department of Corrections Ruling Number 2020-5079 May 1, 2020

The Virginia Department of Corrections (the "agency") has requested a compliance ruling from the Office of Employment Dispute Resolution ("EDR")¹ at the Department of Human Resource Management (DHRM) in relation to the grievant's October 18, 2019 grievance. The agency alleges that the grievant has failed to comply with the time limits set forth in the grievance procedure for advancing or concluding her grievance.

FACTS

On or about October 18, 2019, the grievant initiated a grievance with the agency. On December 4, 2019, the agency's third step respondent met with the grievant to discuss the issues she had raised; the third step respondent then provided a written response dated December 11, 2019, which provided instructions for advancing or concluding the grievance. By letter dated March 17, 2020,² the agency notified the grievant that it had not received an indication from her whether she wished to advance or conclude her grievance, as required by the grievance procedure. The letter advised that, in order to proceed with her grievance, she must return Form A within five workdays of the notice. On April 2, 2020, having received no further response from the grievant, the agency requested that EDR issue a compliance ruling allowing the agency to administratively close the grievance.

DISCUSSION

The grievance procedure requires both parties to address procedural noncompliance through a specific process.³ That process assures that the parties first communicate with each

¹ The Office of Equal Employment and Dispute Resolution has separated into two office areas: the Office of Employment Dispute Resolution and the Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. While full updates have not yet been made to the *Grievance Procedure Manual* to reflect this change, this Office will be referred to as "EDR" in this ruling. EDR's role with regard to the grievance procedure remains the same.

² As it appears on both the third step response and the March 17 letter, the grievant's mailing address contains a slight inconsistency with the street name the grievant indicated on her Grievance Form A. Thus, while this ruling was pending, EDR independently contacted the grievant to forward the March 17 letter and seek her position. The grievant did not respond.

³ Grievance Procedure Manual § 6.3.

May 1, 2020 Ruling No. 2020-5079 Page 2

other about the noncompliance and resolve any compliance problems voluntarily, without EDR's involvement. Specifically, the party claiming noncompliance must notify the other party of any noncompliance in writing and allow five workdays for the opposing party to correct it.⁴ If the opposing party fails to correct the noncompliance within this five-day period, the party claiming noncompliance may seek a compliance ruling from EDR, which may in turn order the party to correct the noncompliance or, in cases of substantial noncompliance, render a decision against the noncomplying party on any qualifiable issue. When EDR finds that either party to a grievance is in noncompliance, its ruling will (i) order the noncomplying party to correct its noncompliance within a specified time period, and (ii) provide that if the noncompliance is not timely corrected, a decision in favor of the other party will be rendered on any qualifiable issue, unless the noncomplying party can show just cause for the delay in conforming to EDR's order.⁵

In this case, the available facts show that, contrary to the grievance procedure's requirements, the grievant has not advanced or concluded her grievance within five workdays of receiving the agency's third step response. Moreover, more than three months after submitting its third step response, the agency sent the grievant notice of her noncompliance and advised her of the opportunity to correct it. Yet no evidence suggests that the grievant has subsequently taken appropriate steps to advance or conclude her grievance.

Because the grievant has apparently neither advanced nor concluded her grievance at this time, she has failed to comply with the grievance procedure. EDR therefore orders the grievant to correct her noncompliance within 10 workdays of the date of this ruling by notifying her human resources office in writing that she wishes either to advance or conclude the grievance. If she does not do so, the agency may administratively close the grievance without any further action on its part. The grievance may be reopened only upon a timely showing by the grievant of just cause for the delay (for example, a serious illness, or other circumstances beyond the grievant's control).

EDR's rulings on matters of compliance are final and nonappealable.⁷

Christopher M. Grab

Oth the Sh

Director

Office of Employment Dispute Resolution

⁴ See id.

⁵ While in cases of substantial noncompliance with procedural rules the grievance statutes grant EDR the authority to render a decision on a qualifiable issue against a noncompliant party, EDR favors having grievances decided on the merits rather than procedural violations. Thus, EDR will typically order noncompliance corrected before rendering a decision against a noncompliant party. However, where a party's noncompliance appears to be driven by bad faith or a gross disregard of the grievance procedure, EDR will exercise its authority to rule against the party without first ordering the noncompliance to be corrected.

⁶ See Grievance Procedure Manual § 3.3.

⁷ See Va. Code §§ 2.2-1202.1(5), 2.2-3003(G).