

Issue: Compliance – Grievance Procedure (5-Day Rule); Ruling Date: July 20, 2010; Ruling #2010-2674; Agency: Virginia Commonwealth University;
Outcome: Grievant Not In Compliance.



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
Department of Employment Dispute Resolution

COMPLIANCE RULING OF DIRECTOR

In the matter of Virginia Commonwealth University
Ruling No. 2010-2674
July 20, 2010

The Virginia Commonwealth University (“the University”) seeks to administratively close the grievant’s April 8, 2010 grievance. The University alleges that the grievant has failed to comply with the time limits set forth in the grievance procedure for advancing or concluding his grievance.

FACTS

On April 8, 2010, the grievant initiated a grievance challenging his receipt of a Group II Written Notice with termination for allegedly failing to follow policy and falsifying records. According to the University, the third resolution step response was sent to the grievant on or about May 21, 2010. Because the grievant did not advance or conclude his grievance within 5 workdays of receiving the third resolution step response, the University sent the grievant a notice of noncompliance via regular U.S. Mail on June 1, 2010.¹ Because more than five workdays have elapsed since the grievant was apparently notified of the noncompliance, and the grievant has not yet cured the non-compliance, the University seeks a compliance ruling.

DISCUSSION

The grievance procedure requires both parties to address procedural noncompliance through a specific process.² That process assures that the parties first communicate with each other about the noncompliance, and resolve any compliance problems voluntarily, without this Department’s (EDR’s) involvement. Specifically, the party claiming noncompliance must notify the other party in writing and allow five workdays for the opposing party to correct any noncompliance.³ If the opposing party fails to correct the noncompliance within this five-day period, the party claiming noncompliance may seek a compliance ruling from the EDR Director, who may in turn

¹ The mailing of correspondence, properly addressed and stamped, raises a presumption of receipt of the correspondence by the addressee. *E.g.*, *Washington v. Anderson*, 236 Va. 316, 322, 373 S.E.2d 712, 715 (1988).

² *Grievance Procedure Manual* § 6.3.

³ *See Id.*

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 an EDR ruling finds that either party to a grievance is in noncompliance, the 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.⁴

In this case, the grievant appears to have failed to advance or conclude his grievance within five workdays of presumably receiving the third resolution step response. Moreover, the University has apparently notified the grievant of his noncompliance, but the grievant has not advanced or concluded his grievance.

As the grievant has apparently failed to advance or conclude his grievance in a timely manner, he has failed to comply with the grievance procedure.⁵ This Department therefore orders the grievant to correct his noncompliance **within ten work days of the date of this ruling** by notifying his human resources office in writing that he wishes either to conclude his grievance or advance the grievance to the agency head for a qualification determination. If he does not, the University 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).

This Department's rulings on matters of compliance are final and nonappealable.⁶

Claudia T. Farr
Director

⁴ While in cases of substantial noncompliance with procedural rules the grievance statutes grant the EDR Director the authority to render a decision on a qualifiable issue against a noncompliant party, this Department favors having grievances decided on the merits rather than procedural violations. Thus, the EDR Director will *typically* order noncompliance corrected before rendering a decision against a noncompliant party. However, where a party's noncompliance appears driven by bad faith or a gross disregard of the grievance procedure, this Department will exercise its authority to rule against the party without first ordering the noncompliance to be corrected.

⁵ See *Grievance Procedure Manual* § 3.3

⁶ See Va. Code § 2.2-1001(5); 2.2-3003(G).