

Issue: Qualification – Discipline (Counseling Memo); Ruling Date: August 27, 2010;  
Ruling #2011-2746; Agency: Department of Motor Vehicles; Outcome: Not  
Qualified.



**COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA**  
**Department of Employment Dispute Resolution**

**QUALIFICATION RULING OF DIRECTOR**

In the matter of the Department of Motor Vehicles  
Ruling Number 2011-2746  
August 27, 2010

The grievant has requested a ruling on whether his April 6, 2010 grievance with the Department of Motor Vehicles (the agency) qualifies for a hearing. For the reasons discussed below, this grievance does not qualify for a hearing.

FACTS

On or about March 31, 2010, the grievant received a counseling memo for “disruptive, disrespectful and insubordinate conduct during a staff meeting.” The grievant initiated a grievance to challenge this management action on or about April 6, 2010. The grievant disputes the counseling memo as a misapplication of policy, retaliation, and violation of other various legal provisions.<sup>1</sup> After proceeding through the management steps, the agency head declined to qualify the grievance for a hearing. The grievant now appeals that determination to this Department.

DISCUSSION

Although state employees with access to the grievance procedure may generally grieve anything related to their employment, only certain grievances qualify for a hearing.<sup>2</sup> Additionally, the grievance statutes and procedure reserve to management the exclusive right to manage the affairs and operations of state government.<sup>3</sup> Thus, claims relating to issues such as the methods, means and personnel by which work activities are to be carried out generally do not qualify for a hearing, unless the grievant presents evidence raising a sufficient question as to whether discrimination, retaliation, or discipline may have improperly influenced management’s decision, or whether state policy may have been misapplied or unfairly applied.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The grievant also appears to request that the agency take actions against unknown members of management due to their alleged conduct in relation to the issues grieved. A hearing officer has no authority to order an agency to take disciplinary action against a particular employee. *E.g.*, *Grievance Procedure Manual* § 5.9(b). Therefore, a grievance cannot be qualified based on such a request and the issue will be addressed no further in this ruling.

<sup>2</sup> See *Grievance Procedure Manual* § 4.1 (a) and (b).

<sup>3</sup> See Va. Code § 2.2-3004(B).

<sup>4</sup> Va. Code § 2.2-3004(A); *Grievance Procedure Manual*, § 4.1(c).

Further, the grievance procedure generally limits grievances that qualify for a hearing to those that involve “adverse employment actions.”<sup>5</sup> Thus, typically, the threshold question is whether the grievant has suffered an adverse employment action.<sup>6</sup> An adverse employment action is defined as a “tangible employment action constitut[ing] a significant change in employment status, such as hiring, firing, failing to promote, reassignment with significantly different responsibilities, or a decision causing a significant change in benefits.”<sup>7</sup> Adverse employment actions include any agency actions that have an adverse effect *on the terms, conditions, or benefits* of one’s employment.<sup>8</sup>

The management action challenged in this grievance is a counseling memo. A counseling memo does not generally constitute an adverse employment action, because such an action, in and of itself, does not have a significant detrimental effect on the terms, conditions, or benefits of employment.<sup>9</sup> Further, this type of action does not constitute a “materially adverse action”<sup>10</sup> required to establish a retaliation claim.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, the grievant’s claims relating to his receipt of the counseling memo do not qualify for a hearing.<sup>12</sup>

Further, we note that while the counseling memo has not had an adverse impact on the grievant’s employment, it could be used later to support an adverse employment action against the grievant. Therefore, should the counseling memo grieved in this case later serve to support an adverse employment action against the grievant, such as a formal Written Notice or a “Below Contributor” annual performance rating, this ruling does not prevent the grievant from attempting to contest the merits of these allegations through a subsequent grievance challenging the related adverse employment action.

---

<sup>5</sup> See *Grievance Procedure Manual* § 4.1(b).

<sup>6</sup> While evidence suggesting that the grievant suffered an “adverse employment action” is generally required in order for a grievance to advance to hearing, certain grievances may proceed to hearing absent evidence of an “adverse employment action.” For example, consistent with recent developments in Title VII law, this Department substitutes a lessened “materially adverse” standard for the “adverse employment action” standard in retaliation grievances. See EDR Ruling No. 2007-1538.

<sup>7</sup> *Burlington Industries, Inc. v. Ellerth*, 524 U.S. 742, 761 (1998).

<sup>8</sup> *Holland v. Washington Homes, Inc.*, 487 F.3d 208, 219 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007).

<sup>9</sup> See *Boone v. Goldin*, 178 F.3d 253 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999).

<sup>10</sup> *Burlington N. & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. White*, 548 U.S. 53, 67-68 (2006); see, e.g., EDR Ruling Nos. 2007-1601, 2007-1669, 2007-1706 and 2007-1633.

<sup>11</sup> See, e.g., EDR Ruling No. 2009-2090, at n.6.

<sup>12</sup> Although this grievance does not qualify for an administrative hearing under the grievance process, the grievant may have additional rights under the Virginia Government Data Collection and Dissemination Practices Act (the Act). Under the Act, if the grievant gives notice that he wishes to challenge, correct or explain information contained in his personnel file, the agency shall conduct an investigation regarding the information challenged, and if the information in dispute is not corrected or purged or the dispute is otherwise not resolved, allow the grievant to file a statement of not more than 200 words setting forth his position regarding the information. Va. Code § 2.2-3806(A)(5). This “statement of dispute” shall accompany the disputed information in any subsequent dissemination or use of the information in question. Va. Code § 2.2-3806(A)(5).

APPEAL RIGHTS AND OTHER INFORMATION

For information regarding the actions the grievant may take as a result of this ruling, please refer to the enclosed sheet. If the grievant wishes to appeal the qualification determination to the circuit court, the grievant should notify the human resources office, in writing, within five workdays of receipt of this ruling and file a notice of appeal with the circuit court pursuant to Va. Code § 2.2-3004(E). If the court should qualify this grievance, within five workdays of receipt of the court's decision, the agency will request the appointment of a hearing officer unless the grievant wishes to conclude the grievance and notifies the agency of that desire.

---

Claudia T. Farr  
Director