

Issue: Compliance – Grievance Procedure (5-Day Rule); Ruling Date: October 4, 2010; Ruling #2011-2775; Agency: James Madison University; Outcome: Grievant Not in Compliance.



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
Department of Employment Dispute Resolution

COMPLIANCE RULING OF DIRECTOR

In the matter of James Madison University
Ruling No. 2011-2775
October 4, 2010

James Madison University (the University) seeks to administratively close the grievant's July 15, 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 her grievance.

FACTS

On July 15, 2010, the grievant initiated an expedited grievance challenging her receipt of a Group II Written Notice with three-day suspension for allegedly violating the workplace violence policy. According to the University, the second resolution step response was received by the grievant on or about August 11, 2010. Because the grievant did not advance or conclude her grievance within 5 workdays of receiving the second resolution step response, the University sent the grievant a notice of noncompliance via certified mail on August 25, 2010. The notice of noncompliance was delivered on August 26, 2010. Because more than five workdays have elapsed since the University's notification of 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.¹ 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.² If the opposing party fails to correct the noncompliance within this five-day period, the party claiming

¹ *Grievance Procedure Manual* § 6.3.

² *See Id.*

noncompliance may seek a compliance ruling from the EDR Director, who 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 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.³

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

As the grievant has apparently failed to advance or conclude her grievance in a timely manner, she has failed to comply with the grievance procedure.⁴ This Department therefore orders the grievant to correct her noncompliance **within ten work days of the date of this ruling** by notifying her human resources office in writing that she wishes either to conclude her grievance or advance the grievance to agency head for a qualification determination. If she 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.⁵

Claudia T. Farr
Director

³ 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.

⁴ See *Grievance Procedure Manual* § 3.2.

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