Issue: Qualification – Discipline (Other); Ruling Date: December 16, 2011; Ruling No. 2012-3191; Agency: Department of Social Services; Outcome: Not Qualified.



# COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA Department of Employment Dispute Resolution

## QUALIFICATION RULING OF DIRECTOR

In the matter of the Department of Social Services Ruling Number 2012-3191 December 16, 2011

The grievant has requested a ruling on whether his November 9, 2011 grievance with the Department of Social Services (the agency) qualifies for a hearing. For the reasons discussed below, this grievance does not qualify for a hearing.

### **FACTS**

On October 14, 2011, the grievant received the agency's "Notice of Intent" of taking disciplinary action. The grievant initiated a grievance to challenge this management action on or about November 9, 2011. The agency has since decided not to take disciplinary action against the grievant. 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. The grievance procedure generally limits grievances that qualify for a hearing to those that involve "adverse employment actions." Thus, typically, the threshold question is whether the grievant has suffered an adverse employment action. 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." Adverse employment actions include any

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Grievance Procedure Manual § 4.1 (a) and (b).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Grievance Procedure Manual § 4.1(b).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</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>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Burlington Industries, Inc. v. Ellerth, 524 U.S. 742, 761 (1998).

December 16, 2011 Ruling No. 2012-3191 Page 3

agency actions that have an adverse effect on the terms, conditions, or benefits of one's employment.<sup>5</sup>

The management action challenged in this grievance is the agency's "Notice of Intent" of taking disciplinary action. A "Notice of Intent" 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. Indeed, the document is nothing more than the agency's proposal to take disciplinary action, which, in this case, did not occur. Therefore, the grievant's claims relating to his receipt of the "Notice of Intent" do not qualify for a hearing.<sup>6</sup>

### 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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Holland v. Washington Homes, Inc., 487 F.3d 208, 219 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</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 (to the extent the "Notice of Intent" would be 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).