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INITIAL ORDER

This Fifth-Step Civil Service administrative proceeding was heard on May 22, 2006 in Nashville, Tennessee, before Joyce Carter-Ball, Administrative Judge, assigned by the Secretary of State, Administrative Procedures Division, and sitting for the Tennessee Civil Service Commission. Kim L. Kirk, Staff Attorney for the Department of Environment and Conservation, represented the State. Grievant Michael Thornton proceeded on his own behalf.

The subject of the hearing is whether the Grievant’s three (3) day suspension with the Department of Environment and Conservation is reasonable and should be upheld.

After consideration of the record and arguments of the parties, it is DETERMINED that Grievant’s three (3) day suspension with the Department of Environment and Conservation is reasonable and is UPHELD.

This determination is based on the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. This is a fifth step disciplinary proceeding where the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (hereinafter referred to as the department or TDEC)
suspended Michael R. Thornton (hereinafter referred to as Grievant or as Mr. Thornton). TDEC suspended Mr. Thornton and he filed a timely grievance and appealed.

2. TDEC employee Michael Thornton, an Environmental Specialist for the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation received a three-day suspension dated September 13, 2005.

3. Mr. Thornton’s position requires him to inspect facilities that discharge wastewater, and to complete the reports and notices after the inspections. Mr. Thornton is responsible for handling enforcement activities for violations of law and of discharge permits. Mr. Thornton has management responsibility for two employees, which includes evaluations of their performance. Mr. Thornton is assigned an office space in the Nashville Environmental Field Office.

4. Joe E. Holland, Jr., Nashville Environmental Field Office Manager for the Division of Water Pollution Control, was Mr. Thornton’s supervisor at the time the suspension action began. Mr. Holland was direct supervisor for Mr. Thornton during most of the 26 years Mr. Thornton has worked for TDEC. At the date the suspension was issued, and at the time of hearing, Ann Rochelle, Environmental Specialist 6, was supervisor for Mr. Thornton.

5. The suspension was issued due to performance deficiencies in three general areas that are set out in Finding of Fact 6.

6. The deficiencies in Mr. Thornton’s performance had been addressed in discipline, and had been addressed in performance reviews. The same performance deficiencies were repeatedly documented in reviews of Mr. Thornton’s performance. Mr. Thornton had received previous disciplinary action. Through the years Mr. Thornton has made
some improvement in performance after performance reviews, and when he was facing possible disciplinary action, his performance returned to being deficient in the same areas.

7. Prior to the September 13, 2005 three-day suspension Mr. Thornton received a written warning dated March 21, 2005. Mr. Thornton said in his opening statement that “most of the items in the written warning I cannot really dispute.” The written warning and suspension were for the same three general areas of performance deficiency.

First: Inspection and enforcement responsibilities:

-- In the preceding year Mr. Thornton performed only 13 of the 24 inspections required by his job plan.

-- For those 13 inspections, post-inspection letters had been done on only 4 of the inspections.

-- Mr. Thornton was assigned responsibility for 87 facilities. Each was to be inspected at least once every three years. At the date of Mr. Thornton’s written warning, only 24 of Mr. Thornton’s facilities had been inspected within the past three years.

-- Mr. Thornton had failed to document violations during his inspections, which caused TDEC to fail to take appropriate enforcement action.

-- Mr. Thornton failed to prepare the enforcement action that Mr. Holland instructed him to prepare.

Second: Management and supervision of employees assigned to him:

Mr. Thornton was months behind in doing performance reviews of his two employees.

-- Mr. Thornton had not kept track of the inspection activities and follow-up documentation done by his two employees. The employees did not meet their inspection goals, and did not produce timely follow-up documentation.

-- Enforcement action had not been done by Mr. Thornton’s employees, which allowed facilities to remain in noncompliance for long periods.
Mr. Thornton did not bring his employees into compliance with requirements for office appearance and file management, including return of files for use by other TDEC employees.

-- TDEC had reduced the number of employees assigned to Mr. Thornton to only two, but Mr. Thornton continued to have performance deficiencies.

Third: Failure to comply with basic office policies:

-- Mr. Thornton held files in his office that should have been returned to TDEC file storage. This practice prevented other employees from having access to those files. Mr. Thornton was not cooperative when other employees, including his managers, asked for files that were in his office.

-- Mr. Thornton would not use the GroupWise computer system calendar to notify the field office and his managers of his location.

-- Mr. Thornton was not cooperative with other TDEC employees who needed information regarding the facilities that were assigned to Mr. Thornton.

-- Mr. Thornton refused to prepare an enforcement action request that was assigned to him by Mr. Holland.

-- Mr. Thornton’s office space was not merely untidy, but was littered with debris, like empty food containers.

8. The written warning included a section titled Description of Proper Performance of Duties, which reads as follows:

You must take the following actions to avoid further disciplinary action:

. Bring your workspace/cubicle into full compliance with the NEFO office appearance policy and require those that you supervise to do the same.

. Remove all Division regulatory files from your cubicle except for those that you are actively using as a part of an inspection or review and require those that you supervise to do the same.

. Use GroupWise to report your specific whereabouts.

. Work cooperatively with others that require information about the facilities assigned to you. Specifically, you should avoid threatening or intimidating behavior in your dealings with co-workers.

. Provide supervisory oversight of your subordinates by tracking their activities to ensure compliance with goals set in their job plans and the Division Work Plan. Especially, emphasis should be placed on their roles as compliance and enforcement inspectors.
Perform timely performance reviews of your subordinates; minimally one Interim and an annual review per evaluation cycle.

Complete inspections and follow-up reports and letters on assigned facilities at a rate that approximates job plan goals.

Examine each assigned facility for compliance and initiate enforcement action when consistent with Division enforcement policy.

9. The Written Warning also contains a section titled **Explanation of Future Disciplinary Actions**, which reads as follows:

Should this performance or behavior occur again you will be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with the Department of Personnel Rules governing Disciplinary Action, specifically Rule 1120-10-.07 (Suspension Without Pay, Transfer/Demotion, and Dismissal).

This language specifically gave notice to Mr. Thornton that failure to correct his performance could result in further discipline, including a suspension without pay.

10. Mr. Holland had five follow-up meetings with Mr. Thornton -- March 22 2005, March 28 2005, April 11 2005, April 29 2006, and May 20, 2005 -- to discuss the performance deficiencies identified in the Written Warning. Mr. Holland prepared a memorandum to Mr. Thornton summarizing each meeting.

11. In the March 22, 2005 meeting Mr. Holland went through each of the items in the Description of Proper Performance of Duties. He emphasized that continued failure to properly perform would result in further disciplinary action. He gave Mr. Thornton a deadline to correct the appearance of his office.

12. In the March 28, 2005 meeting Mr. Holland and Mr. Thornton specifically discussed correction of Mr. Thornton’s office.

13. Following the April 11, 2205 meeting, Mr. Holland documented the following:
-- There had been some progress on clearing Mr. Thornton’s office, but he was focusing on the other performance deficiencies.
-- Mr. Thornton had not done the overdue interim reviews for his employees. He intended to complete them by the end of April.
-- Mr. Thornton had not addressed the office issues of the two employees he supervised, but planned to address this in their interim reviews.
-- Mr. Thornton had not begun updating computer tracking of inspection and compliance work, and was not sure how far behind the Division was in meeting Division compliance inspection goals.

14. Following the April 29, 2005 meeting, Mr. Holland documented the following:
-- Mr. Thornton had made some progress on his office.
-- Mr. Thornton still had not done interim reviews for his two employees. Mr. Thornton stated that he was almost ready to do one review and had just begun compiling information for the other.
-- Mr. Thornton had not addressed the office issues with the two employees he supervised.
-- Mr. Thornton had not begun to update computer files used for tracking inspection and compliance work, but he planned to do this as part of the interim review process.
-- Mr. Thornton was still not sure how far behind the work unit was in meeting the Division’s compliance inspection goals.

15. Following the May 20, 2005 meeting, Mr. Holland documented the following:
-- Mr. Thornton had made no further progress on his office. There was still debris, including newspapers, food and drink containers.
-- Mr. Thornton did appear to be working cooperatively with others to set inspection goals.
  Mr. Thornton had not done the interim reviews for either of his employees.
-- Mr. Thornton had not addressed office issues with either of his employees.
-- Mr. Thornton had not made progress on the tracking information.
-- Mr. Thornton had not done any inspections, and he had not entered any scheduled inspections into the GroupWise calendar.
-- Mr. Thornton had not initiated any enforcement action.

16. In the memorandum from the May 20, 2005 meeting Mr. Holland stated “The written warning made it very clear in the section titled ‘Description of Proper
Performance of Duties’ what you should do to avoid further disciplinary action.
You have failed to adequately address many of the bulleted items presented there.”

17. Mr. Holland regularly did reviews of Mr. Thornton’s job performance, through written interim reviews and annual formal performance evaluations. Mr. Holland met with Mr. Thornton for each interim review and annual performance evaluation. Mr. Thornton received a copy of each review and evaluation.

18. Annual performance evaluations rate the work performance of career service employees. Performance of each job responsibility and overall performance are rated on a scale from 1 Not acceptable, 2 Marginal, 3 Good, 4 Superior, 5 Exceptional. Mr. Holland used interim reviews to provide Mr. Thornton with an assessment of his performance, notice of any deficiencies that needed correction, and notice of the ratings that Mr. Thornton would receive on the annual evaluation if correction did not occur.

19. During interim reviews and annual evaluations the same three primary areas of performance deficiency were repeatedly identified.

20. In an interim review dated June 28, 2004 Mr. Thornton received the following ratings:

- Inspection of Wastewater Dischargers  Rating 3
- Conducting Employee Job Planning and Performance Program  Rating 2 (Marginal)
- Enforcement  Rating 2 (Marginal)
- Leadership, Image and Self Discipline  Rating 3
- Overall Rating  2 (Marginal)
21. In the annual performance evaluation dated January 24, 2005, Mr. Thornton received the following ratings:

- Inspection of Wastewater Dischargers: Rating 2 (Marginal)
- Conducting Employee Job Planning and Performance Program: Rating 2 (Marginal)
- Enforcement: Rating 2 (Marginal)
- Leadership, Image and Self Discipline: Rating 3
- Overall Rating: Rating 2 (Marginal)

22. None of Mr. Thornton’s ratings had improved since the June 28, 2004 interim review. The rating for Inspection of Wastewater Dischargers had dropped from good to marginal. On the performance evaluation form Mr. Thornton marked that he agreed with the marginal rating in Inspection of Wastewater Dischargers. He marked “partially agrees” with each of the other ratings, including the Overall rating of marginal.

23. Another interim review dated June 10, 2005 was done by Mr. Holland. This was approximately three months after the written warning of March 21. Mr. Thornton’s performance ratings dropped further in this review period. Mr. Thornton received a rating of 1 Not Acceptable for the job responsibility Inspection of Wastewater Dischargers. Mr. Holland noted, “Your job plan establishes an average of 12 inspections per 6 months as a goal. In 2005 you have performed 2 compliance inspections. This is far deficient of your goal. An examination of the inspection tracking spreadsheet shows that you have reported only one inspection in this entire fiscal year. With the fiscal year ending this month, it is apparent that you are very deficient in this job responsibility.”
24. Mr. Thornton’s performance of Conducting the Employee Job Performance Planning and Evaluation Program continued to be rated at 2 Marginal. Mr. Holland stated that “Interim reviews for DJE and DTI were due on 12/31/04. Those reviews were actually performed on 5/20/05. Both DJE and DTI have performance problems that need to be addressed. Doing the interim reviews this close to their annual performance review date (6/30/05) makes it very difficult to expect improvement by that date. By failing to track performance and require improvement, it is unlikely that your staff will meet compliance inspection and enforcement goals set by the Division.”

25. Mr. Thornton’s performance of Enforcement continued to be rated at 2 Marginal. Mr. Holland stated “You have sent one NOV [Notice of Violation] during this evaluation period. That resulted from a sewage overflow at Hartsville. The April 11 NOV was well justified. It established a 30-day deadline for a response. The Hartsville file shows no evidence that response was received. You should follow-up on this enforcement.”

26. Mr. Thornton’s performance of Leadership, Image and Self Discipline had declined to a rating of 2 Marginal. Mr. Holland stated, “We have met several times over the past few months to discuss performance issues, but you have failed to correct most of problems. You have not made effective use of your working time.”
27. The overall rating for Mr. Thornton’s performance was 2 Marginal. Mr. Holland stated “You have failed to substantially respond to the marginal rating given on 1/24/05, and to performance reviews on 3/21/05, 3/28/05, 4/11/05, 4/29/05, and 5/20/05. You rarely achieve any of the standards set in your job plan for exceptional performance. Your failure to do compliance inspections is a deficiency that greatly affects your overall performance.

28. A due process notification of possible suspension without pay was delivered to Mr. Thornton on July 22, 2005. A due process meeting was held with Mr. Thornton on August 23, 2005. A three-day suspension was issued by letter dated September 13, 2005.

29. Mr. Thornton testified that he believed the suspension was issued too close in time to the written warning to allow him enough time to improve his performance. This contention was not established by the evidence. Mr. Holland had five review meetings with Mr. Thornton after the March 21, 2005 written warning. In the memorandum prepared following the May 20, 2005 review meeting Mr. Thornton was again warned regarding further disciplinary action. In the June 10, 2005 Interim Review Mr. Thornton’s performance rating had fallen.

30. In June 2005 Ann Rochelle became Mr. Thornton’s direct supervisor. Ms. Rochelle has worked for the Water Pollution Control Division for 22 years. During her tenure with TDEC, Ms. Rochelle had observed Mr. Thornton’s performance.

31. Ms. Rochelle had personal experience with needing records that were buried in Mr. Thornton’s office. She had also received complaints from other employees
that the records they needed were in Mr. Thornton’s office. Mr. Thornton was not forthcoming when he was asked about records that could not be located.

32. Mr. Thornton received an interim review from Ms. Rochelle in November 2005. On the Interim Review Mr. Thornton’s performance was rated as improved in Inspection of Wastewater Dischargers and in Enforcement, but his overall rating remained 2 Marginal. Ms. Rochelle stated that “You are showing improvement, and the 3 ratings given in the areas of inspection and enforcement were based primarily on the short-term increase in number of inspections and enforcement. Those job duties are still very close to the lower (2) rating.”

33. Ms. Rochelle did an annual performance review dated February 7, 2006. Mr. Thornton’s overall performance continued to be 2 Marginal. It cannot be concluded from the evidence that a delay in issuance of the three-day suspension would have resulted in Mr. Thornton curing the deficiencies in his performance.

34. Mr. Thornton’s primary challenge to the evidence presented regarding the basis of the suspension was to produce photographs to demonstrate the offices of other employees in Mr. Holland’s unit also were in disorder. However, he did not present evidence that other employees’ offices contained files that needed to be filed in the agency’s records and available to be used by others. Mr. Thornton testified that he did make some minimal compliance with office standards such as use of the State GroupWise email calendar system. Mr. Thornton did not offer evidence that materially contradicted the evidence of deficiencies in his performance in the three primary areas identified by his supervisors.
35. Grievant (Mr. Thornton) testified that on January 24, 2005 he received a rating of 2 on a performance evaluation. Grievant felt that parts of this were accurate, and parts of it did not completely show what his performance was.

36. Grievant testified that less than 2 months later he received a Written Warning. Grievant agreed with a number of items in the Written Warning.

37. Grievant was instructed to have the office cleaned up by March 24th, two days later. Grievant testified that he “immediately set to work to remove material and items, specifically items that were on the floor that wouldn’t interfere, so that they would be able to clean the carpets.”

38. Grievant testified that it wasn’t indicated to him that maybe he ought to stay afterwards, or that he ought to spend more than his additional working hours to accomplish these tasks.

39. Grievant then began “working on trying to pull together the information to conduct the Interim Reviews. In doing Mr. Ey’s paperwork, it took quite a while to go through the various databases, some of which he was responsible for directly overseeing, and some of which the secretarial staff entered data in.”

40. Grievant came in on a weekend and worked on his office appearance some, because this was the item he took to mean needed the most immediate attention. “To me, the items that needed attention were cleaning the office, getting the Interim Reviews conducted, and would include evaluating the record keeping files, and databases and conducting inspections.”
41. Grievant testified that he tried to get some list of priorities from Mr. Holland. “He has indicated in this memo that I expressed concern that I didn’t understand the priorities.”

42. Grievant testified that during this same period of time, he was still receiving phone calls, inquiries, questions that he had to answer in addition to trying to perform these various tasks.

43. Grievant testified that in July it was still indicated to him that his office was not up-to-par. He looked at other offices within his division and took some digital photographs of those offices.

44. Grievant presented photos of other offices in his division.

45. Grievant testified that he neglected to take any pictures of Mr. Holland’s office, “which by comparison to the majority of the offices in our division, is rather sparse and he does not have a lot of material in his office. So I feel that overall when he judges office appearance he is judging it by what he feels is necessary to work and to do the job.”

46. Grievant testified that he made substantial improvements in this area by the June 10th Interim Evaluation, but doesn’t feel that this was acknowledged.

47. Grievant testified that no one suggested that he might have needed to contact the Employee Assistance Program, or asked whether there was any reason for his (Grievant’s) behavior.

48. Grievant testified that he has been going through, for a period of time, beginning in 2004, certain marital difficulties.
49. Grievant testified that he felt like his marital problems contributed to conditions at the office.

50. Grievant testified that he was trying to make improvements after receiving the Written Warning, by working on the Performance Evaluations, working on the office appearance and starting to conduct inspections.

51. Grievant testified that, from the time he received the Written Warning until the recommendation for a 3 day suspension, he was not given sufficient time to show improvement in these areas.

52. Grievant takes the position that the 3 day suspension was not warranted.

**Conclusions of Law:**

1. The Tennessee Department of Personnel Rule 1120-10-.06 includes the following “EXAMPLES OF DISCIPLINARY OFFENSES”:

   (1) Inefficiency or incompetency in the performance of duties.
   (2) Negligence in the performance of duties.
   (18) Refusal to accept a reasonable and proper assignment from an authorized supervisor (insubordination).

   Mr. Thornton’s work performance came within all three of these disciplinary offenses.

2. The Tennessee Department of Personnel Rule 1120-10-.07 includes the following guidance regarding PROGRESSIVE DISCIPLINARY ACTION:

   (1) The supervisor is responsible for maintaining the proper performance level, conduct and discipline of the employees under his supervision. When corrective action is necessary, the supervisor must administer disciplinary action beginning at the appropriate step as described.
(2) **Oral Warning.** The supervisor will meet privately with the employee for:

(a) Review with the employee exactly what is expected on the job and why.
(b) Explain to the employee how he has not met requirements and why present conduct or performance is unacceptable.
(c) Allow the employee to give reasons for his actions or failure.
(d) Make suggestions for correction.
(e) Record the date of the discussion and other necessary information for future reference.
(f) Written follow-up to the discussion may be forwarded to the employee but is not required. Written follow-up to an oral warning shall not be construed as a written warning as described below and will not become part of the employee’s official personnel file.

(3) **Written Warning.** The supervisor will meet with the employee and:

(a) Review the points covered in the oral warning, if an oral warning was administered. The employee will be told that a significant change in his present conduct or performance must be made.
(b) Tell the employee he will receive a letter covering the significant points of the discussion to include:
   1. What has been expected and how these expectations have not been met.
   2. Suggestions for improvement.
   3. Indication that failure to improve will lead to further disciplinary action.
(c) Review with the organizational unit head the contents of the letter prior to its delivery to the employee by the supervisor.
(d) A copy of the written warning may be placed in the employee’s official personnel file in the agency personnel office at the discretion of the appointing authority. Any written warning which has been issued to an employee shall be automatically expunged from the employee’s personnel file after a period of two (2) years from the date of the letter; provided, that the employee has had no further disciplinary action with respect to the same area of performance, conduct, and discipline.

(4) **Suspension Without Pay.**

(a) After minimum due process is provided, a suspension without pay may be issued by the appointing authority for one (1) to thirty (30) days. No employee may be suspended without pay for disciplinary purposes for more than thirty (30) days in any consecutive twelve (12) month period. Suspensions with or without pay of more than thirty (30) days may be issued pending the outcome of an investigation or legal action with approval of the Commissioner.
(b) Before issuance, a written notice of the suspension without pay will be prepared. The notice will contain an account of the circumstances which led to the decision to issue the suspension, the beginning and ending dates of the suspension and information to the employee concerning his rights of appeal as
outlined in Chapter 1120-11 of these rules. A copy of the notice will be placed in the employee’s official personnel file and a copy will be sent to the Department.

3. Minimum due process was provided prior to imposition of the suspension without pay.

4. Mr. Thornton’s inspection assignments are part of the State’s work plan commitment for funding from the Environmental Protection Agency. Under the Rules of the Tennessee Department of Personnel, Mr. Thornton’s performance deficiencies in the area of **Inspection and enforcement responsibilities** do constitute inefficiency in the performance of duties [Rule 1120-10-.06 (1)] and negligence in the performance of duties [Rule 1120-10-.06 (2)]. Because a specific number of inspections are assigned in Mr. Thornton’s job plan, his failure to perform those inspections also constitutes insubordination [Rule 1120-10-.06 (18)]. The preponderance of the evidence establishes that there was a continuation of these performance deficiencies after issuance of the written warning. The performance deficiencies provide a valid basis for disciplinary action. The three-day suspension without pay was appropriate progressive discipline.

5. The inspections assigned to Mr. Thornton’s employees are part of the State’s work plan commitment for funding from the Environmental Protection Agency. Under the Rules of the Tennessee Department of Personnel, Mr. Thornton’s performance deficiencies in the area of **Management and supervision of employee’s assigned to him** do constitute inefficiency in the performance of duties [Rule 1120-10-.06 (1)] and negligence in the performance of duties
Mr. Thornton received repeated instructions regarding completion of the performance reviews for his employees. His extended failure to perform those reviews also constitutes insubordination [Rule 1120-10-.06 (18)]. The preponderance of the evidence establishes that there was a continuation of these performance deficiencies after issuance of the written warning. The performance deficiencies provide a valid basis for disciplinary action. The three-day suspension without pay was appropriate progressive discipline.

6. Mr. Thornton’s performance deficits had a negative impact on the work of other employees and of the unit. Under the Rules of the Tennessee Department of Personnel, Mr. Thornton’s performance deficiencies in the area of Failure to comply with basic office policies do constitute inefficiency in the performance of duties [Rule 1120-10-.06 (1)] and negligence in the performance of duties [Rule 1120-10-.06 (2)]. Mr. Thornton received repeated instructions regarding the use of standard office procedures. His extended failure to perform those duties also constitutes insubordination. [Rule 1120-10-.06 (18)]. The preponderance of the evidence establishes that there was a continuation of these performance deficiencies after issuance of the written warning. The performance deficiencies provide a valid basis for disciplinary action. The three-day suspension without pay was appropriate progressive discipline.

7. T.C.A. Section 8-30-325 Suspension for disciplinary purposes provides that “An appointing authority may suspend without pay a regular employee for disciplinary purposes, for such length of time as the authority considers appropriate, not exceeding thirty (30) days in any twelve month period.”
8. Grievant’s technical knowledge and ability to perform the engineering duties and inspections is not at question, however, Grievant failed to maintain these work activities for extended periods of time.

9. For various periods of time Grievant has allowed his supervisory duties and job performance to drop below acceptable levels.

10. There is no dispute that Grievant has been far behind in the number of inspections that he should be performing.

11. Grievant has failed to follow through on responsibilities that had been spelled out to him since November of 2002.

12. Progressive discipline was appropriate. Grievant’s supervisor was meeting with him on a regular basis following the Written Warning, and noting the continuing deficiencies, and putting him on notice of the potential for additional disciplinary action.

13. It is CONCLUDED that a suspension of three days is reasonable, based upon the Findings of Fact contained herein.

14. Therefore, it is ORDERED that the three-day suspension is UPHELD.
This Initial Order entered and effective this 29th day of August 2006.

Joyce Carter-Ball  
Administrative Judge

Filed in the Administrative Procedures Division, Office of the Secretary of State, this 29th day of August 2006.

Charles C. Sullivan, II, Director  
Administrative Procedures Division
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