### IN THE MATTER OF ARBITRATION

### **BETWEEN**

### THE OHIO VETERANS HOME

AND

# THE OHIO CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION/ LOCAL 11, AFSCME-AFL-CIO

Before: Robert G. Stein

PANEL APPOINTMENT

CASE # 33-00-19991220-1012-01-04 Anita Kennedy, Grievant

Advocate(s) for the UNION:

Robert Robinson, Staff Representative OCSEA Local 11, AFSCME, AFL-CIO 1680 Watermark Dr. Columbus OH 43215

Advocate(s) for the EMPLOYER:

Robert D. Day, Human Resources Mgr. OHIO VETERANS HOME 3416 Columbus Avenue Sandusky OH 44870 Hospital Aide, employed at the Ohio Veterans Home (hereinafter referred to as "Employer" or "OVH"). Ms. Kennedy was terminated from her position for violation of Rule D-02, "willfully falsifying, altering, destroying or disposing of any official or public document" and Rule D-09 "violation of ORC 124.34." Ms. Kennedy began working for the Ohio Veteran's Home in 1995.

On August 30, 1999, the Grievant appeared in the Ohio Court of Claims in Columbus, Ohio. She had filed suit against the Employer and one of its police officers, Norbert Bliss. In her suit, Ms. Kennedy claimed malicious prosecution, false arrest, negligent infliction of emotional distress, and intentional infliction of emotional distress. During the course of her testimony the Grievant was questioned regarding her prior criminal background. Records were introduced in the proceeding that showed Ms. Kennedy had prior 1991 felony convictions for Trafficking in Drugs (ORC 2925.03), Drug Abuse (ORC 2925.11), Possession of Criminal Tools (ORC 2923.24), and 1990 felony convictions for Aggravated Burglary (ORC 2911.11), Robbery (ORC 2921.02), and Kidnapping (ORC 2905.01). The Grievant was remanded to the Ohio Reformatory for Women in Marysville, Ohio for a period of 5 to 25 years. She served 6 months of that term.

When the Grievant's 1995 employment application for the OVH and her Civil Service Application were reviewed (JX 1), it was discovered that she had answered no to the question of whether she had ever been convicted of a felony. The Grievant was terminated on December 16, 1999. She filed a grievance on 12/20/99, claiming the Employer had committed procedural violations of the Agreement and that she was not terminated for just cause.

### UNION'S POSITION

The Union first readily admits that the Grievant has a record of felony convictions that she failed to disclose on her employment applications. However, the Union argues that at the time the Grievant applied for her position in 1995, she submitted to a drug test and provided the Employer with her police record from the Sandusky Police Department (Erie County). The Union argues that the evidence and testimony provided in the arbitration hearing readily demonstrate that Ms. Kennedy has been an exemplary employee. She has learned a hard lesson from her past and deserves a break from the Employer, contends the Union.

The Union also points to several procedural violations committed by the Employer in its termination of the Grievant. The Union claims that the Employer had knowledge of the Grievant's prior felony convictions for several months before she was terminated on December 16, 1999. The Employer revealed that it had knowledge of her convictions on August 30, 1999 and possibly as early as June of that year. The Union points to the provisions of Articles 24.04 and 24.05 that require the Employer to act in a timely manner regarding matters of discipline. The Union argues that the Employer violated these provisions by waiting some five months before terminating the Grievant. Delays can only occur pending "criminal charges," contends the Union.

The Union also argues that Ms. Rena Norman violated the Agreement when she failed to provide the Grievant with a requested extension of 48 hours to hold a Pre-Disciplinary hearing and also inappropriately talked about the Grievant's case with another bargaining unit employee, Alice Orshoski, prior to her Pre-Disciplinary hearing. In this conversation the Union claims that Ms. Norman revealed her inclinations

never been convicted of a felony. She then secured, from a local police agency, a record that she knew would show no criminal convictions in the county where the Employer is located. She mislead the Employer into thinking she did not have a criminal record. The purposeful nature of these actions further undermines her credibility in this matter.

There is no question that individuals with a criminal background have a difficult time securing meaningful employment in our society. People who have reformed from a jaded past deserve an opportunity to undo what they have done. However, the need to make an honest living, regardless of how difficult, cannot be based upon deceit.

I find that the Employer took an excessive amount of time (some five months) to discharge the Grievant. However, its delayed action appeared to be substantially explained by litigation that was initiated by the Grievant. I do not find that the Grievant or the Union were disadvantaged by this delay, nor do I find that it violated the Collective Bargaining Agreement in this particular case. If the Employer did not have the excuse of being engaged in litigation, this delay may have been viewed more critically.

I find the allegation that Ms. Norman discussed her feelings about Mrs. Kennedy with another employee, Ms. Orskoski, prior to the Pre-D hearing, to be most disturbing. However, the Union did not provide definitive proof that Ms. Norman committed such an act. In addition, the actions of the Grievant are so clear cut, it is unlikely that proof of such a thoughtless and foolish act on the part of Ms. Norman would be sufficient to overcome the Grievant's own admission of lying on her application, an admission she repeated during her testimony in the arbitration hearing.

## **AWARD**

The grievance is denied.

Respectfully submitted to the parties this 23 day of June, 2000.

Robert G. Stein, Arbitrator