DHR PROCESS - ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT State of Vermont - Department of Human Resources

	Misconduct Reported to DHR: Sources: • Line Employee • Supervisor • John Q. Public • Media Report of Criminal Charge
	 Review of Allegation by DHR (Legal, Labor Relations, Investigative Unit [IU], DHR Field Professional) <u>DHR Decision Points:</u> Does allegation constitute misconduct? Are there sufficient facts to determine if investigation is warranted? Does allegation involve possible criminal conduct for referral? Is employment investigation warranted? Who should perform investigation (IU, Field DHR, or Department/Agency)? If <u>DHR decides no investigation warranted</u>: DHR Manager works with Agency/Department to address issue appropriately Coaching Feedback Advice RE: Performance process under agreements with VSEA if issue is one of performance
ΔŢ	 Paid Temporary Relief from Duty is Considered DHR weighs in if consulted Leadership at Employee's Agency/Department decides: Is employee presence at work detrimental to the best interests of state, public, morale? Extension beyond 30 days requires DHR Commissioner concurrence
	 Investigation is Conducted Whether by IU, DHR Field, or (Local) Department Investigation involves: Collection/review of physical evidence (emails, documents, state phone, tangible things) Interview of Complainant Interviews of Witnesses Interviews of Subject (with union representation) Draft and Legal review of written report
~	In 2019: 93% of Reports Completed within target period (80/90 days) Average number of days to complete report: 53

DHR PROCESS - ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT State of Vermont - Department of Human Resources

****	 Report submitted to Commissioner/Secretary or Designee Commissioner/Secretary or Designee Decision Points: DHR provides advice on appropriate discipline, but Employee's Commissioner/ Secretary or Designee is the decider Are Allegations Substantiated? If so, what level of discipline is warranted? If feedback or oral/written reprimand, it is implemented at this point
3	 Employee gets written notice and an opportunity to be heard (due process requirement) Meeting is scheduled/held - attended by Decider, DHR, Employee, VSEA Settlement is a possibility at all points in this process Process is halted by good faith settlement negotiations Absent settlement, discipline is imposed, triggering employee's grievance rights
Ċ	 Post-Discipline Follow Up Documentation of discipline or copy of stipulation is placed in employee's official Personnel File to establish record of misconduct In certain cases (e.g. sexual harassment, discrimination, bullying) a 'close-out' letter is sent to the complainant advising that matter has been dealt with appropriately Current confidentiality policy mandates that follow-up letter be general and not specific
	 CHANGES TO PROCESS SINCE 2017: September 2017 Cross-functional review process added. Emphasis changed to favor investigations by IU or DHR Field Manager, providing more consistency and objectivity. Mandatory legal review of investigation reports added Meeting between DHR & Agency/Department Leadership added as a required step in the process December 2017 AHS III is transformed to DHP.
	 AHS IU is transferred to DHR. July 2019 AHS and DHR investigations databases are updated and combined