

What's Inside?

EA Staff and Board Members	2
Legal	
Telecommuting Employees	3
Training & Safety	
Building Employee Performance	4
Heat Related Illnesses	
Wellness Tips & Wellness	
Simple Healing Foods	6
Summer Safety	
Leadership	
Lessons in Commitment in the Restroom	7
Hotline Hits	
Car Allowances	8
EA Partners	
Workers' Compensation Programs	9
EA Reminders	
Wage & Salary Survey Deadline	
"Like" Us On Facebook	
Upcoming July Trainings	12

Telecommuting Employees: Changing Times, Changing Liabilities

In recent years, the American workplace has undergone a dramatic transformation. How, when, and where employees perform work continues to evolve with technological advances and demographic changes. Even traditional brick and mortar industries employ advanced robotics and electronics. Employees work "flex schedules" (a favorite of the Millennial generation) and many employees work more than 40 hours a week (thank you, Blackberry and Apple). Finally, an increasing number of employees work from home or other remote locations (Starbucks). Recent surveys show that over 60% of employers permit some type of remote work.

These changes have been driven by both technological advancements and employer responses to employee demands. In many respects, the law and courts have been slow to keep up with the changing workplace. However, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals explicitly acknowledged those changes to the workplace as a deciding factor when it recently held that telecommuting may be required as a reasonable accommodation under the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA). In so holding, the majority rejected the employer's assertion that "face-to-face" interactions in problem-solving meetings were an essential function of the job.

(Telecommuting Employees continued on page 3)



Administration

Jack Hollister

President; ext. 204

jhollister@employersassociation.com

Karen Wagenknecht

Administrative Assistant; ext. 200

karenw@employersassociation.com

HR Research

Bob Bethel

Director, HR Services; ext. 216

bbethel@employersassociation.com

Cheryl Riggs

HR Member Services Manager; ext. 202

criggs@employersassociation.com

Megan Balduf

HR Research Assistant; ext. 210

mbalduf@employersassociation.com

Seminar Learning

Terry Vernier

Seminar & Learning Manager; ext. 213

tvernier@employersassociation.com

Judi Roe

Membership / Learning Assistant; ext. 203

jroe@employersassociation.com

Board of Directors

Chairperson

Thomas Kolena, CPA/ABV, CPA/CFF – 2016

Managing Partner / Mira + Kolena, Ltd.

Scott Armey – 2017

HR Manager / Pro-Pak Industries

Michael Bieringer – 2017

Global VP, Human Resources,
Communications & Safety / Amcor Rigid
Plastics NA

Sheri Caldwell – 2017

HR Director / Grain Division/The
Andersons, Inc.

Robert F. Deardurff - 2015

President / Phoenix Technologies

Print Media

Sarah Beddoes

Marketing Assistant; ext. 207

sbeddoes@employersassociation.com

Member Services

Eliana Klein

Membership Manager; ext. 209

eklein@employersassociation.com

Judi Roe

Membership / Learning Assistant; ext. 203

jroe@employersassociation.com

Nancy Hollister

Member Services Assistant; ext. 205

nhollister@employersassociation.com

Accounting

Vicki Bender

Accountant; ext. 201

vbender@employersassociation.com

EA Health Plus

Jennifer Kiernan

Director, EA Health Plus; ext. 212

jkiernan@employersassociation.com

Megan Garris

Wellness Coordinator; ext. 211

mgarris@employersassociation.com

Cory Panning

Wellness Coordinator; ext. 214

cpanning@employersassociation.com

Kayla Vollmar

Wellness Assistant; ext. 215

kvollmar@employersassociation.com

On-Site Learning and Consulting

Dave Tippett, PHR

Director, On-site Learning & Consulting;
ext. 206

dtippett@employersassociation.com

Bob Bethel

Director, HR Services; ext. 216

bbethel@employersassociation.com

Judy Seibenick — 2016

Executive Director / Hospice of Northwest
Ohio

Joyce Slusher – 2016

MBA, PMP/ Information Technology
Leader/Project Management Professional

David M. Smigelski — 2015

Attorney / Spengler Nathanson, P.L.L.

Michael Walters — 2015

CEO/President / Centaur Associates, Inc.

Karen Ward — 2015

Vice President, HR and Employee
Relations / AAA Northwest Ohio

Sarah Zibbel— 2017

Director, Corporate Human Resources /
Owens-Illinois



(Telecommuting Employees continued from page 1)

In *EEOC v. Ford Motor Co.*, 2014 Fed App. 0082P (6th Cir.), the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed a Michigan Federal District Court decision in favor of Ford Motor Company and held that a question of fact existed as to whether an employee with a disability could perform all of the essential functions of her position from home, as she requested. Jane Harris was employed by Ford as a resale steel buyer. Her position involved serving as an intermediary between steel suppliers to Ford and parts producers. Throughout her employment, Harris suffered from Irritable Bowel Syndrome (IBS). One of her symptoms was loss of bowel control. She was permitted to take FMLA leave when her symptoms required, but over time, her condition worsened.

Ford maintained a telecommuting policy that permitted some employees to telecommute up to 4 days per week. Harris requested permission under the policy to telecommute 4 days per week and she had telecommuted in the past. Other resale buyers had been granted permission to telecommute 1 day per week. Ford determined that Harris' position was not appropriate for 4-day telecommuting as it required face-to-face meetings and "email and telecommuting was an insufficient substitute for in-person team problem-solving." Ford suggested that Harris' cubicle be moved closer to the restroom or that she transfer to an open position that would permit her to telecommute. Harris refused and filed a disability discrimination claim with the EEOC. Ford alleged that Harris' performance deteriorated and she was discharged. She then filed a second charge alleging retaliation.

The District Court granted Ford summary judgment relying upon several legal theories. First, courts are reluctant to question an employer's business decisions and act as a "super personnel department." Second, many courts have held that "regular attendance" is an essential function of most jobs. The Sixth Circuit majority noted technological advancements "that most people could not have conceived of in the 1990s are now commonplace" and held that, while a court may not sit as a "super personnel department," it also may not "allow employers to redefine the essential functions of an employee's position to serve their own interests." Ultimately, the majority held that Harris could establish she was qualified to perform the position without being "physically present." The majority also rejected Ford's argument that providing Harris with the requested telecommuting accommodation was an undue burden. Finally, the majority ruled that a factual issue existed regarding whether Ford's termination of Harris was retaliatory.

Lessons for Employers

1. **Regular attendance at the workplace is not always an "essential job function," especially in the Sixth Circuit.** There is no bright line rule that excessive absenteeism from the workplace renders an employee "unqualified" as a matter of law under the ADA. Instead, employers need to ask the question: "Considering the nature of the position, is the individual's presence at work essential?" This may involve an analysis of written job descriptions, employer business justifications for the employee's physical presence at the workplace and the past experiences of other employees in the same or similar positions.
2. **Extensive engagement in the interactive process is mandatory.** Although Ford engaged in the interactive process, the majority held that its efforts fell short. Employers need to continue to engage in the interactive process to either reach an accommodation or at least exhaust potential alternatives. A single conversation merely considering and rejecting a requested accommodation will be insufficient in most cases.
3. **"Disabled" is defined broadly.** The majority spent virtually no time analyzing whether IBS was a disability under the ADA. Congress and the courts have instructed employers to find ways to accommodate disabled employees instead of challenging the existence of a disability.
4. **Don't retaliate!** Retaliation is now the most common charge filed with the EEOC. Retaliation charges are also the most difficult for employers to defend. Employers must stress to their employees (especially front line supervisors) that retaliation against those who complain against discrimination will not be tolerated.
5. **Re-visit telecommuting arrangements.** Employers and employees have recognized the many benefits of telecommuting arrangements. Conversely, employers also need to recognize the many risks associated with employees working remotely. Telecommuting agreements can allocate risks and clarify expectations for telecommuters and should be used by employers for telecommuting employees.

(Sarah Pawlicki and Jim Yates, Eastman & Smith, 6/2014)

1787 Indian Wood Circle, Suite A Maumee, OH 43537 | 419-893-3000