

GREG STRACK, ET AL.,	*	BEFORE WILLIS GUNTHER BAKER,
LIBRARY SERVICES SPECIALIST,	*	AN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
GRIEVANTS	*	OF THE MARYLAND OFFICE OF
v.	*	ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF	*	
MARYLAND, UNIVERSITY OF	*	OAH No.: USM-UMBC-03-21-28007
MARYLAND BALTIMORE COUNTY	*	

* * * * *

DECISION

STATEMENT OF THE CASE
ISSUE
SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE
FINDINGS OF FACT
DISCUSSION
CONCLUSION OF LAW
ORDER

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On September 30, 2021, Greg Strack,¹ Library Services Specialist for the University of Maryland Baltimore County (University or UMBC) at the Albin O. Kuhn (AOK) Library (Library), filed a grievance, claiming that his supervisor subjected him and other staff to religious discrimination and demeaning and disregarding behavior (Grievance). The Grievance was amended to add additional grievants Joe Lee, Library Services Technician; Susan Morris, Library Services Technician; and Dakota Boodhoo, Library Services Specialist (collectively Grievants), who also worked under the same supervisor. Md. Code Ann., Educ. § 13-206(c) (Supp. 2021).² The Grievants pursued their grievance through steps one and two of the

¹ Strack was no longer a Grievant at the time of the hearing, as he chose to leave employment at UMBC.
² Unless otherwise noted, all references hereinafter to the Education Article are to the 2021 Supplement to the 2018 Replacement Volume of the Maryland Annotated Code and will be abbreviated as "Educ."

MAR 27 PM 3:19

University's Grievance Procedure; however, the parties did not reach a mutually satisfactory settlement. Educ. §§ 13-201 through 13-207 (2018 & Supp. 2021). On December 9, 2021, the Grievants requested a step-three appeal before the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH). Educ. § 13-203(d)(2018). On February 11, 2022, UMBC filed a Motion to Dismiss (Motion) and on February 24, 2022, the Grievants filed a Response to the Motion. I advised the parties that the Motion would be argued on the scheduled hearing date.

The Motion had indicated that some of the Grievants had withdrawn so I clarified that issue at the start of the hearing.³ Only Susan Morris (Grievant) remained as a Grievant on March 1, 2022.

On March 1, 2022, I held a hearing at the OAH in Hunt Valley, Maryland. *Id.* Maydha Kapur, Union Organizer, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Council 3 represented the Grievant, who was present. Michale Tallon, Esquire, Director, Labor Relations, UMBC, represented the University.

The contested case provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, the grievance procedures in sections 13-201 through 13-207 of the Education Article, and the Rules of Procedure of the OAH govern procedure in this case. Md. Code Ann., State Gov't §§ 10-201 through 10-226 (2021); Educ. §§ 13-201 through 10-207; COMAR 28.02.01.

ISSUE

1. Did the University allow a supervisor to perpetrate religious discrimination or a pattern of demeaning behavior against the Grievant entitling her to relief, and if so;
2. Is the Grievant entitled to be assigned to a new supervisor?

³ Greg Strack left employment with UMBC and Joe Lee and Dakota Boodhoo withdrew from the Grievance.

SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE

Exhibits

I admitted the following exhibits offered by the Grievant:

- Gr. Ex. 1 - Email from Timothy Hackman to the AOK Public Services Group, January 26, 2022
- Gr. Ex. 2 - Email from Paula Langley to the Library staff, September 28, 2021
- Gr. Ex. 3 - Not offered
- Gr. Ex. 4 - Screen shots of Viv Barter social media posts, October 12, 2016

I admitted the following exhibits offered by the University:

- Univ. Ex. 1 - Ariana Arnold's Advice and Guidance from the Office of Equity and Inclusion, November 8, 2021
- Univ. Ex. 2 - Email from Elmer Falconer to Maydha Kapur, October 13, 2021
- Univ. Ex. 3 - Excerpt of Memorandum of Understanding between AFSCME and UMBC, Article 18, December 9, 2016 through June 30, 2019

The Grievant testified and presented the following witnesses:

- Greg Strack, former Library Services Specialist
- Joe Lee, Library Services Technician
- Perry Alexander, former Night and Weekend Library Supervisor

The University presented the following witnesses:

- Timothy Hackman, Associate Director of Public Services
- Ever Hanna, Office of Equity Inclusion

FINDINGS OF FACT

I find the following facts by a preponderance of the evidence:

1. At all times relevant to this proceeding, the Grievant was employed as Library Services Technician at the Library at UMBC and has been employed there for approximately two years as of March 2022.

2. There are three intermediate managers who supervise the Library services staff who report directly to Paula Langley, Manager of Circulation at the Library (Langley). Langley historically would skip over the intermediate managers and direct the subordinate staff herself.

3. The Grievant's immediate manager was Perry Alexander until he retired in May 2021. In June 2021, the Grievant began directly reporting to Langley.

4. Shortly after Langley became the Grievant's supervisor, Langley brought the Grievant to the Library Gallery that was having an exhibit entitled "Séance." Langley began questioning the Grievant about spirituality and the Grievant conveyed a personal spiritual story. Langley told her, "I don't believe in spiritualism." Langley continued to probe the Grievant to try to ascertain her religious beliefs. The Grievant felt very uncomfortable.

5. The Library had weekly to biweekly staff meetings. Langley introduced a new idea where during a staff member's birthday month, they could present at the staff meeting for twenty to thirty minutes on a topic of their choosing.

6. September is Langley's birthday month. At the mandatory Library staff meeting on September 22, 2021, she passed out bibles and began the meeting with a Christian prayer asking that the information she was providing "would fall on receptive ears." She told the staff to bow their heads as she led them in prayer. Langley asked for volunteers to read chosen bible passages. When no one volunteered, she placed a bible in Dakota Boodhoo's hands, opened it to a particular passage and told him to read, so he did.

7. Langley asked the staff if they had been educated in the church and what they had experienced with the Christian faith. No one responded. She called on Greg Strack to recount his experience with the church. Strack responded that it was not a work-related question and he did not feel comfortable speaking about it.

8. Langley presented a slide show about her church, its structure, and its beliefs. Langley spoke about death, resurrection, and redemption and asked if they knew of “Christ’s redemption for your sins?” Langley told the staff that “people who did not adhere to these beliefs would go to hell with the devil, just like the Lord had smited heathen nations” and that “eradication of certain groups was God’s way of disciplining his children.” Some staff members took this as a threat.

9. The staff were angry and uncomfortable by what they felt was offensive behavior of their supervisor in sermonizing in a work setting.

10. No one believed they could leave the meeting because they were aware that previously a former Library staff member left a staff meeting due to the topic causing her distress and was threatened with discipline by Langley and that Langley belittled a staff member and threw candy at him when he tried to leave a meeting.

11. Langley had a history of belittling, berating, and embarrassing Library staff in a public manner.

DISCUSSION

Motion to Dismiss

On February 11, 2022, UMBC filed a Motion to Dismiss (Motion). On February 24, 2022, the Grievant filed a Response (Response). The parties argued the Motion at the start of the hearing on March 1, 2022.⁴ The University claimed that the relief sought by the Grievance, to be assigned to a new supervisor, had already been done, resulting in no justiciable controversy. The Grievant responded and provided an affidavit and documents to support that the change in supervision was a temporary measure. I reserved ruling on the Motion and proceeded with the hearing on the merits. For the reasons that follow, the Motion is denied.

⁴ At the Hearing, the University handed me a new copy of their Motion that was identical to the original Motion, but contained two exhibits that were never identified, authenticated, or discussed. These exhibits were not considered.

The OAH Rules of Procedure provide the framework for ruling on motions. Upon the filing of a motion to dismiss, I may issue a decision dismissing an initial pleading if it fails to state a claim for which relief may be granted. COMAR 28.02.01.12C. A motion to dismiss constitutes an attack on the initial pleading itself.

The Appellant is entitled to all favorable inferences that can reasonably be drawn from the appeal. *Gen. Mtrs. Corp. v. Lahocki*, 286 Md. 714, 733 (1980). Looking only at the Appellant's appeal as the initial pleading in this matter, it clearly states an actionable grievance. The Motion, however, states many facts outside the initial pleading, making it not appropriate for consideration as a motion to dismiss.⁵

However, if, on a motion to dismiss, a party presents matters outside the initial pleading for the administrative law judge's (ALJ) consideration, the motion must be treated as one for summary decision. COMAR 28.02.01.12D. In its Motion, the local department recites facts and conclusions for consideration to support its Motion, therefore, it also will be considered as a motion for summary decision.

The OAH Rules of Procedure at COMAR 28.02.01.12D(1) provide that a party may move for summary decision on the grounds that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The Motion must be supported by affidavit, testimony under oath, self-authenticating documents, or a document authenticated by affidavit. COMAR 28.02.01.12D(2). An ALJ may grant summary decision if the judge finds that "there is no genuine issue of material fact and [the moving] party is entitled to prevail as a matter of law." COMAR 28.02.01.12D(5).

⁵ I would also note that Counsel for UMBC was both the author of the Second Step Grievance Appeal Decision and the Motion and relied on her findings in the Second Step Decision to support the Motion. The Second Step Grievance Decision was written by Management and is not binding on the OAH.

The local department's Motion fails to comport with the requirements of COMAR 28.02.01.12D(2) as it does not provide an affidavit or testimony under oath to support its argument, the documents are not self-authenticating, nor is there an affidavit authenticating the documents. The Grievant's Response did contain an affidavit and documents identified in the affidavit to demonstrate that the reassignment of a supervisor was temporary. COMAR 28.02.01.12D(3). For these reasons I do not find that the University is entitled to judgment and the Motion must be denied.

The Merits

Applicable Law and Burden of Proof

Under the Education Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, section 13-201(c):

(1) "Grievance" means any cause of complaint arising between a regular full-time or part-time employee and the University on a matter concerning discipline, alleged discrimination, promotion, assignment, or interpretation or application of University rules or departmental procedures over which the University management has control.

(2) "Grievance" does not include:

(i) Complaints on the general level of wages, wage patterns, fringe benefits, or other broad areas of financial management and staffing; or

(ii) Any cause of complaint by any employee who is not represented by an exclusive representative under Title 3 of the State Personnel and Pensions Article.

Educ. § 13-201(c).⁶

⁶ UMBC offered Exhibit 3 which is the MOU between AFSCME and UMBC in effect from December 9, 2016 through June 30, 2019 which contains excerpts from the Education Article Title 13 Subtitle 2. Education Article Title 13 Subtitle 2 was revised by Acts 2019, chapters 697 and 698, effective October 1, 2019. Therefore, the language quoted in the MOU has been altered by law and only the revised language in the Education Article is relevant to this Grievance.

Education Article Section 13-203 sets forth the steps to the grievance process and the considerations:

(a) If, following informal discussion with the supervisor, a dispute remains unresolved, the grievance procedure is available. There are three steps in the grievance procedure.

(b) (1) Step One. Step one is the initiation of a complaint. Grievances shall be initiated within 30 calendar days of the action involved, or within 30 calendar days of the employee having reasonable knowledge of the act, unless these time limits are further delimited as stated in § 13-205 of this subtitle. . . .

(2) Both employee and department head or chairman or designee shall continue to review the matter, either privately or with the help of others in the employee's immediate work unit who are directly involved in the grievance. . . .

(c) Step Two. The appeal shall be submitted to the president of the constituent institution or the president's designated representative within 5 days after the receipt of the written decision at step one. The president or the president's designated representative shall hold a conference with the aggrieved or the employee's designated representative within 10 days of receipt of the written grievance appeal and render a written decision within 15 days after the conclusion of the conference.

(d) Step Three. In the case of any still unresolved grievance between an employee and the constituent institution, the aggrieved employee, after exhausting all available procedures provided by the constituent institution, may submit the grievance to either arbitration or to the Chancellor who may delegate this responsibility to the Office of Administrative Hearings in accordance with Title 10, Subtitle 2 of the State Government Article. . . . The Chancellor or administrative law judge, as appropriate, shall make the final decision that is binding on all parties.

(e) The Chancellor or administrative law judge, as appropriate, shall have the power to award back pay in any grievance and the president of the constituent institution shall enforce such order. In any reclassification case in which the Chancellor or administrative law judge, as appropriate, or his designated representative, determines that an employee has been misclassified, the Chancellor or administrative law judge, as appropriate, may, in his discretion, award back pay to the employee for a period not to exceed one year prior to the initial filing of the grievance.

....

Educ. § 13-203.

When not otherwise provided by statute or regulation, the standard of proof in a contested case hearing before the OAH is a preponderance of the evidence, and the burden of proof rests on the party making an assertion or a claim. State Gov't § 10-217; COMAR 28.02.01.21K. *See Comm'r of Labor & Indus. v. Bethlehem Steel Corp.*, 344 Md. 17, 34 (1996) (quoting *Bernstein v. Real Estate Comm'n*, 221 Md. 221, 231 (1959) (the burden of proof lies with the party asserting the affirmative of an issue)); *Garrett v. State*, 124 Md. App. 23, 28 (1998) (“The general practice is to allocate the burden of proof to the party asserting the affirmative of an issue or seeking to change the status quo.”).

In this case, the Grievant asserts that the University allowed the Grievant's supervisor, Paula Langley, to perpetrate religious discrimination and a pattern of demeaning behavior against the Grievant entitling her to be supervised by someone other than Langley. Therefore, the Grievant bears the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence. State Gov't § 10-217. To prove an assertion or a claim by a preponderance of the evidence means to show that it is “more likely so than not so” when all the evidence is considered. *Coleman v. Anne Arundel Cty. Police Dep't*, 369 Md. 108, 125 n.16 (2002).

Neither party raised any issues concerning timeliness or failure to follow the proper grievance procedures, and the evidence supports that proper procedures were followed. Therefore, I find that any challenge to procedural issues has been waived, as the University's grievance procedure requires that timeliness be raised and resolved promptly. Educ. §13-206(k), (t).⁷

Parties' Positions

The Grievant contends that the Library supervisor, Langley, has created a hostile work environment by disrespecting staff, acting unprofessionally, and imposing her religious beliefs

⁷ University Exhibit 2 is an email exchange between the parties that waived timelines.

on others and asking staff about their own religious beliefs. The Grievant is uncomfortable at work and feels the unprofessional behavior by Langley has created a toxic environment. She seeks to have a different supervisor manage her.

The University contends that the issue has been dealt with in that Langley does not directly supervise the Grievant and that they are in the process of reorganizing the supervisory structure of the Library. The University argued that the Grievant will report directly to the night manager once that open position is filled and in the meantime is supervised by Langley's superior, Timothy Hackman (Hackman). In addition, UMBC contends the matter was investigated by UMBC's Office of Equity and Inclusion who determined that the alleged religious discrimination was not pervasive enough to constitute a hostile work environment and did not impact the Grievant's employment so did not constitute employment discrimination and therefore did not violate University Policy.

For the reasons that follow, I find for the University.

Analysis

The Grievant and her witnesses painted a picture of a very difficult working environment due to the personality and behaviors of Langley. Each witness relayed demeaning and unprofessional actions by Langley that were meant to intimidate and belittle her colleagues. Her behavior in pursuing religious evangelization in the course of a staff meeting was disturbing.

The Grievant has been working at the Library since early 2020. She had no personal knowledge of incidents that occurred with Langley before her arrival but had discussed them with others who worked at the Library. When she first arrived the Grievant was supervised by Perry Alexander (Alexander), but when he retired in May 2021, Langley became the Grievant's supervisor. The Grievant testified that even though Management has indicated it is restructuring supervision in the Library, because her manager's position is vacant, Langley still supervises her,

even though she is assigned to Hackman. She also testified that Langley did not care that there were intermediate managers who were supposed to be the go-between, Langley took it upon herself to supervise everyone.

The Grievant testified that Langley is brusque and demeaning, and bullies staff in public. The Grievant recounted a situation where Langley was trying to ascertain her religious beliefs by taking her to a Library exhibit entitled "Séance." When probed by Langley about her beliefs, the Grievant shared a personal story about spirituality. Langley then told her she did not believe in spiritualism.

The Grievant testified about the September 2021 staff meeting regarding Langley's religious presentation, how staff were forced to bow their heads and listen to prayer and were asked to read from the bible. The Grievant stated it made her "very, very angry" and that it was "offensive." The Grievant now does what she can to avoid interacting with Langley.

Joe Lee, who had been a named Grievant, stated that she dropped out of the Grievance due to the overwhelming stress of the situation and her inability to expend any more energy on pursuing relief. Lee testified that she was no longer supervised by Langley, as she reports to the intermediate manager, Chrisie Cowden, but that Langley often by-passes Cowden and manages her directly anyway. Lee was present at the September 2021 staff meeting and testified consistently with the other witnesses who were present. She spoke of Dakota Boodhoo being "forced" to recite from the bible and being aware that they would be "punished" if they tried to leave the meeting. Lee testified that Langley was her supervisor for two years and that she was "disappointed and disheartened" by the experience and felt disrespected by Langley.

Greg Strack worked at the Library for five years as staff and two years while a student at UMBC. He testified that Langley pressed him and others for personal information about other staff regarding their religion, health issues, or pending human resource issues and would use the

information to demean people publicly. He testified that Langley particularly tried to get him to reveal any information he had about the Grievant's health. Strack stated that Langley had invited him and others to attend her church with her, but he had declined.

Strack indicated that the supervisory structure with intermediate managers did not work because everyone was intimidated by Langley and she did not allow the intermediate managers to have responsibility. He also noted that the restructuring outlined by Hackman in Grievant Exhibit 1 was temporary in nature and that Langley continued to supervise the staff during that time. He testified that Cowden, an intermediate manager, was in the staff meeting, but she did not speak up against the religious presentation to defend her subordinates because she was afraid of Langley.

Following the Complaint made to Hackman after the staff meeting, Langley sent the staff an email apologizing for causing "distress," acknowledging she made people uncomfortable, and advising people to interrupt her if she is ever inappropriate (Grv. Ex. 2). Strack testified that based on his experience with Langley, if a subordinate spoke up to challenge Langley, it would result in discipline or a difficult situation at work and, based on years of interaction with her, he did not find her apology to be sincere.

Perry Alexander was the night and weekend supervisor at the Library at the time of his retirement in May 2021, and had been employed there for forty-six years. Alexander stated that Langley was a bully who would yell at him in front of students and staff and try to belittle him by telling him he was not a good supervisor even though he had been there for forty years. Langley would assign him tasks on top of his regular duties and when they were not immediately done she would berate him. Alexander stated that Langley would nitpick his subordinates. Langley was constantly trying to get Alexander to retire, but he told her he would leave on his

own accord. Alexander testified that Langley created a stress-filled environment that made it hard to come to work.⁸

Management presented Timothy Hackman, the Associate Director of Public Services since March 2019. Hackman testified that Cowden contacted him following the September 2021 staff meeting to advise that Langley made staff uncomfortable speaking about religion at the meeting. Hackman stated that previous staff presentations had included other topics of interest to the presenters including sumo wrestling, mental health resources, and “free sourcing” on Facebook. Hackman spoke to Langley on September 24, 2021 and determined that her presentation “seemed problematic.” Hackman contacted the Human Resources (HR) Department and the Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI) at UMBC. He provided OEI with the email addresses of the staff who were present at the September staff meeting and gave them a summary of his conversation with Langley. OEI issued their “Advice/Guidance” Report on November 8, 2021 (Univ. Ex. 1) wherein they concluded that the Langley’s actions did not amount to actionable religious discrimination, religious harassment, or hostile work environment under federal law.

In anticipation of the Second Step of the Grievance and in consultation with HR, the University altered the reporting structure for the four original Grievants. Boodhoo transferred out of the Department and was no longer under Langley. Lee remained under the supervision of Cowden. Strack and the Grievant were to be supervised by the new night supervisor once that position was filled, but Strack resigned in January 2022. Hackman determined that he would directly supervise the Grievant until the evening supervisor position is filled. Hackman testified

⁸ Strack and Alexander testified about two former colleagues, A and B (randomly chosen initials to protect confidentiality), who were particular targets of Langley around the 2015-17 timeframe. B tragically committed suicide in 2016, blaming the cruelty of Langley as a reason. They testified that Langley did not believe that the B’s life choices were acceptable pursuant to her religious beliefs, and she used slurs and told B her gender was not valid. While this behavior is horrifying, as the Grievant did not know A or B and was not employed at the Library until several years later, I do not find that this evidence supports the Grievant’s claim.

that the restructuring is intended to raise the status of the intermediate managers and free Langley from supervision. He stated that Langley will not “supervise” but will continue to “direct” the Grievant and others to do tasks as the Circulation Manager.

Ever Hanna, OEI, participated in the investigation of the complaint regarding the September 2021 staff meeting to determine the sufficiency of the evidence as it related to a violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. The parties who were present at the staff meeting were interviewed and OEI compared the allegations against Title VII standards for religious discrimination, harassment, and hostile work environment. Hanna testified that OEI ruled out religious discrimination because the supervisor’s conduct did not impact the terms and conditions of the staff members’ employment in that they were not “required” to participate in order to receive some job benefit and were not subject to discipline if they did not. Similarly, Hanna testified that the September 2021 staff meeting and one time in June 2020 were the only times that Langley asked staff to engage in prayer or religious activities, which were insufficient to establish religious harassment as a hostile work environment because the supervisor’s actions were not severe and pervasive. Hanna testified that there were other investigations that OEI had done in the past related to Langley, but that they did not consider these in the aggregate as they were separate investigations.

In order for the Grievance to be successful, the Grievant is not required to demonstrate a violation of Title VII as this is not a federal claim. She merely needs to demonstrate “any cause of complaint arising between [the Grievant] and the University on a matter concerning...alleged discrimination...assignment, or interpretation or application of University rules or departmental procedures” under management’s control. Educ. § 13-201(c)(1). While I believe that there may be University policies and procedures at issue based on the allegations, none were provided by

the parties, so there is no basis for me to assess them.⁹ I also do not find the OEI report to be dispositive on the issue of whether discrimination occurred.

The Grievant cites *School Dist. of Abington Tp., Pa. v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963) for the premise that requiring students to participate in the daily reading of a bible verse at public school as an established daily exercise was found to violate the Establishment Clause of the Constitution. However, there has been no allegation that UMBC required prayer as a condition of employment at a public university. The allegation is that an individual employed in a supervisory position pushed her personal religious beliefs on her subordinates during a staff meeting and a few other times in a less pervasive way. There is no question that what Langley did was improper and demonstrated extremely poor judgement. It appears that the University acknowledged that Langley was inappropriate, but I have no information as to what, if any, action the University took to counsel or discipline her. The University has, however, made a concerted effort to restructure the reporting hierarchy in the Library to give the intermediate managers more authority to supervise the Library Services staff and put some distance between the staff and Langley, although she remains the manager of all of them.

The Grievant has not suggested that she is grieving her current assignment, nor has she requested assignment to a different position with the University. The Grievant seeks as her remedy that Langley not supervise her. However, based on Langley's position, there is no way to completely guarantee that without removing Langley. I do not have the authority to provide such a remedy in a grievance procedure. The Education Article specifically excludes complaints on broad areas such as "staffing" from the definition of grievance. Educ. § 13-201(c)(2)(i). And

⁹ For example, UMBC's Policy on Discrimination and Equal Opportunity is mentioned in the OEI Report (Univ. Ex. 2) but it was not provided. The Policy may or may not have provided additional safeguards and remedies beyond that required by Title VII.

the only remedies suggested by the statute are the “power to award back pay” or determine “that an employee has been misclassified.” Educ. § 13-203(e).

Where discrimination is alleged, the University has the duty to investigate, which it did in this case. Based on the Advice and Guidance from OEI, the University has an ongoing duty to monitor the behavior of Langley to ensure that she does not continue to impose her religious beliefs on staff thereby creating a pervasive atmosphere leading to a hostile work environment. And while I find Langley’s actions to be wholly inappropriate, I do not find that the Grievant has demonstrated that the University has knowingly allowed discrimination or has misapplied University rules or procedures in this matter. Certainly the University is now on notice of Langley’s actions, and the Library staff should make sure to report any further religious or bullying behavior. The University investigated the discrimination complaint and took actions to protect the Grievant from further potential harassment. I do not find that the actions of Langley rise to the level of an actionable religious discrimination and the allegations of “demeaning and disregarding staff” are not sufficient as to the remaining Grievant. Further, the requested remedy is not within the contemplation of the grievance statute and must be denied.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

I conclude as a matter of law that the Grievant has not met her burden to demonstrate that the University allowed a supervisor to perpetrate religious discrimination or an actionable pattern of demeaning behavior against the Grievant and therefore, there is no basis to award the Grievant relief. Educ. § 13-201; Educ. § 13-203.

ORDER

I **ORDER** that Susan Morris' grievance be **DENIED**.

Willis Gunther Baker

March 22, 2022
Date Decision Mailed

Willis Gunther Baker
Administrative Law Judge

WGB/cj
#197200

REVIEW RIGHTS

A party aggrieved by this final decision may file a written petition for judicial review with the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, if any party resides in Baltimore City or has a principal place of business there, or with the circuit court for the county where any party resides or has a principal place of business. The petition must be filed within thirty (30) days of the date of this decision. Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 10-222(c) (2021); Md. Rules 7-201 through 7-210. A separate petition may be filed with the court to waive filing fees and costs on the ground of indigence. Md. Rule 1-325. The Office of Administrative Hearings is not a party to any review process.

Copies Mailed To:

Susan D. Morris
c/o Joseph Cox
American Federation of State, County and
Municipal Employees
190 West Ostend Street, Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21230

Maydha Kapur, Union Organizer
American Federation of State, County and
Municipal Employees
190 West Ostend Street, Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21230

Michale Tallon, Esquire
University of Maryland Baltimore County
Director of Labor and Employee Relations
1000 Hilltop Circle
Baltimore, MD 2125

Valerie A. Thomas, Agency Representative
University of Maryland Baltimore County
1000 Hilltop Circle AD 92
Baltimore, MD 21250

Heinrich J. Losemann, Jr., Director
Department of Budget and Management
Employee Relations Division
301 West Preston Street, Room 607
Baltimore, MD 21201

