## NAHCR

**National Association for Health Care Recruitment** 

# **Employment Law Updates: What's Hot for 2016**

July 14, 2016

Presented by: Jason Kearnaghan

#### Overview

- EEOC Activity
- Minimum Salary Test
- Employee v. Independent Contractor
- Email Spoofing
- NLRB Activity

#### **EEO-1 REPORTING**

#### **EEO-1 Reports**

- Covered employers must file an annual EEO-1 report, containing employment data categorized by job category, gender, and race/ethnicity
- The EEOC has proposed a rule to change the EEO-1 reports to include wage data (to identify potential discrimination) for 12 different "pay bands," beginning with the September 2017 report
- The EEOC has a "Questions and Answers" page online
- A proposed version of the new form is available on its website at www.eeoc.gov

#### **EEO-1 Reports**

- Takeaways:
  - If implemented, employers should audit pay structures and analyze any pay differences that may be flagged in their EEO-1 report

#### **EEOC INVESTIGATIONS**

- Recent changes to EEOC investigation procedures
- Old system: position statement procedures were set by each EEOC District Office
- New system: nationwide procedure for all position statements requested on or after January 1, 2016

- Key Changes:
  - At the time a Charge is filed, the Charging Party is advised that they may request a copy of the employer's position statement
  - Charging Party may submit a verbal or written response to the position statement within 20 days of receipt
  - Employer is *not* given a copy of the response
  - The EEOC may request additional evidence from the employer based on the Charging Party's response

- Strategic Considerations:
  - Employers should carefully consider any statements that are made in a position statement
  - Refrain from sharing non-essential information
  - Position statement may preview an employer's strategy for subsequent civil litigation
  - Plaintiffs may use this information to tailor civil complaints and circumvent or defeat anticipated defenses

- Confidential Information:
  - Employers may provide confidential information to the EEOC in a *separate attachment*, but must justify the need to segregate information
  - The EEOC will not produce and/or will redact confidential information before providing information to the Charging Party
  - Employers may wish to provide a "redacted version" of evidence as an added precaution

#### Takeaways:

- The EEOC is expected to be more active in its investigations and enforcement
- Litigating against the EEOC may be significantly different from defending claims brought by an individual
- Retain experienced labor counsel to assist in preparing position statements
- Provide a concise and well-supported position statement, while keeping extraneous/confidential information to a minimum

#### WELLNESS PROGRAMS

- Title II of the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008 ("GINA"), which prohibits genetic information discrimination in employment, took effect on November 21, 2009
- Under Title II of GINA, it is illegal to discriminate against employees or applicants because of genetic information

- In October 2015, the EEOC announced that it was issuing a proposed rule to amend the regulations
- The goal was to seek a balance between the Affordable Care Act's encouragement of workplace wellness programs and GINA

■ The proposed regulations would permit employees to provide certain health information about a spouse's current or past health status in exchange for various financial and other incentives as part of employer wellness programs

- More than 90 individuals and organizations, including senators, advocates for persons with disabilities and groups representing employers and health benefit plan administrators, submitted comments on the GINA proposal during a public comment period that ended January 28, 2016
- The EEOC issued final rules regarding wellness plan incentives under GINA and the Americans with Disabilities Act on May 16, 2016, which will take effect in 2017

- Takeaways:
  - Employers should review their wellness programs and ensure compliance with the new rules

#### MINIMUM SALARY TEST

## Minimum Salary Test

- The FLSA guarantees minimum wages and overtime pay for non-exempt employees
- To qualify for certain exemptions, employees must meet minimum duties tests and be paid on a salaried basis no less than a specified minimum amount
- Since 2004, the standard salary level for federal exemption has been \$455 a week, which is \$23,660 per year

## **Minimum Salary Test**

- The increase for federal minimum salary test:
  - From \$455 to \$913 per week/\$47,476 per yer
  - From \$100,000 to \$134,004 per year for "highly compensated employees"
  - December 1, 2016 implementation date

## **Minimum Salary Test**

- Takeaways:
  - The proposed change would greatly affect employers with low-paid exempt employees
  - Employers should review the new rule, and raise the minimum salary if required

# EMPLOYEE MISCLASSIFICATION

- Still a widespread phenomenon
  - Not considered employees when hired to perform a service
  - Often seen in a consultant capacity
- Financial advantages to company
  - Reported on IRS Form 1099
  - No tax withholding, Medicare/Social Security contributions or unemployment/workers' compensation premiums
  - Employee benefits not extended to independent contractors

 The financial advantages gained can be eliminated due to employee misclassification and the litigation costs, fines and penalties

- DOL (Wage and Hour Division) is working with the IRS
- Entered into partnerships with 30 states
  - Sharing information
  - Coordinated enforcement
  - Fiscal Year 2015: 102,000 workers received \$74 million in back wages

- IRS Test: Looks at a number of factors that fall into the three following categories:
  - Behavioral
  - Financial
  - Type of Relationship

- DOL Economic Reality Test:
  - The extent to which the services rendered are an integral part of the principal business
  - The permanency of the relationship
  - The amount of the contractor's investment in facilities and equipment
  - The nature and degree of control
  - The contractor's opportunities for profit and loss
  - The amount of initiative, judgment or foresight in open market competition
  - The degree of independent business organization and operation

- Avoid misclassification issues:
  - Conduct an audit/assessment of independent contractor positions
  - Analyze the employer's right to control
  - Reclassify and make whole

### **EMAIL SPOOFING**

## **Email Spoofing**

- Email spoofing is the creation of email messages with a forged sender address
- For employers, this means the message will appear to have originated from inside the company
- Cyber criminals often use email spoofing to obtain confidential employee information, such as Social Security numbers and W-2 forms
- Email recipients are deceived into disclosing protected information, which is then used to submit employees' tax returns to the IRS, transferring company funds into irretrievable accounts, etc.

## **Email Spoofing**

- Many employers are investing in innovative information security technologies
- But even sophisticated technology can be defeated where an employee is fooled into transferring company files, money, or passwords
- Information Security is every employee's responsibility

## **Email Spoofing**

#### Takeaways:

- Educating employees about the risks of email spoofing is essential to prevent an information breach
- Create and enforce policies and protocols related to the transfer of important company information in order to protect yourself from phishing and spoofing scams

## NLRB HANDBOOK CHALLENGES

- March 18, 2015: Memorandum GC 15-04
- Targeted handbook policies
- Stated purpose was to protect Section 7 rights
- Impacts union and non-union workplaces

- Non-disparagement provisions
- Confidentiality provisions
- Employee conduct provisions
- Media contact
- Photographs and recordings
- Use of logos/trademarks
- Walk-outs

- April 13, 2016 decision William Beaumont Hospital
- Affirmed 2004 decision in Lutheran Heritage Village, which rendered in part work rules and handbook provisions unlawful if employees would "reasonably construe" them to prohibit Section 7 activities
- Dissent: NLRB should start considering employers' justifications for implementing rules as part of the test to determine if valid

#### Takeaways:

- Audit handbooks to ensure NLRA compliance
- Revise policies that:
  - Restrict employees from discussing wages, labor violations and other terms/conditions of employment
  - Limit employees' rights to be critical of supervisors/management
  - Explain purpose of the policy

#### NLRB PROTECTED ACTIVITY

- Staffing Network Holdings, LLC v. NLRB, 7<sup>th</sup>
  Circuit, March 2016
  - Supervisor told employees to work more quickly
  - One employee responded that he could not work any faster for \$8.25/hour
  - Supervisor sent him home because of his attitude and because he was not keeping up with his work
  - Other employees reacted and confronted the supervisor, protesting the action, stating it was unfair and the employee was new

- Supervisor responded that it was not their concern and to return to work or they would also be sent home
- One employee continued to protest, so the supervisor stated he would send her home if she had an issue
- Other employees came to her defense and she stated that she knew her rights
- Supervisor instructed her to leave but she refused,
  with other employees again coming to her defense

- She ultimately left when the supervisor stated that security would escort her out
- She assumed she had been terminated and filed an unfair practice charge with the NLRB
- Employer argued that it acted lawfully due to the employee's insubordination, claiming employee used abusive language and embarrassed the supervisor in front of other employees
- ALJ and NLRB rejected these arguments

- Court stated that brief, on-the-job work-stoppage is a form of economic pressure protected by the NLRA, and found that the employee was terminated because of the *protected*, *concerted* activity of protesting her supervisor's dismissal of the first employee
- The Court upheld the NLRB's order that the employer must offer reinstatement to the employee and make her whole for lost wages
- The Seventh Circuit upheld the decision

- Takeaways:
  - Remember that non-union employees are protected by the NLRA
  - Train management how to avoid inciting this type of insurgence
  - An employee's bad attitude when participating in protected activities is often protected, unless there is a safety risk or violation of the law

## **Any Questions?**

#### Thank you for attending!

**Contact Information:** 

Jason Kearnaghan

213.617.5516

jkearnaghan@sheppardmullin.com

This presentation is for general information only and is not to be considered legal advice or relied upon as applicable to any specific employer or situation. These materials may not be reproduced, copied, or distributed without prior permission of the above.

Copyright 2012 Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton, LLP