EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: WHAT'S A BIDEN PRESIDENCY GOING TO MEAN FOR EMPLOYERS? AN OVERVIEW

The labor and employment law policies and enforcement goals of the federal government rely largely on which party's administration occupies the White House. When inaugurated in January, President Joseph R. Biden made some immediate and significant changes that will affect employers. Also, based on President Biden's statements made during his campaign and the stated goals of others in the Democratic Party, decidedly pro-employee policies, enforcement goals, and legislation are very likely on the way. These changes are all but certain, now, with a Democratically controlled Congress. Over the next five weeks, the OCHDL employment law team will examine five labor and employment areas that employers should know and understand in order to navigate through the new and significant changes that the Biden Administration will likely make in the coming months and years. In the following weeks, we will cover:

- **OSHA**: On January 21, 2021, President Biden signed an Executive Order requiring OSHA to provide guidance to employers on workplace safety during the COVID-19 pandemic. In response, on January 29, 2021, OSHA issued guidance related to COVID-19. This guidance, as well as OSHA's enforcement policies regarding COVID-19, will likely continue to evolve under the new administration.
- **Wage and Hour**: This blog series will also cover potential wage and hour changes such as an updated federal minimum wage and the proposed Paycheck Fairness Act, which would expand the equal pay provisions contained in the FLSA and require that any pay differential between sexes be passed on "a bona fide factor other than sex, such as education, training, or experience."
- **Labor Law**: We'll discuss the future of the NLRB and labor law under a Biden Administration. Significant changes, including the roll back of certain enforcement guidance and the ousting of the General Counsel, have already occurred, and if campaign promises are to be believed, we could have significant additional changes, including the passing of the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act, which would be a sweeping overhaul of federal labor law including prohibiting the use of class action waivers in arbitration agreements, making it easier for workers to form unions, limiting the impact of right-to-work laws, and codifying an expanded definition of what constitutes a joint employer.
- **Discrimination**: Then, we'll cover the Biden Administration's potential impact on issues of discrimination, including the Bringing an End to Harassment by Enhancing Accountability and Rejecting Discrimination in the Workplace (BE HEARD) Act, which would require most businesses to provide anti-harassment policies and training and would codify the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, pregnancy, childbirth, a medical condition related to pregnancy or childbirth, and a sex stereotype under Title VII.
- **DOL**: Finally, this blog series will wrap up with potential changes that could come

through the Department of Labor, including changes to the independent contractor test, changes to the joint employer test, and expansions of the FMLA.

As always, O'Neil Cannon is here for you. We look forward to expounding on these topics over the next five weeks and providing you with timely and relevant information over the years to come. We encourage you to reach out with any questions, concerns, or legal issues you may have regarding the anticipated labor and employment law changes under the new Biden Administration.

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: CAN EMPLOYEES USE FMLA TO AVOID OVERTIME?

The FMLA requires that covered employers grant eligible employees twelve weeks of unpaid leave for a serious health condition that prevents them from performing the functions of their job. FMLA leave can be taken on an intermittent basis if medically necessary. A recent case out of the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut shows the importance of correctly identifying your obligations under the FMLA and how they may differ from your obligations under other employment law statutes such as the Americans with Disabilities Act.

In *Santiago v. Department of Transportation, et al.*, the employee was diagnosed with "cluster headaches," which he said were "worse than migraines," "completely disabling," and "can last for hours to days depending on the episode." The employee and his doctor determined that his "excessive work schedule," which was essentially anything over eight hours a day or forty hours per week, was a main trigger of his headaches and suggested that his work schedule be limited. Because the employee's job required mandatory overtime, the employer stated that it could not accommodate him and that, if he could not find another job with the employer, he would either need to apply for disability retirement or be terminated. The employer stated that those were his only options if he could not perform overtime, even if he applied for FMLA leave. The employee submitted FMLA paperwork from his physician that outlined his serious health condition and stated that he could not work over eight hours per day. Because he could not perform overtime, he was placed on leave and eventually terminated.

Although the employer argued that the employee was only entitled to leave when he was actually incapacitated, the court found that "[t]he examples in the regulation specifically provide that an employee can take leave to avoid the onset of illness, noting that 'an employee with asthma may be unable to report for work . . . because the employee's health care provider has advised the employee to stay home when the pollen count exceeds a

certain level.'" (*citing* 29 C.F.R. § 825.115(f)).

Furthermore, the employer argued that what the employee was requesting was essentially a permanent accommodation that changed the essential functions of the job. The Court acknowledged that while the employee "might not be able to use the ADA to avoid overtime . . . employees can use their yearly allotment of 12 weeks of FMLA leave to significantly alter their schedules." The Court went on to point out that, unlike the ADA, the FMLA does not include an "undue hardship" defense and the employer is required to provide the mandated 12 weeks of leave.

Decisions like this can put employers between a rock and a hard place, where they need employees to be at work because overtime is an essential function of the job and where they have to comply with multiple laws. Employers also need to carefully evaluate their obligations to make sure that they are properly complying with all relevant employment laws.

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: THE FMLA, WFMLA, AND SAME-SEX SPOUSES

On February 25, 2015, the Department of Labor (DOL) issued a Final Rule revising the definition of "spouse" under the FMLA. Currently, a "spouse" is defined as "a husband or wife as defined or recognized under State law for purposes of marriage in the State where the employee resides, including common law marriage in States where it is recognized." The Final Rule amends the FMLA definition of "spouse" to include eligible employees in same-sex marriages, even in states that do not recognize same-sex marriages. Importantly, same-sex marriages will be deemed valid based on the place in which the marriage was entered into, instead of the state in which the employee lives or works. Marriages will be valid if they are performed in any state or country that deems the marriage legal. Wisconsin, through a series of recent federal court decisions, recognizes same-sex marriages. Therefore, if an employee in a same-sex marriage was married in a place that legally recognizes same-sex marriages, an employer in any state, even those that do not currently recognize same-sex marriages, must grant that employee FMLA leave for the care of a same-sex spouse if the employee is otherwise eligible for that leave.

The amendment to the meaning of "spouse" under the federal FMLA does not affect the Wisconsin Family Medical Leave Act (WFMLA). The WFMLA is broader in scope than the federal FMLA as it not only recognizes the right of an employee to take a leave of absence for the serious health condition of a "spouse," defined as "an employee's legal husband or wife" (including a same-sex spouse), but also provides leave rights to employees engaged in

domestic partnerships. The WFMLA defines “domestic partner” in one of two ways. First, domestic partner can mean two individuals who: (i) are 18 years or older and competent to enter into a contract; (ii) are not married to or in a domestic partnership with anyone else; (iii) are not related by blood in a way that would prohibit marriage; (iv) consider themselves each other’s immediate family; (v) agree to be responsible for each other’s basic living expenses; and (vi) share a common residence. Second, domestic partners can be those who have signed and filed a declaration of domestic partnership in the office of the registrar of deeds of the county in which they reside. In Wisconsin, domestic partnerships can apply to same-sex couples who are not married as well as to opposite-sex couples who are not married. Therefore, even employees who are not legally married can be eligible for up to two weeks of WFMLA leave if they are part of a domestic partnership recognized under state law.

The new FMLA regulation goes into effect on March 27, 2015 and the WFMLA is already in effect for Wisconsin employers, so employers should review their policies and educate supervisors, managers, and human resources personnel on the Final Rule as well as Wisconsin law so that they can be applied properly.

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: HOW FMLA LEAVE SHOULD—AND SHOULD NOT—AFFECT YOUR EMPLOYEES’ PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

Under the Family Medical Leave Act, employers are not permitted to take an employee’s FMLA-protected absences into consideration when making employment decisions such as discipline and termination. However, if performance deficiencies are discovered while an employee is on FMLA leave and would have resulted in termination or discipline had the employee not been on leave, the employer is permitted to follow through with the same discipline or termination. Determining which category an employee’s performance issues fall into can be very challenging.

For example, in a recent decision out of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, the period in which the employee was on FMLA leave factored into the employer’s calculation of her achievement of performance goals, which eventually led to her termination. As an Account Executive, the employee was assessed based on her revenue-to-budget figure, which was calculated on a three-month rolling average. Because the employee was on leave for five weeks, the court found that her numbers were affected for not only those specific weeks but also the following five months in which the revenue that

could have been generated in those weeks would have shown up as part of her assessment. Because of this, the Court granted summary judgment to the employee finding that "no reasonable juror could conclude that [the employer] did not use [the employee's] FMLA leave as a negative factor in its decision to discipline and then terminate [the employee]."

However, employees who take FMLA are not entitled to greater rights than they would have been if they had been continuously working. "Therefore, if, while the employee is on leave, an employer happens to discover a performance issue or other offense for which the employee would have been disciplined or terminated had he or she been working at the time, the employer is still entitled to terminate or discipline that employee." As the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals has said "the fact that the leave permitted the employer to discover the problems cannot logically be a bar to the employer's ability to fire the deficient employee."

Employers need to be very careful in handling how they discipline and terminate employees who are either taking or have recently taken FMLA leave. If the employee's FMLA leave could affect an objective performance criterion in a negative way, employers need to be cautious of using that criterion to terminate an employee. However, if the employer can show that they would have taken the action independent of the leave and merely discovered the issue while the employee was on leave, it will have a solid defense to an FMLA claim.