ARTICLE 16 DISCIPLINE PROCEDURE

16.1 **Section 1. Principles**

In the administration of this Article, a basic principle shall be that discipline should be corrective in nature, rather than punitive. No employee may be disciplined or discharged except for just cause such as, but not limited to, insubordination, pilferage, intoxication (drugs or alcohol), incompetence, failure to perform work as requested, violation of the terms of this Agreement, or failure to observe safety rules and regulations. Any such discipline or discharge shall be subject to the grievance-arbitration procedure provided for in this Agreement, which could result in reinstatement and restitution, including back pay.

Just Cause Principle

The principle that any discipline must be for "just cause" establishes a standard that must apply to any discipline or discharge of an employee. Simply put, the just cause provision requires a fair and provable justification for discipline.

Just cause is a term of art created by labor arbitrators. It has no precise definition. It contains no rigid rules that apply in the same way in each case of discipline or discharge. However, arbitrators frequently divide the question of just cause into six sub-questions and often apply the following criteria to determine whether the action was for just cause. These criteria are the basic considerations that the supervisor must use before initiating disciplinary action.

- **Is there a rule?** If so, was the employee aware of the rule? Was the employee forewarned of the disciplinary consequences for failure to follow the rule? It is not enough to say, "Well, everybody knows that rule," or "We posted that rule ten years ago." You may have to prove that the employee should have known of the rule. Certain standards of conduct are normally expected in the industrial environment and it is assumed by arbitrators that employees should be aware of these standards. For example, an employee charged with intoxication on duty, fighting on duty, pilferage, sabotage, insubordination, etc., may be generally assumed to have understood that these offenses are neither condoned nor acceptable, even though management may not have issued specific regulations to that effect.
- **Is the rule a reasonable rule?** Management must make sure rules are reasonable, based on the overall objective of safe and efficient work performance. Management's rules should be reasonably related to business efficiency, safe operation of our business, and the performance we might expect of the employee.
- **Is the rule consistently and equitably enforced?** A rule must be applied fairly and without discrimination. Consistent and equitable

enforcement is a critical factor. Consistently overlooking employee infractions and then disciplining without warning is improper. If employees are consistently allowed to smoke in areas designated as No Smoking areas, it is not appropriate suddenly to start disciplining them for this violation. In such cases, management loses its right to discipline for that infraction, in effect, unless it first puts employees (and the unions) on notice of its intent to enforce that regulation again. Singling out employees for discipline is usually improper. If several similarly situated employees commit an offense, it would not be equitable to discipline only one.

- **Was a thorough investigation completed?** Before administering the discipline, management must make an investigation to determine whether the employee committed the offense. Management must ensure that its investigation is thorough and objective. This is the employee's day in court privilege. Employees have the right to know with reasonable detail what the charges are and to be given a reasonable opportunity to defend themselves before the discipline is initiated.
- **Was the severity of the discipline reasonably related to the infraction itself and in line with that usually administered, as well as to the seriousness of the employee's past record?** The following is an example of what arbitrators may consider an inequitable discipline: If an installation consistently issues five-day suspensions for a particular offense, it would be extremely difficult to justify why an employee with a past record similar to that of other disciplined employees was issued a 30-day suspension for the same offense. There is no precise definition of what establishes a good, fair, or bad record. Reasonable judgment must be used. An employee's record of previous offenses may never be used to establish guilt in a case you presently have under consideration, but it may be used to determine the appropriate disciplinary penalty.
- **Was the disciplinary action taken in a timely manner?** Disciplinary actions should be taken as promptly as possible after the offense has been committed.

Corrective Rather than Punitive

The requirement that discipline be corrective rather than punitive is an essential element of the just cause principle. In short, it means that for most offenses management must issue discipline in a progressive fashion, issuing lesser discipline (e.g., a letter of warning) for a first offense and a pattern of increasingly severe discipline for succeeding offenses (e.g., short suspension, long suspension, discharge). The basis of this principle of corrective or progressive discipline is that it is issued for the purpose of correcting or improving employee behavior and not as punishment or retribution.

Just cause for the discipline of City Carrier Assistant (CCAs) is addressed in Appendix B, 3. Other Provisions, Section E – Article 16 of the 2019 National Agreement. This section is reprinted on page 16-12 of the JCAM.

Unadjudicated Discipline. The parties agree that arbitrators may not consider unadjudicated discipline cited in a disciplinary notice when determining the propriety of that disciplinary notice. When removal cases are scheduled for a hearing before the underlying discipline has been adjudicated, an arbitrator may grant a continuance of a hearing on the removal case pending resolution of the unadjudicated discipline (National Arbitrator Snow, E94N-4E-D 96075418, April 19, 1999, C-19372).

Examples of Behavior. Article 16.1 states several examples of misconduct which may constitute just cause for discipline. Some managers have mistakenly believed that because these behaviors are specifically listed in the contract, any discipline of employees for such behaviors is automatically for just cause. The parties agree these behaviors are intended as examples only. Management must still meet the requisite burden of proof, e.g. prove that the behavior took place, that it was intentional, that the degree of discipline imposed was corrective rather than punitive, and so forth. Principles of just cause apply to these specific examples of misconduct as well as to any other conduct for which management issues discipline.

Remedies. The last sentence of Article 16.1 establishes the principle that discipline may be overturned in the grievance/arbitration procedure and that remedies may be provided to the aggrieved employee—"reinstatement and restitution, including back pay." If union and management representatives settle a discipline grievance, the extent of remedies for improper discipline is determined as part of the settlement. If a case is pursued to arbitration, the arbitrator states the remedy in the award.

Back Pay. The regulations concerning back pay are found in the ELM Section 436. The parties agree that, while all grievance settlements or arbitration awards providing for a monetary remedy should be promptly paid, the following Memorandum of Understanding applies only to those back pay claims covered by the ELM Section 436.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN THE
UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
AND THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS, AFL-CIO

Re: Article 15—ELM 436—Back Pay

The following applies solely to back pay claims covered by Section 436 of the Employee and Labor Relations Manual (ELM):

A pay adjustment required by a grievance settlement or arbitration decision will be completed promptly upon receipt of the documentation required by ELM part 436.4

Documents in Support of Claim. An employee not paid within sixty (60) days of submission of the required documentation will receive an advance, if requested by the employee, equivalent to seventy (70) percent of the approved adjustment. If a disagreement exists over the amount due, the advance will be set at seventy (70) percent of the sum not in dispute.

(The preceding Memorandum of Understanding, Article 15 - ELM 436 - Back Pay, applies to NALC City Carrier Assistant Employees.)

The following Memorandum of Understanding provides that where an arbitration award specifies that an employee is entitled to back pay in a case involving disciplinary suspension or removal, the Postal Service must pay interest on the back pay at the Federal Judgment Rate.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN THE
UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AND
THE JOINT BARGAINING COMMITTEE
(American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO, and
National Association of Letter Carriers, AFL-CIO)

Re: Interest on Back Pay

Where an arbitration award specifies that an employee is entitled to back pay in a case involving disciplinary suspension or removal, the Employer shall pay interest on such back pay at the Federal Judgment Rate. This shall apply to cases heard in arbitration after the effective date of the 1990 Agreement.

(The preceding Memorandum of Understanding, Interest on Back Pay, applies to NALC City Carrier Assistant Employees.)

16.2

Section 2. Discussion
For minor offenses by an employee, management has a responsibility to discuss such matters with the employee. Discussions of this type shall be held in private between the employee and the supervisor. Such discussions are not considered discipline and are not grievable. Following such discussions, there is no prohibition against the supervisor and/or the employee making a personal notation of the date and subject matter for their own personal record(s). However, no notation or other information pertaining to such discussion shall be included in the employee's personnel folder. While such discussions may not be cited as an element of prior adverse record in any subsequent disciplinary action against an employee, they may be, where relevant and timely, relied upon to establish that employees have been made aware of their obligations and responsibilities.

Although included in Article 16, a "discussion" is non-disciplinary and thus is not grievable. Discussions are conducted in private between a supervisor and an employee.

Both the supervisor and the employee may keep a record of the discussion for personal use. However, these are not to be considered official Postal Service records. They may not be included in the employee's personnel folder, nor may they be passed to another supervisor.

Discussions cannot be cited as elements of an employee's past record in any future disciplinary action. Discussions may be used (when they are relevant and timely) only to establish that an employee has been made aware of some particular obligation or responsibility.

16.3 **Section 3. Letter of Warning**

A letter of warning is a disciplinary notice in writing, identified as an official disciplinary letter of warning, which shall include an explanation of a deficiency or misconduct to be corrected.

Letters of warning are official discipline and should be treated seriously. They may be cited as elements of prior discipline in subsequent disciplinary actions subject to the two year restriction discussed in Article 16.10. Arbitrator Fasser held in NB-E 5724, February 23, 1977 (C-02968), that a letter of warning which fails to advise the recipient of grievance appeal rights is procedurally deficient.

16.4 **Section 4. Suspensions of 14 Days or Less**

In the case of discipline involving suspensions of fourteen (14) days or less, the employee against whom disciplinary action is sought to be initiated shall be served with a written notice of the charges against the employee and shall be further informed that he/she will be suspended. A suspended employee will remain on duty during the term of the suspension with no loss of pay. These disciplinary actions shall, however, be considered to be of the same degree of seriousness and satisfy the same corrective steps in the pattern of progressive discipline as the time-off suspensions. Such suspensions are equivalent to time-off suspensions and may be cited as elements of past discipline in subsequent discipline in accordance with Article 16.10.

Employees issued discipline involving suspensions of fourteen days or less will remain on duty during the term of the suspension with no loss of pay. These disciplinary actions are of the same degree of seriousness and satisfy the same requirements to be corrective progressive discipline as time-off suspensions. Such suspensions are equivalent to time-off suspensions and may be cited as elements of past record in subsequent discipline in accordance with Article 16.10.

Suspensions issued under the provisions of Article 16.4 must advise the recipient of grievance appeal rights.

The Postal Service has agreed that letters of warning must be used instead of suspensions of less than five work (not calendar) days. If suspensions of five days or more are reduced unilaterally, it must be to a letter of warning rather than to a suspension of four days or less. The only exception is in cases where a suspension of less than five days is the result of a grievance settlement (USPS Letters M-00582 and M-01234).

16.5 Section 5. Suspensions of More Than 14 Days or Discharge

In the case of suspensions of more than fourteen (14) days, or of discharge, any employee shall, unless otherwise provided herein, be entitled to an advance written notice of the charges against him/her and shall remain either on the job or on the clock at the option of the Employer for a period of thirty (30) days. Thereafter, the employee shall remain on the rolls (non-pay status) until disposition of the case has been had either by settlement with the Union or through exhaustion of the grievance-arbitration procedure. A preference eligible who chooses to appeal a suspension of more than fourteen (14) days or his/her discharge to the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) rather than through the grievance-arbitration procedure shall remain on the rolls (non-pay status) until disposition of the case has been had either by settlement or through exhaustion of his/her MSPB appeal. When there is reasonable cause to believe an employee is guilty of a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment can be imposed, the Employer is not required to give the employee the full thirty (30) days advance written notice in a discharge action, but shall give such lesser number of days advance written notice as under the circumstances is reasonable and can be justified. The employee is immediately removed from a pay status at the end of the notice period.

Letter carriers must be given thirty days advance written notice prior to serving a suspension of more than fourteen days or discharge. During the notice period they must remain either on the job or on the clock at the option of the Postal Service. The only exceptions are for crime or emergency situations as provided for in Article 16.6 and 16.7.

Removals are also subject to the Dispute Resolution Process Memorandum which provides in part:

> Removal actions, subject to the thirty (30) day notification period in Article 16.5 of the National Agreement, will be deferred until after the Step B decision has been rendered, or fourteen (14) days after the appeal is received at Step B, whichever comes first, except for those removals involving allegations of crime, violence, or intoxication or cases where retaining the employee on duty may result in damage to postal property, loss of mails, or funds, or where the employee may be injurious to self or others, pursuant to Article 16.6 and 16.7.

Thus, when an Article 16.5 removal action is deferred, the employee remains either on the job or on the clock until after the Step B decision has been rendered, or fourteen days after the appeal is received at Step B, whichever comes first. This is true even if it results in the employee remaining on the job or on the clock for longer than the thirty days provided for in Article 16.5.

This same deferral rule applies to CCAs as shown in Appendix B, 3. Other Provisions, Section E. Article 16 – Discipline Procedure. However, this requirement cannot extend a 360-day appointment.

Issues concerning the MSPB appeal rights afforded preference eligible employees are discussed under Article 16.9.

16.6.A **Section 6. Indefinite Suspensions—Crime Situation**

A. The Employer may indefinitely suspend an employee in those cases where the Employer has reasonable cause to believe an employee is guilty of a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment can be imposed. In such cases, the Employer is not required to give the employee the full thirty (30) days advance notice of indefinite suspension, but shall give such lesser number of days of advance written notice as under the circumstances is reasonable and can be justified. The employee is immediately removed from a pay status at the end of the notice period.

16.6.B B. The just cause of an indefinite suspension is grievable. The arbitrator shall have the authority to reinstate and make the employee whole for the entire period of the indefinite suspension.

16.6.C C. If after further investigation or after resolution of the criminal charges against the employee, the Employer determines to return the employee to a pay status, the employee shall be entitled to back pay for the period that the indefinite suspension exceeded seventy (70) days, if the employee was otherwise available for duty, and without prejudice to any grievance filed under B above.

16.6.D D. The Employer may take action to discharge an employee during the period of an indefinite suspension whether or not the criminal charges have been resolved, and whether or not such charges have been resolved in favor of the employee. Such action must be for just cause, and is subject to the requirements of Section 5 of this Article.

Article 16.6, which deals with indefinite suspensions in crime situations, provides the following:

- The full thirty-day notice is not required in such cases. (See also Article 16.5.)
- Just cause of an indefinite suspension is grievable. An arbitrator has the authority to reinstate and make whole. In NC-NAT 8580, September 29, 1978 (C-03216), National Arbitrator Garrett wrote that an indefinite suspension is:

  > reviewable in arbitration to the same extent as any other suspension to determine whether 'just cause' for the disciplinary action has been shown. Such a review in arbitration necessarily involves considering at least (a) the presence or absence of 'reasonable cause' to believe the employee guilty of the crime alleged, and (b) whether such a relationship exists between the alleged crime and the employee's job in the USPS to warrant suspension.

- If the Postal Service returns an employee who was on an indefinite suspension to duty, the employee is automatically entitled to back pay for all but the first seventy days of pay. The indefinite suspension and entitlement to the first seventy days of pay still remains subject to the grievance provisions stated in Subsection (B).

- During an indefinite suspension, the Employer can take final action to remove the employee. Such removals must be for just cause and are subject to Article 16.5, like any other removal.

16.7 **Section 7. Emergency Procedure**

An employee may be immediately placed on an off-duty status (without pay) by the Employer, but remain on the rolls where the allegation involves intoxication (use of drugs or alcohol), pilferage, or failure to observe safety rules and regulations, or in cases where retaining the employee on duty may result in damage to U.S. Postal Service property, loss of mail or funds, or where the employee may be injurious to self or others. The employee shall remain on the rolls (non-pay status) until disposition of the case has been had. If it is proposed to suspend such an employee for more than thirty (30) days or discharge the employee, the emergency action taken under this Section may be made the subject of a separate grievance.

The purpose of Article 16.7 is to allow the Postal Service to act immediately to place an employee in an off-duty status in the specified emergency situations.

Written Notice. Management is not required to provide advance written notice prior to taking such emergency action. However, an employee placed on emergency off-duty status is entitled to written charges within a reasonable period of time. In H4N-3U-C 58637, August 3, 1990 (C-10146), National Arbitrator Mittenthal wrote as follows:

> The fact that no "advance written notice" is required does not mean that Management has no notice obligation whatever. The employee suspended pursuant to Section 7 has the right to grieve his suspension. He cannot effectively grieve unless he is formally made aware of the charge against him, the reason why Management has invoked Section 7. He surely is entitled to such notice within a reasonable period of time following the date of his displacement. To deny him such notice is to deny him his right under the grievance procedure to mount a credible challenge against Management's action.

What Test Must Management Satisfy? Usually employees are placed on emergency non-duty status for alleged misconduct. However, the provisions of this section are broad enough to allow management to invoke the emergency procedures in situations that do not involve misconduct, such as if an employee does not recognize that he or she is having an adverse reaction to medication. The test that management must satisfy to justify actions taken under Article 16.7 depends upon the nature of the emergency. In H4N-3U-C 58637, August 3, 1990 (C-10146), National Arbitrator Mittenthal wrote as follows:

> My response to this disagreement depends, in large part, upon how the Section 7 "emergency" action is characterized. If that action is discipline for alleged misconduct, then Management is subject to a

"just cause" test. To quote from Section 1, "No employee may be disciplined...except for just cause." If, on the other hand, that action is not prompted by misconduct and hence is not discipline, the "just cause" standard is not applicable. Management then need only show "reasonable cause" (or "reasonable belief") a test which is easier to satisfy.

One important caveat should be noted. "Just cause" is not an absolute concept. Its impact, from the standpoint of the degree of proof required in a given case, can be somewhat elastic. For instance, arbitrators ordinarily use a "preponderance of the evidence" rule or some similar standard in deciding fact questions in a discipline dispute. Sometimes, however, a higher degree of proof is required where the alleged misconduct includes an element of moral turpitude or criminal intent. The point is that "just cause" can be calibrated differently on the basis of the nature of the alleged misconduct.

The same Article 16.7 provisions that apply to career letter carriers apply to CCAs as shown in Appendix B, 3. Other Provisions, Section E. Article 16 – Discipline Procedure.

Separate Grievances. If, subsequent to an emergency suspension, management suspends the employee for more than thirty (30) days or discharges the employee, the emergency action taken under this section should be grieved separately from the later disciplinary action.

16.8 Section 8. Review of Discipline

In no case may a supervisor impose suspension or discharge upon an employee unless the proposed disciplinary action by the supervisor has first been reviewed and concurred in by the installation head or designee.

In post offices of twenty (20) or less employees, or where there is no higher level supervisor than the supervisor who proposes to initiate suspension or discharge, the proposed disciplinary action shall first be reviewed and concurred in by a higher authority outside such installation or post office before any proposed disciplinary action is taken.

Concurrence is a specific contract requirement to the issuance of a suspension or a discharge. It is normally the responsibility of the immediate supervisor to initiate disciplinary action. Before a suspension or removal may be imposed, however, the discipline must be reviewed and concurred with by a manager who is a higher level than the initiating, or issuing, supervisor. This act of review and concurrence must take place prior to the issuance of the discipline. While there is no contractual requirement that there be a written record of concurrence, management should be prepared to identify the manager who concurred with a disciplinary action so he/she may be questioned if there is a concern that appropriate concurrence did not take place.

For additional information on the Review of Discipline section, see National Arbitration Eischen, E95R-4E-D-01027978, December 3, 2002, C-23828. (Note that this is a NRLCA case. The NRLCA's Review of Discipline is in their Article 16.6 and requires written concurrence.)

16.9 **Section 9. Veterans' Preference**

A preference eligible is not hereunder deprived of whatever rights of appeal are applicable under the Veterans' Preference Act. If the employee appeals under the Veterans' Preference Act, however, the time limits for appeal to arbitration and the normal contractual arbitration scheduling procedures are not to be delayed as a consequence of that appeal; if there is an MSPB appeal pending as of the date the arbitration is scheduled by the parties, the grievant waives access to the grievance-arbitration procedure beyond Step B.

MSPB Dual Filings. The Veterans' Preference Act guarantees preference eligible employees certain special rights concerning their job security. (Federal law defines a preference eligible veteran at Title 5 United States Code Section 2108; see EL-312, Section 483). A preference eligible employee may file both a grievance and an MSPB appeal on a removal or suspension of more than fourteen days. However, Article 16.9 provides that an employee who exercises appeal rights under the Veterans' Preference Act waives access to arbitration when they have an MSPB appeal pending as of the date the grievance is scheduled for arbitration by the parties. The date of the arbitration scheduling letter is considered "the date the arbitration is scheduled by the parties" for the purposes of Article 16.9.

This language has been modified to reflect the parties' agreement that an employee should receive a hearing on the merits of an adverse action. It supercedes the 1988 Memorandum of Understanding on Article 16.9. While a preference eligible city letter carrier may appeal certain adverse actions to the MSPB, as well as file a grievance on the same action, the employee is not entitled to a hearing on the merits in both forums. This provision is designed to prevent the Postal Service from having to defend the same adverse action in an MSPB hearing as well as in an arbitration hearing. If a city letter carrier has an MSPB appeal pending on or after the date the arbitration scheduling letter is dated, the employee waives the right to arbitration.

The parties agree that the union will be permitted to reactivate an employee's previously waived right to an arbitration hearing if that employee's appeal to the MSPB did not result in a decision on the merits of the adverse action, or the employee withdraws the MSPB appeal prior to a decision on the merits being made. It is understood that this agreement does not preclude the parties from raising other procedural issues from the original arbitration appeal. Additionally, the Union is not precluded from raising as an issue in arbitration whether any Postal Service

backpay liability should include the period between the time the right to arbitration was waived by the employee and the time the Union reactivated the arbitration appeal.

EEO and EEO/MSPB Mixed Cases—Dual Filings. Article 16.9 does not bar the arbitration of a grievance where a grievant has asserted the same claim in an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) complaint. Nor does it apply where a preference eligible grievant has appealed the same matter through the EEOC and then to the MSPB under the mixed case federal regulations (National Arbitrator Snow, D90N-4D-D 95003945, April 24, 1997, C-16650).

16.10 Section 10. Employee Discipline Records

The records of a disciplinary action against an employee shall not be considered in any subsequent disciplinary action if there has been no disciplinary action initiated against the employee for a period of two years.

Upon the employee's written request, any disciplinary notice or decision letter will be removed from the employee's official personnel folder after two years if there has been no disciplinary action initiated against the employee in that two-year period.

(Additional discipline procedure provisions regarding City Carrier Assistant Employees are found in Appendix B.).

The purpose of Article 16.10 is to protect employees from having their past records considered when they have shown over a two-year period that they performed their job without incurring any further disciplinary action.

Additional information on the retention and disposal of discipline records may be found in Handbook AS-353 (National Prearbitration, Q94N-4Q-C-96044119, March 2, 2004, M-01511).

The Step 4 settlement H4N-5G-D 7167, January 5, 1989 (M-00889), provides the following:

> A notice of discipline which is subsequently fully rescinded, whether by settlement, arbitration award, or independent management action, shall be deemed not to have been "initiated" for purposes of Article 16, Section 10, and may not be cited or considered in any subsequent disciplinary action.

Last Chance Agreements (LCA) are not records of disciplinary action. LCAs are not covered by the provisions of Article 16.10. If an LCA contains a reference to a disciplinary record that exceeds the limitation in Article 16.10, the following instruction from Arbitrator Briggs in case D98N-4D-D 00114765, January 15, 2002 (C-22941), is to be followed: LCAs "...can logically be divided into disciplinary and administrative categories, and only those elements falling into the former category are subject to the Article 16.10 time restriction."

CCAs. Appendix B, 3. Other Provisions, Section E – Article 16 of the 2019 National Agreement addresses access to the grievance procedure for separated or disciplined CCAs.

APPENDIX B

Appendix B is the reprinting of Section I of the 2013 Das Award, the creation of a new non-career employee category. Provisions of the Das Award that were modified in the 2019 National Agreement are indicated in bold. Those provisions that are reflected in another part of the National Agreement or Joint Contract Administration Manual are not reprinted herein.

3. OTHER PROVISIONS

E. Article 16 - Discipline Procedure

CCAs may be separated for lack of work at any time before the end of their term. Separations for lack of work shall be by inverse relative standing in the installation. Such separation of the CCA(s) with the lowest relative standing is not grievable except where it is alleged that the separation is pretextual. CCAs separated for lack of work before the end of their term will be given preference for reappointment ahead of other CCAs with less relative standing in the installation, provided the need for hiring arises within 18 months of their separation.

CCAs may be disciplined or removed within the term of their appointment for just cause and any such discipline or removal will be subject to the grievance arbitration procedure, provided that within the immediately preceding six months, the employee has completed ninety (90) work days, or has been employed for 120 calendar days (whichever comes first) of their initial appointment. A CCA who has previously satisfied the 90/120 day requirement either as a CCA or transitional employee (with an appointment made after September 29, 2007), will have access to the grievance procedure without regard to his/her length of service as a CCA. Further, while in any such grievance the concept of progressive discipline will not apply, discipline should be corrective in nature, rather than punitive.

CCAs may be immediately placed in an off-duty status under the circumstances covered by Article 16.7. If the CCA completed the requisite period and has access to the grievance procedure pursuant to the previous paragraph, the requirements regarding notice, justification and the employee's ability to protest such action are the same as that for career employees under Article 16.7

In the case of removal for cause within the term of an appointment, a CCA shall be entitled to advance written notice of the charges against him/her in accordance with the provisions of Article 16 of the National Agreement.

Removal actions, subject to the thirty day notification period in Article 16.5 of the National Agreement, will be deferred until after the Step B decision has been rendered, or fourteen days after the appeal is received at Step B, whichever comes first, except for those removals involving allegations of crime, violence or intoxication or cases where retaining the employee on duty may result in damage to postal property, loss of mails, or funds, or where the employee may be injurious to self or others. This requirement cannot extend a 360-day appointment period.

Discipline issued to a CCA may not be considered or cited in determining whether to issue discipline to the CCA employee after his or her conversion to career status.