



Transportation
Security
Administration

ANALYSIS WORKSHEET

Employee's Name: (b)(5) Case Number: (b)(6)

INSTRUCTIONS: Listed below are relevant factors for Deciding Officials. Deciding officials must consider all relevant factors in determining the appropriate penalty. The Deciding Official shall check the box to the left of each relevant factor applicable to the case and provide a concise statement documenting what was considered. If the offense is one for which removal is mandatory pursuant to TSA Management Directive 1100.75-1, do not complete this worksheet.

☒ The nature & seriousness of the offense and its relation to the employee's duties, position, and responsibilities, including whether the offense was intentional, technical or inadvertent, or was committed maliciously or for personal gain, or was frequently repeated. What consideration was given to this factor?

Offense is very serious and is directly related to employee's job responsibilities. Actions were intentional and frequently repeated. Officer Patterson has repeatedly refused to follow the standard set forth by the SOP. This non compliance has made it difficult for management to grow the culture of Walking the Line within the STL BDO program.

☒ The employee's job level and type of employment, including supervisory or fiduciary, contacts with the public, and prominence of the position. What consideration was given to this factor?

As a BDO, (b)(6) is in an important role providing an essential layer of security. He is in constant contact with the public and the SOP is designed with the Walk the Line process as a critical step in the success of the program. BDO participation in this process is a key to a successful program.

☒ The employee's past disciplinary record. What consideration was given to this factor?

Employee has had no previous discipline. (b)(6) has an exemplary record and this was taken into account when counseling him as well as a mitigating factor for the level of discipline given.

☒ The employee's past work record, including length of service, performance on the job, ability to get along with fellow workers, and dependability. What consideration was given to this factor?

Consideration was given. This is the first performance issue we have dealt with from Andrew. The offense warrants an action due to its seriousness in nature.

☒ The effect of the offense upon the employee's ability to perform at a satisfactory level and its effect upon his supervisor's confidence in the employee's ability to perform those duties. What consideration was given to this factor?

I am very confident that (b)(6) knows how to walk the line and I have seen him do it with success. I do question whether he will perform these duties with the diligence and frequency required by the SOP.

☒ Consistency of penalty with those imposed upon other employees for the same or a similar offense. What consideration was given to this factor?

I have given consideration to the table of Offenses and Penalties. There are mitigating and aggravating circumstances. I aligned my action with previous discipline given to other employees for similar offenses.

■ | The notoriety of the offense and its impact on the reputation of the agency. What consideration was given to this factor?

Failure to follow SOP always places the agency and program at risk. This walk the line process is designed to (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(n) to determine if behaviors exist. Failure to follow this procedure allows passengers to transit the security checkpoint without encountering the (b)(3) 49 U.S.C. § 114(n)

■ | The clarity with which the employee was on notice of any rules that were violated in committing the offense, or had been warned about the conduct in question. What consideration was given to this factor?

Employee has unrestricted access to the SPOT SOP. (b)(6) received an e mail from me on March 19, 2012 in which I clearly stated the importance of walking the line and that it was required by SOP. Additionally, he was counseled in both his mid year and 3rd quarter PASS meetings that he needed to improve. Finally, on October 4, 2012, STSM Tipler had a candid discussion with him warning him that we were ready to elevate to the next level if we did not see vast improvements.

■ | Potential for the employee's rehabilitation? What consideration was given to this factor?

Potential for rehabilitation can be achieved. (b)(6) knows how to walk the line and has done it with success.

■ | Mitigating circumstances surrounding the offense such as unusual job tensions, personality problems, mental impairment, harassment, or bad faith, malice or provocation on the part of others involved in the matter. What consideration was given to this factor?

Employee feels he is doing what we have asked of him. No notable mitigating circumstances other than previous performance record.

■ | The adequacy and effectiveness of alternative sanctions to deter such conduct in the future by the employee and others. What consideration was given to this factor?

Alternative sanctions have been attempted and worked with no success. I do not feel they have impressed upon the employee the seriousness of this offense. This action will help to deter other employees from making similar mistakes.

Bud Lewis STSM
Deciding Official's Name/Title

11/2/2012
Date