



Board of Administration Offsite

# Action Item – Proposed Decision of Administrative Law Judges Item a

---

July 16, 2025

**Item Name:** Proposed Decision – In the Matter of the Application for Industrial Disability Retirement of DANIELLE M. L. WADE, Respondent, and CALIFORNIA INSTITUTION FOR MEN, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION, Respondent.

**Program:** Disability and Survivor Benefits Division

**Item Type:** Action

## Parties' Positions

Staff argues that the Board of Administration should adopt the Proposed Decision, as modified. Respondent Danielle M. L. Wade's (Respondent) position is included in Attachment C, if any.

## Strategic Plan

This item is not a specific product of either the Strategic or Annual Plans. The determination of administrative appeals is a power reserved to the Board of Administration.

## Procedural Summary

Respondent submitted an application for service pending industrial disability retirement based on orthopedic conditions (right hand, elbow, wrist, back, hip, and left hand). CalPERS approved Respondent's service retirement but denied her IDR application. Respondent appealed this determination, and the matter was heard by the Office of Administrative Hearings on April 22, 2025. Due to Respondent California Institution for Men, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's (Respondent CDCR) failure to appear, the case proceeded as a default as to Respondent CDCR only under Government Code section 11520. A Proposed Decision was issued on May 21, 2025, affirming CalPERS' determination and denying the appeal.

## Alternatives

A. For use if the Board decides to modify and adopt the Proposed Decision as its own Decision:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, pursuant to Government Code section 11517, subdivision (c)(2)(C), which

hereby modifies the Proposed Decision, by inserting the word “industrial” before the words “disability retirement” on page five, paragraph 10; page seven, paragraph 18; page eight, paragraphs 19 and 20; and page seventeen, paragraph 21 of the Proposed Decision, and hereby adopts as its own Decision the Proposed Decision dated May 21, 2025, as modified, concerning the appeal of Danielle M. L. Wade; RESOLVED FURTHER that this Board Decision shall be effective 30 days following mailing of the Decision.

B. For use if the Board decides to adopt the Proposed Decision as its own Decision:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System hereby adopts as its own Decision the Proposed Decision dated May 21, 2025, concerning the appeal of Danielle M. L. Wade; RESOLVED FURTHER that this Board Decision shall be effective 30 days following mailing of the Decision.

C. For use if the Board decides not to adopt the Proposed Decision, and to decide the case upon the record:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, after consideration of the Proposed Decision dated May 21, 2025, concerning the appeal of Danielle M. L. Wade, hereby rejects the Proposed Decision and determines to decide the matter itself, based upon the record produced before the Administrative Law Judge and such additional evidence and arguments that are presented by the parties and accepted by the Board; RESOLVED FURTHER that the Board's Decision shall be made after notice is given to all parties.

D. For use if the Board decides to remand the matter back to the Office of Administrative Hearings for the taking of further evidence:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, after consideration of the Proposed Decision dated May 21, 2025, concerning the appeal of Danielle M. L. Wade, hereby rejects the Proposed Decision and refers the matter back to the Administrative Law Judge for the taking of additional evidence as specified by the Board at its meeting.

E. Precedential Nature of Decision (two alternatives; either may be used):

1. For use if the Board wants further argument on the issue of whether to designate its Decision as precedential:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System requests the parties in the matter concerning the appeal of Danielle M. L. Wade, as well as interested parties, to submit written argument regarding whether the Board's Decision in this matter should be designated as precedential, and that the Board will consider the issue whether to designate its Decision as precedential at a time to be determined.

2. For use if the Board decides to designate its Decision as precedential, without further argument from the parties.

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, hereby designates as precedential its Decision concerning the appeal of Danielle M. L. Wade.

**Budget and Fiscal Impacts:** Not applicable

**Attachments**

Attachment A: Proposed Decision

Attachment B: Staff's Argument

Attachment C: Respondent(s) Argument(s)

---

Kimberly A. Malm  
Deputy Executive Officer  
Customer Services and Support