The Constitution and HR Policies: Public Employee Speech and the First Amendment.

Hinders, Updegraff & Franklin, PLC. | April 2026

Public employees don't shed their free speech rights at the office door but they don't keep all of them either. The Supreme Court's *Pickering-Connick-Garcetti* framework still governs: speech on matters of public concern, made as a citizen rather than pursuant to official duties, is protected subject to a balancing of the employee's interest against the government's interest in an efficient workplace.

Public Employee Speech and the First Amendment: Where the Line Is Drawn

When a government employee speaks out, whether in a staff meeting, on social media, or to a reporter, the question of constitutional protection quickly becomes complicated. Unlike private-sector workers, public employees operate inside the government itself, which means their speech can implicate both individual liberties and the effective functioning of public institutions. Over time, courts have developed a framework to balance those competing interests.

The Foundational Principle

The First Amendment generally protects individuals from government retaliation based on speech. But when the government is also the employer, it has additional authority to regulate speech to maintain efficiency, discipline, and public trust. This tension sits at the core of public employee speech law.

Modern doctrine largely follows a two-step analysis shaped by a series of Supreme Court decisions:

1. Was the employee speaking as a citizen on a matter of public concern?
Speech is more likely to be protected if it addresses issues like government misconduct, public safety, or misuse of funds—topics that concern the broader community. By contrast, purely personal workplace grievances (e.g., disputes about promotions or internal policies affecting only the employee) generally fall outside constitutional protection.

A critical refinement came with *Garcetti v. Ceballos* (2006), where the Court held that speech made "pursuant to official duties" is not protected under the First Amendment. In other words, if speaking is part of the employee's job, the Constitution usually does not shield that speech from employer discipline.

2. Does the government's interest outweigh the employee's speech rights?
If the employee clears the first hurdle, courts then balance the employee's interest in speaking against the government's interest in running an efficient workplace. This balancing test originated in *Pickering v. Board of Education* (1968), where a teacher's letter to a newspaper criticizing school funding decisions was deemed protected.

Factors in this balancing include:

- Whether the speech disrupts workplace operations
- Whether it undermines authority or discipline
- The employee's role (e.g., policymaking vs. rank-and-file)

Social Media and Modern Challenges

The rise of social media has blurred the lines between personal and professional speech. Courts increasingly confront questions like:

- When does a Facebook post count as speaking "as a citizen"?
- Can off-duty speech still disrupt workplace efficiency?
- How should anonymous or pseudonymous speech be treated?

Employers often argue that online speech can erode public trust or workplace cohesion, while employees claim a right to comment on public issues in their private capacity. The outcomes vary widely depending on context.

Missouri Case Law.

Henderson v. Springfield R-12: DEI Training Meets Compelled Speech

The biggest recent decision out of the circuit is *Henderson v. Springfield R-12 School District*, decided en banc on December 30, 2025. Two employees of the Springfield, Missouri school district alleged that a mandatory 2020 equity and diversity training violated their First Amendment rights — not because they were disciplined, but because the presentation itself, coupled with admonitions that nonprofessional behavior could cost them credit and pay, chilled their ability to voice disagreement.

The district court dismissed the case for lack of standing, called it frivolous, and ordered the plaintiffs to pay the school district's attorney's fees. An Eighth Circuit panel largely affirmed (while vacating the fee award). On rehearing, a divided en banc court reversed 6-5, holding the plaintiffs had alleged a sufficiently concrete injury to establish standing because the training's structure credibly threatened adverse consequences for expressing

disagreement. Writing for the majority, Judge Erickson concluded that "the harm is in the suppression of the speech itself, and one is not subjected to punishment for self-censorship."

Judge Colloton's dissent warned of the doctrinal stretch, that under the majority's approach, "an employer who trains on any subject from any point of view, while requiring employees to be professional, is subject to a federal lawsuit by an employee who disagrees with the training and keeps quiet." The case now returns to the district court, and how it shakes out on the merits will matter well beyond Springfield. The ruling lowers the bar for public employees in the Eighth Circuit challenging mandatory workplace trainings on First Amendment grounds, a dynamic likely to produce more litigation as public employers continue to wrestle with DEI and equity programming.

Practical Implications for Public Employers

Public employers should be aware that public employees may be engaged in protected speech based on a variety of factors.

- Speaking outside official duties increases the likelihood of protection.
- Framing speech around public issues strengthens constitutional claims.
- The manner and setting of speech matter as much as the content.
- Even protected speech can lose protection if it severely disrupts operations.