

REVIEW COMMITTEE DECISION

Review Committee File Nos. 628, 690, 812, 822, 839, 913, 933, 968, 1065, 1089, 1101, 1138, 1143, 1146, 1182, 1239, 1258, 1259, 1260, and 1281

De Sabla Division Grievance Nos. D.Gr/C 10-65-8 and D.Gr/C 10-67-7

Humboldt Division Grievance No. D.Gr/C 19-69-3

North Bay Division Grievance Nos. D.Gr/C 4-68-6, D.Gr/C 4-68-11, D.Gr/C 4-71-18

D.Gr/C 4-72-2, D.Gr/C 4-73-2, D.Gr/C 4-73-4, D.Gr/C 4-73-5, and D.Gr/C 4-73-12

San Jose Division Grievance Nos. D.Gr/C 8-65-4, D.Gr/C 8-71-12, and D.Gr/C 8-71-29

San Francisco Division Grievance Nos. D.Gr/C 2-69-9, D.Gr/C 2-70-26,

D.Gr/C 2-71-15, D.Gr/C 2-72-5, and D.Gr/C 2-72-21

Stockton Division Grievance No. D.Gr/C 16-70-1

Statement of Facts

These grievances involve either the reclassification or rate of pay of clerical positions in the Division Customer Services or Operating Departments.

The issues in the grievances can be narrowed down to one, the method in which the Company evaluates and classifies clerical jobs. Prior to December 8, 1969, the Company utilized the Clerical Job Evaluation Plan to determine classifications and rates of pay. The plan is essentially a point system that weighs the degree of responsibility of factors that make up individual jobs. The Company substituted a revised evaluation plan, referred to as the "Cross-Hatch" Clerical Grade Index, after December 8, 1969. The primary difference between this method and the former plan is the addition of "percent of time spent" to complement the "degree of responsibility" on individual factors. This allows the job analyst to pinpoint levels of responsibility more accurately and give consideration to the time spent in proportion to the overall job. The Union took exception to the latter plan inasmuch as they believed that, before it could be utilized or accepted, it had to be agreed upon between the parties. Further, these grievances which necessarily involve the expertise of application of the "Cross-Hatch" Clerical Grade Index did not lend themselves readily to resolution in the Review Committee.

Discussion

The Review Committee, after several discussions and meetings, finally concluded that agreement could not be reached on how to evaluate and classify clerical jobs, let alone settle the grievances. By mutual agreement, the Review Committee formed a subcommittee to discuss the entire problem of job evaluation. This "Cross-Hatch" Committee consisted of Company's Director of Wage and Salary and his staff, four Union members from the Clerical Bargaining Unit, and members of the Review Committee.

After several meetings, the "Cross-Hatch" Committee agreed to the principles of the "Cross-Hatch" Clerical Grade Index as a means of resolving those grievances currently before the Review Committee. The Review Committee then requested the "Cross-Hatch" Committee to evaluate all of the pending grievances and submit their recommendations for settlement to the Review Committee. The following are the agreed to recommendations of the "Cross-Hatch" Committee:

<u>R.C. No.</u>	<u>Division</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Recommendation - Clerical Classification</u>
628	San Jose	Reclassification of Steno A to Clerk-Steno C, Redwood City.	Clerk-Steno C - no adjustment
690	De Sabla	Job assignment and rate of pay of Clerk C, Chico office.	Clerk C - no adjustment
812	North Bay	Reclassification of Clerk C to Clerk D, Guerneville office.	Clerk C
822	De Sabla	Job assignments and rates of pay of Clerk D's and C's, Customer Services, Chico office.	Clerk D - no adjustment
839	North Bay	Should the Clerk B, Building Maintenance Section, San Rafael, be reclassified to a Clerk A.	Clerk B - no adjustment
913	San Francisco	Work assignments of three Clerk B's, Customer Services.	Clerk A - G. Houston Clerk B - B. Klementz - no adjustment Clerk B - A. McDaniels - no adjustment
933	Humboldt	Job assignment and rate of pay of Clerk C during the absence of the Clerk B, Garberville office.	Clerk C - no adjustment
968	Stockton	Reclassification of Clerk B to Clerk C, Substation Department.	Clerk C - no adjustment
1065	San Francisco	Reclassification of Clerk C to Clerk D, Electric Dept.	Clerk D - no adjustment
1089	San Jose	Reclassification of Clerk A to Clerk B, Customer Services.	Clerk B - The Committee is in disagreement as to the appropriate classification at the time the grievance was filed. However, the job currently rates as a Clerk B; and the Committee cannot determine when the change took place.

<u>R.C. No.</u>	<u>Division</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Recommendation - Clerical Classification</u>
1101	San Francisco	Reclassification of Clerk B to Clerk C, Electric Department.	Clerk C - no adjustment
1138	North Bay	Reclassification of PBX Operator A to PBX Operator B, Customer Services, San Rafael.	PBX Operator B - no adjustment
1143	San Jose	Job assignments and rates of pay of Clerk C, Clerical Operating Dept.	Clerk C - no adjustment
1146	North Bay	Reclassification of Clerk A to Clerk B, Operating Department, San Rafael.	Clerk B - no adjustment
1182	San Francisco	Reclassification of Clerk A to Clerk C, Electric Department.	Clerk C - no adjustment
1239	San Francisco	Job assignments of two Clerk B's, Customer Services.	Clerk B - no adjustment
1258	North Bay	Reclassification of Clerk C to Clerk-Steno D, Commerical Dept., Santa Rosa.	Clerk D - no adjustment
1259	North Bay	Reclassification of Supervising Clerk B to Clerk C, Customer Services, San Rafael.	Clerk C - no adjustment
1260	North Bay	Reclassification of Clerk B to Clerk-Typist D, Customer Services, Vallejo.	Clerk-Typist D - no adjustment
1281	North Bay	Reclassification of Clerk A to Clerk B, Gas Dept., Vallejo.	Clerk B - no adjustment

Decision


After a thorough examination of all the facts surrounding the grievances and the "Cross-Hatch" Committee's recommendations, the Review Committee has decided the following:

1. The reclassification and job assignments of Review Committee Case Nos. 628, 690, 822, 839, 933, 968, 1065, 1089, 1101, 1138, 1143, 1146, 1182, 1239, 1258, 1259, 1260, and 1281 were proper and are closed without adjustment.
2. The reclassification from Clerk C to Clerk D was improper in Review Committee Case No. 812, and the grievant will be reclassified as a Clerk C, Guerneville. Additionally, the Clerk D is entitled to the Clerk C rate of pay for all time worked as a Clerk D in the Guerneville office since the initial reclassification.
3. In Review Committee Case No. 913, the work assignments of grievant G. Houston warranted the Clerk A rate of pay; and he is to be paid at the Clerk A rate of pay from the time the grievance was filed until his reclassification to Clerk A in June of 1972 (excluding time worked in other classifications). The remaining two grievants were properly assigned work within their Clerk B classifications.
4. There are two issues in Review Committee Case No. 1239. The first issue is one of the proper rate of pay of two Clerk B's while working in the new business section of the Customer Services Department. The second issue is an alleged sex discrimination charge by the female Clerk B's performing the same work as the male Clerk A. The Review Committee agrees with the "Cross-Hatch" Committee that the Clerk B's were properly paid for the work they performed. As to the second issue, the Review Committee is of the opinion that it was not a case of sex discrimination, but simply one of retaining a long-service employee at a higher rate of pay, a practice that has been followed, in the appropriate case, without regard to sex.

FOR UNION:

W. H. Burr
E. R. Sheldon
L. N. Foss

By




Date March 22, 1974

FOR COMPANY:

J. A. Faichild
P. Matthew
L. V. Brown

By



Date March 22, 1974