

# VIA FACSIMILE AND U.S. CERTIFIED MAIL #7005 0390 0005 7226 0547

October 4, 2005

Mr. Jerome Whittaker State Compensation Insurance Fund 655 North Central Avenue Glendale, CA 91203

RE: Grievance of All Affected Staff Counsel

SCIF- Glendale, Legal Unit B

Dear Mr. Whittaker:

CASE is filing the attached grievance with you for resolution at the first level. CASE was granted an extension in which to file this grievance.

I can be reached at (916) 669-5869 or mminer@calattorneys.org.

wir Minie

Sincerely,

Monica Miner

CASE Labor Relations Representative

Enclosures

cc:

Raquel Silva- CASE Executive Director

Holly Wilkens- CASE President

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

## **EMPLOYEE CONTRACT GRIEVANCE**

STD 630 (Rev 7/00)

GRIEVANT'S NAME (Person Effected)	aw Judges	HOME TELEPHONE NUMBER	
All Affected Staff Counsel- Glendale,	Legal Unit B		
MAILING ADDRESS (NUMBER/STREET)	(CITY)	(ZIP CODE	
655 North Central Avenue	Glendale	91203	
DEPARTMENT	DIVISION OR FACILITY	SECTION, BRANCH, UNIT ETC.	
State Compensation Insurance Fund		The state of the s	
	NORMAL WORKING HOURS	WORK TELEPHONE NUMBER	
Staff Counsel			
REPRE	ESENTATION INFORMATION (COMPLETE IF	APPLICABLE)	
REPRESENTATIVE'S NAME	TELEPHONE NUMBER	ORGRANIZATION OR AFFILIATION	
Monica Miner	(916) 669-5869	CASE	
	TRACKING INFORMATION		
DEPARTMENTAL TRACKING NUMBER	DEPARTMENTAL SECOND TRACKING NUMBER	UNION TRACKING NUMBER	
Jere - Berra			
	Please Refer to The Bargaining Unit Co		
	For Specific Information Regarding Em		
	For Specific Information Regarding Emprocedures and Time Frame Requirement		
	Procedures and Time Frame Requirement	ents for That Unit.	

SPECIFIC ARTICLE(S) AND SECTION(S) OF CONTRACT ALLEGEDLY VIOLATED

4.3, 6.3, any and all other applicable sections.

## SPECIFIC REMEDY SOUGHT

- 1. CASE requests that SCIF cease and desist from imposing "core hours" on Unit 2 employees;
- 2. CASE requests that SCIF remove any disciplinary document, either informal or formal, from each and every Unit 2 member's Official Personnel file and/or supervisory file and/or any other file kept on Unit 2 employees regarding the failure of that Unit 2 employee to keep "core hours" in violation of the Unit 2 MOU;
- 3. CASE requests that SCIF withdraw any active formal allegations against each and every Unit 2 employee for failure to comply with the "core hours" in violation of the Unit 2 MOU;
- 4. CASE requests that SCIF take immediate steps to make whole any Unit 2 employee who received any formal discipline for their failure to keep "core hours" in violation of the Unit 2 MOU;
- CASE requests that SCIF cease and desist from requiring Staff Counsel from reporting absences to their secretaries:
- 6. CASE requests that Staff Counsel not be expected to be at the work location by an assigned time;
- 7. CASE requests any and all other applicable remedies.

SIGNATURE OF GRIEVANT	1.	1	0 11	1114	DATE FILED
- Monus	Mence	Leu	all	appeless	10/4/05
100000		1		11	7.0

ATE RECEIVED	GRIEVANCE REVIE		
NIE REGEIVED	DATE OF RESPONSE	LEVEL I DECISION TO BE ENTER	RED BELOW
AVITURE OF LEVEL 180451450			
GNATURE OF LEVEL I REVIEWER	PRINTED NAME AND TIT	LE	TELEPHONE NUMBER
I CONCUR AND DO NOT	I DO NOT CONCUR AND APPEAL TO	GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	DATE
APPEAL TO THE SECOND	THE SECOND REVIEW LEVEL (IF	A.	9
REVIEW LEVEL	CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)	_	
ASON FOR APPEAL	III A		
	GRIEVANCE REVIE	WLEVEL II	
TE RECEIVED	DATE OF RESPONSE		
		☐ DECISION ATTACHED	
GNATURE OF LEVEL II REVIEWER		PRINTED NAME AND TITLE	
_vc		· P	
- Tu aquaya wa na yaz	I —	GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	I DATE
I CONCUR AND DO NOT	I DO NOT CONCUR AND APPEAL TO	GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	DATE
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL	I DO NOT CONCUR AND APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)	GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	DATE
APPEAL TO THE THIRD	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF	GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	DATE
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF	GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	DATE
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF	GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	DATE
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF	GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	DATE
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF	GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	DATE
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF	GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	DATE
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL EASON FOR APPEAL	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)  GRIEVANCE REVIE		DATE
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL EASON FOR APPEAL	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)		DATE
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL  EASON FOR APPEAL  ATE RECEIVED	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)  GRIEVANCE REVIE	WLEVEL III	DATE
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL  EASON FOR APPEAL  ATE RECEIVED	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)  GRIEVANCE REVIE	WLEVEL III	DATE
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL  EASON FOR APPEAL  ATE RECEIVED	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)  GRIEVANCE REVIE	WLEVEL III  DECISION ATTACHED PRINTED NAME AND TITLE	
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL  EASON FOR APPEAL  ATE RECEIVED  GNATURE OF LEVEL III REVIEWER  I CONCUR AND DO NOT	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)  GRIEVANCE REVIE  DATE OF RESPONSE	WLEVEL III	DATE
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL  EASON FOR APPEAL  ATE RECEIVED  GNATURE OF LEVEL III REVIEWER  I CONCUR AND DO NOT APPEAL TO THE FOURTH	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)  GRIEVANCE REVIE  DATE OF RESPONSE  I DO NOT CONCUR AND APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL (IF	WLEVEL III  DECISION ATTACHED  PRINTED NAME AND TITLE  GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL  SASON FOR APPEAL  STE RECEIVED  SNATURE OF LEVEL III REVIEWER  I CONCUR AND DO NOT APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)  GRIEVANCE REVIE  DATE OF RESPONSE	WLEVEL III  DECISION ATTACHED PRINTED NAME AND TITLE	
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL  SASON FOR APPEAL  STE RECEIVED  SNATURE OF LEVEL III REVIEWER  I CONCUR AND DO NOT APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)  GRIEVANCE REVIE  DATE OF RESPONSE  I DO NOT CONCUR AND APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL (IF	WLEVEL III  DECISION ATTACHED  PRINTED NAME AND TITLE  GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL  EASON FOR APPEAL  STE RECEIVED  GNATURE OF LEVEL III REVIEWER  I CONCUR AND DO NOT APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)  GRIEVANCE REVIE  DATE OF RESPONSE  I DO NOT CONCUR AND APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL (IF	WLEVEL III  DECISION ATTACHED  PRINTED NAME AND TITLE  GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL  EASON FOR APPEAL  ATE RECEIVED  GNATURE OF LEVEL III REVIEWER  I CONCUR AND DO NOT APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)  GRIEVANCE REVIE  DATE OF RESPONSE  I DO NOT CONCUR AND APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL (IF	WLEVEL III  DECISION ATTACHED  PRINTED NAME AND TITLE  GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL  EASON FOR APPEAL  ATE RECEIVED  GNATURE OF LEVEL III REVIEWER  -  I CONCUR AND DO NOT APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)  GRIEVANCE REVIE  DATE OF RESPONSE  I DO NOT CONCUR AND APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL (IF	WLEVEL III  DECISION ATTACHED  PRINTED NAME AND TITLE  GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL  EASON FOR APPEAL  ATE RECEIVED  GNATURE OF LEVEL III REVIEWER  I CONCUR AND DO NOT APPEAL TO THE FOURTH	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)  GRIEVANCE REVIE  DATE OF RESPONSE  I DO NOT CONCUR AND APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL (IF	WLEVEL III  DECISION ATTACHED  PRINTED NAME AND TITLE  GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL  EASON FOR APPEAL  ATE RECEIVED  GNATURE OF LEVEL III REVIEWER  I CONCUR AND DO NOT APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)  GRIEVANCE REVIE  DATE OF RESPONSE  I DO NOT CONCUR AND APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL (IF	WLEVEL III  DECISION ATTACHED  PRINTED NAME AND TITLE  GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL  SASON FOR APPEAL  STE RECEIVED  SNATURE OF LEVEL III REVIEWER  I CONCUR AND DO NOT APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL	THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)  GRIEVANCE REVIE  DATE OF RESPONSE  I DO NOT CONCUR AND APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL (IF	WLEVEL III  DECISION ATTACHED PRINTED NAME AND TITLE  GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE —	
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL  EASON FOR APPEAL  ATE RECEIVED  GNATURE OF LEVEL III REVIEWER  I CONCUR AND DO NOT APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL  EASON FOR APPEAL	GRIEVANCE REVIE  DATE OF RESPONSE  I DO NOT CONCUR AND APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)	WLEVEL III  DECISION ATTACHED PRINTED NAME AND TITLE  GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE	
APPEAL TO THE THIRD REVIEW LEVEL  EASON FOR APPEAL  ATE RECEIVED  GNATURE OF LEVEL III REVIEWER  -  I CONCUR AND DO NOT APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL	GRIEVANCE REVIE  DATE OF RESPONSE  GRIEVANCE REVIE  DATE OF RESPONSE  I DO NOT CONCUR AND APPEAL TO THE FOURTH REVIEW LEVEL (IF CHECKED, STATE REASON BELOW)  GRIEVANCE REVIE	WLEVEL III  DECISION ATTACHED PRINTED NAME AND TITLE  GRIEVANT'S SIGNATURE —	

## STATEMENT OF FACTS- SCIF, GLENDALE LEGAL UNIT B

SCIF is in violation of Section 4.3 and 6.3 of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Union and the State per an email that Attorney In Charge Jerry Whitaker, Glendale Legal Unit B, sent to all Unit 2 members on July 14, 2005. (See Attached). First, the email is a violation of the MOU as it requires Unit 2 members to report their whereabouts to their secretary. This is a violation of 6.3 of the MOU which states that "employees are responsible for keeping management reasonably apprised of their schedule and whereabouts." Secretaries are not management and therefore Staff Counsel should not be reporting to them.

Second, Staff Counsel are expected to be in the office between 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on weekdays. The email states that Staff Counsel are accountable for the time between 8 am and 5 pm. However what is being enforced is that they are required to be in the office when not at hearings or depositions. By Mr. Whitaker's requirement, SCIF is imposing "core hours" on the Staff Counsel at Glendale Legal Unit B in violation of the MOU, and treating Unit 2 employees as hourly employees.

Third, the email fails to take into account that the Staff Counsel are expected to work all hours necessary to complete the work assigned per section 6.3 of the MOU. The expectation is that they will work an average of 40 hours per week. Many Staff Counsel assigned to Unit B work well beyond the normal business hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. including late into the evening. They are averaging well over 40 hours per week even though they are not physically present in the office. They are completing the work assigned on a timely and professional basis. The requirement that attorneys be in the office at 8 every morning and remain in the office until 5 every evening unless they are in a hearing or deposition, is in essence the same as requiring them to punch in and out, a "time clock", which is a violation of section 6.3 of the MOU. CASE did not agree to negotiate this provision which is included in the current MOU and is still being given effect per Government Code section 3517.8. SCIF's action also violates section 4.3 of the MOU.

#### Susan Taeb

From:

Jerome P. Whitaker

Sent: To: Thursday, July 14, 2005 11:10 AM

Alan B. Fein; Alexandra M. Montgomery; Elizabeth Rifkin; Frank R. Burton; Gevik Anjirgholian; Gilberto Y. Moreno; Gustavo E. SanJose; Hagop H. Baronian; Jay K. Nakasone; Katherine Harvey-Edwards; Leslie B. Ferguson; Lila Mahooti; Lisa Bushin; Mark S. Poindexter; Patrick D. Bingham; Paul D. Bishop; Richard G. Adams; Robert A. Wilson; Romeo Y. Ybanez; Roxanne B. Paige; Sheronda L. Edwards; Shivonne N. Theresia; Susan Taeb; Victor C. Bolden; Zinnia C. Barrero; A. Lidia Castro; Alice M. Rosales; Armando Martinez; Carolyn A. Oconnor; Deborah A. Carpenter; Elizabeth Herrera; Erma Cisneros; Felisha Williams; Grazia Tangorra; JoAnn Mercado; Kate V. Addy; Linda L. Mercurio; Marcy R. Garcia; Mosi T. Odom;

Peachy M. Valenciano; Samuel G. Agcaolli; Susan R. Lawrence; Tony D. Maranan

Use of Time

Subject:

I am beginning to notice that some of the attorney offices are beginning to be backed up on mail. Some instances of this may be due to secretarial problems and both Alice and I are aware of where this is true. I also recognize that we have recently have had some very heavy calendars. Nevertheless, many attorneys manage to get into their offices and do their mail timely. Thank you to those of you who do this. At the risk of sounding like a broken record, below is the official policy on use of attorney time:

- If you are not on calendar in the morning, you are expected to be in the office.
- If you are not on calendar in the afternoon, absent other considerations, you are expected to be in the office.
- You are accountable for your time during normal business hours. Which is 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. This is the time when adjusters, the WCAB, employers and your opposition expect to be able to contact you. If you cannot be in the office for some reason, e.g., you are held over at the Board, you are required to let your secretary know where you are.
- NOTE: you are not allowed to work at home during business hours instead of coming into the office without specific permission.

Finally, lets realize that we are all doing the Fund's work and need to be understanding with each other. The more harmony we have the better our work product will be. Jerome Whitaker Attorney in Charge Glendale Legal Unit B Telephone (818)291-7373 FAX (818)291-7536

## Monica

From: Jean A. Rowan [jarowan@scif.com]

Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2005 3:43 PM

To: MMiner@calattorneys.org

Cc: Kathy A. McDonald

Subject: RE: Extension to file grievances

Monica,

The address is the same: 655 N. Central Avenue, Glendale, CA 91203.

Julie Mason - Legal Unit E Jerry Whitaker - Legal Unit B

Thank you for allowing me time to look into the III percentages.

Jean

----Original Message----

**From:** Monica [mailto:mminer@calattorneys.org] **Sent:** Wednesday, September 21, 2005 3:15 PM

To: Jean A. Rowan

Subject: RE: Extension to file grievances

Jean,

Thank you for the extension. I will file the 6.3 grievances with Mr. Whitaker and Ms. Mason. Is Ms. Mason at the same address as Mr. Whitaker?

As for the III issue, that is fine for you to research and get back to me. I will see what I can find out from my end.

Monica Miner CASE Labor Relations Representative 2495 Natomas Park Road, Ste. 550 Sacramento, CA 95833 (916) 669-5869 (916) 669-4199 FAX

----Original Message----

From: Jean A. Rowan [mailto:jarowan@scif.com] Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2005 3:03 PM

To: MMiner@calattorneys.org

Subject: RE: Extension to file grievances

Monica,

October 4th is acceptable. Are you going to filing the grievance(s) with Julie Mason and Jerry Whitacker? I want to let Kathy McDonald know, since I'll be out of the office that week.

I see better your approach on the IIIs. I'm not sure what the percentages are office by office, so if you'll allow me to do some research on this, I might be able to respond. Unfortunately, I won't be able to do so until the second week of October when I'll be back in the office.

Jean

----Original Message----

From: Monica [mailto:mminer@calattorneys.org]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2005 3:05 PM

To: Jean A. Rowan

Subject: RE: Extension to file grievances

Jean,

Would Oct 4 be OK to file the 6.3 core hours grievance?

Also, I am looking into the issue about the cap on the IIIs. My information is that the 55% cap is office by office at SCIF whereas CASE's position is that the attorney pool needs to be assessed by a department on a statewide basis. So what is happening is that people are not being promoted to the III position at their current office because the 55% cap is being invoked on the office. If however, the cap was evaluated at a statewide level then more attorneys could become IIIs.

Monica Miner CASE Labor Relations Representative 2495 Natomas Park Road, Ste. 550 Sacramento, CA 95833 (916) 669-5869 (916) 669-4199 FAX

----Original Message----

From: Jean A. Rowan [mailto:jarowan@scif.com] Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2005 11:29 AM

To: MMiner@calattorneys.org

Subject: RE: Extension to file grievances

Monica,

I agree to an extension for filing a grievance over Article 6.3.C. Do you have an idea as to when you expect to be able to file it? Kathy McDonald is out of the office this week, and I will be out of the office from September 26 through October 7. It would just be helpful to have an idea when to expect it for response pursposes.

With regard to the cap language, we didn't spend much time on that point, so perhaps you might provide a little more explanation as to how you believe State Fund has violated

Article 15.1.

Jean

[Jean A. Rowan] -----Original Message-----

From: Monica [mailto:mminer@calattorneys.org]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2005 11:18 AM

To: Jean A. Rowan

Cc: mminer@calattorneys.org

Subject: Extension to file grievances

Jean,

This is to confirm that we spoke on Monday and you have granted me an

extension to file grievances regarding the core hours issues arising out of the 2 Glendale locations.

Also, I spoke with you regarding the 55% cap on IIIs is being applied office by office as opposed to statewide. It is CASE's position that the cap is statewide per department as opposed to office by office. I would also like an extension in which to file so that you may have an opportunity to look into the matter.

Thank you.

Monica Miner CASE Labor Relations Representative 2495 Natomas Park Road, Ste. 550 Sacramento, CA 95833 (916) 669-5869 (916) 669-4199 FAX