

REVIEW COMMITTEE



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY LABOR RELATIONS DEPARTMENT 375 N. WIGET LANE, SUITE 130 WALNUT CREEK, CA 94598 (530) 246-6430 INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO LOCAL UNION 1245, I.B.E.W. P.O. BOX 2547 VACAVILLE, CALIFORNIA 94696 (707) 452-2700

KIT STICE, SECRETARY

CLAIRE IANDOLI, CHAIRPERSON

DECISION

LETTER DECISION

PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

Pre-Review Committee Numbers 22807 and 22870 Customer Care – Contact Center Operations – Fresno

Chris Diamond Company Member Local Investigating Committee Graciela Clark Union Member Local Investigating Committee

Subject of the Grievance

These cases concern a Decision Making Leave issued to a Customer Service Representative for continued work performance problems related to mishandling customer calls, and the Grievant's subsequent termination for making a threat of violence against her supervisor and obstructing a Corporate Security investigation.

Facts of the Case

At the time of the DML, which was issued for using personal email while on live customer calls, Grievant had an active Oral Reminder, Written Reminder and two Coach/Counseling subsequent to the Written, all in the Work Performance category. During the LIC meeting, Grievant acknowledged that she had been disciplined in the past for using her personal email while on calls with customers.

The event that led to termination involved threats of violence made by the Grievant against her supervisor following the issuance of the DML, and for attempting to obstruct the investigation into the threats by Corporate Security.

Discussion

Union maintained that Grievant's actions with the personal emails were due to her concern about her schedule being accurate. Since the emails were related to her work and were time sensitive, Union opined that Grievant should not have been disciplined for it. Company stated that Grievant had progressed through the disciplinary process for work performance issues, including discipline for mishandling customer calls and other violations of Contact Center policies, and had continually failed to change her behavior. Once Grievant returned from the DML and chose to remain with PG&E, she was on notice for her total performance.

Union opined that the Company's investigation into alleged threats of violence did not prove that the Grievant had violated Company policy or interfered with the investigation by Corporate

Security. Company stated that threats made by the Grievant were substantiated, as were her attempts to obstruct the investigation into the allegations. The Company has clearly communicated that making threats about workplace violence will not be tolerated, and has no choice but to take all threats of violence seriously. Grievant was on a DML when she chose to make the threats and when she interfered with the investigation into the threats. Therefore, termination of her employment is warranted.

Decision

The Committee agreed that the DML and subsequent termination were for just and sufficient cause. This case is closed.

s/Clare Id. 3.15.17

Claire Iandoli, Chairperson Date Review Committee

3/15 117

Kit Stice, Secretary Review Committee

Date