

2004 CPER INDEX

An index to the 2004 issues of
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RELATIONS (CPER)
Issues 164-169

A service of the California Public Employee Relations Program

Carol Vendrillo, *Director*

Institute of Industrial Relations
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720-5555
(510) 643-7092

<http://cper.berkeley.edu>

Prior editions of the CPER Index, from 1969 to 2003, are available.
For cost and order information, call CPER at (510) 643-7092.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

How to Use the CPER Annual Index *i*

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Part I: General Index | 1 |
| Part II: Table of Cases | 21 |
| Part III: Table of PERB Orders and Decisions | 30 |
| Section A: Annotated Table of PERB Orders and Decisions | 30 |
| Dills Act Cases | 30 |
| EERA Cases | 31 |
| HEERA Cases | 35 |
| MMBA Cases | 36 |
| Section B: Key to Orders and Decisions by PERB Decision Number | 39 |
| Part IV: Index of Arbitration | 45 |
| Grievance Actions | 45 |
| Neutrals | 47 |

HOW TO USE THE CPER ANNUAL INDEX

The 2004 issues of the *CPER* bimonthly periodical — No. 164 (February) through No. 169 (December) — are indexed in this edition of the annual *CPER Index*.

The *Index* is arranged in four parts to provide convenient access to information. The first part is a topical index, the second is a table of all court decisions reported in *CPER* periodicals, the third is a table of decisions of the Public Employment Relations Board, and the fourth is an index of arbitration awards abstracted in the periodical. Each part is described below.

Key to *CPER* References

References to material in *CPER* consist of issue and page number, appearing at the end of each entry. For example, page 22 in *CPER* No. 168 is printed as **168:22**. References are only to the first page of an article.

Part I: General Index

This part is the basic topical index to *CPER*. Under each main topic appear: (1) cross references to related topics (or if it is not a main topic, reference to the main topic under which material on that subject is indexed); (2) feature articles by title, with authors noted; (3) annotations of “recent development” news stories; and (4) annotations of Public Employment Relations Board cases reported in these issues.

Cases in the General Index under each topic serve as a subject key to cases that appear in the separate tables of court cases (Part II) and PERB rulings (Part III). (Parts II and III provide complete case titles, official citations, and case annotations, but no subject indexing. See full explanation below.) The PERB cases under each topic include all final board decisions, whether they were reported in a news story or abstracted in the *CPER* log of PERB rulings.

To accommodate the specialized use of the Index for research of arbitration issues, arbitration awards are indexed separately in Part IV. In the General Index, they appear with the entry “arbitration log.” (See description of Part IV, below.)

Unions and associations are listed in the General Index under the topic **Employee Organizations**. *Employers* are under **Employers, California Public**. Most news stories are indexed by employer and employee organization, as well as by topic. All material regarding any one employer (news story, arbitration case, or court or PERB ruling) is indexed by name of the employer.

Major *statutes* appear as General Index topics (such as **Dills Act**). New legislation is indexed under the topic, **Legislation**, as well as under subject headings.

Part II: Table of Cases

This table includes all court cases reported in the 2004 issues of *CPER*. The official title of each case is followed by a brief statement of the court's holding, the official court citations, and the citation to *CPER* analysis of the decision.

Part III: Table of PERB Orders and Decisions

This table contains two sections.

Section A is an annotated table of all final rulings of the Public Employment Relations Board, whether abstracted in the *CPER* log of PERB rulings or featured in a news story. The table is presented in subdivisions reflecting the four statutes under PERB's jurisdiction: the Dills Act, the Educational Employment Relations Act (EERA), the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA), and the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act (MMBA). Each case title is followed by the PERB decision number, year, and reference to the case synopsis appearing in the log of PERB decisions in each issue of *CPER*.

Section B is a key to case titles by PERB decision number.

Decisions are indexed by topic and by employer in the General Index (Part I).

Part IV: Index of Arbitration

This part is a separate index of arbitration awards that were abstracted in the "Arbitration Log" in each periodical. Entries are arranged by the issue in dispute (based on the headnotes used in the Log). In addition, a list of neutrals' names and *CPER* citations to their awards is provided. Awards also are indexed by name of employer in the General Index (Part I).

PART I

GENERAL INDEX

A

ACCOMMODATION

Part-Time Program for Educators Not a Fundamental and Substantial Public Policy/167:40

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Utility District's Affirmative Action Program Violates Proposition 209/168:69

AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT

see Discrimination — Age

AGENCY SHOP, OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL SECURITY, AND DUES DEDUCTION

Recent Developments in Fair Share Fee Law Affecting Public Sector Employers, Unions and Employees (Demain)/167:6

Remedy for Defective Agency Fee Notice Is Not Automatic Refund/164:52

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA)

Employee Leaves of Absence (Backstrom)(Kenny)/169:13
Refusal to Rehire Employee Previously Fired for Drug Problem Does Not Violate ADA/164:79

ARBITRATION

A Glossary of Basic Terms for Labor Arbitration Advocates (Winograd) /165:11

Arbitrator's Award of Attorneys' Fees Upheld by Court of Appeal/164:88

Arbitrator's Award Vacated for Failure to Disclose Prior Service With Law Firm/166:57

Binding-Nonbinding Arbitration: A New Process to Resolve Interest Disputes (Edelman)(Mitchell)/164:6

Body Weight Not Hindrance to Promotion/167:74

Efforts to Win Binding Arbitration in Santa Clara County/166:32

Firefighter Cannot Be Both Permanently Disabled and Ready to Work/169:62

Seasonal Employees Unable to Attain Health Care Benefits/164:86

Supreme Court to Review *SPB v. DPA*/164:56

Voters Reject Ballot Measure for Arbitration of Bargaining Impasses/169:25

ATTORNEYS' FEES

Arbitrator's Award of Attorneys' Fees Upheld by Court of Appeal/164:88

B

BUDGET

CTA and Schwarzenegger: Unlikely Bedfellows Cut School Funds/164:35

Declining Attendance Forces School Closures/164:40

Full Wages During Impasse/167:63

Governor Slashes Labor Institute at U.C./164:62

Inequity in Academia/166:44

Legislature Rejects Schwarzenegger's Attempt to Repeal Contracting-Out Law/166:21

Teachers Lose All Tax Breaks for Buying Classroom Supplies/169:34

West Contra Costa County School District — Wave of the Future? /165:27

C

CALIFORNIA FAMILY RIGHTS ACT

Employee Leaves of Absence (Backstrom)(Kenny)/169:13

CALIFORNIA PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Corrections Performance Review Stresses Management Rights and Responsibilities/167:57
Using CPR to Blow Up Boxes/165:44

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM (CalPERS)

Attorneys Win Right to 'Safety Retirement' in S.F. /165:24

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT

Newspapers, Cities, and Unions Tangle Over Disclosure of Salary Info/168:41
No Disclosure of Court Documents Under Public Records Act/167:28
Public Records Act May Trump Penal Code Confidentiality Provisions/168:43

CALIFORNIA STATE MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

'Don't Mess With PERB': Public Testimony Resoundingly Rejects Plans to Alter PERB (Vendrillo)/168:17

CALIFORNIA STATE TEACHERS RETIREMENT SYSTEM (CalSTRS)

see State Teachers Retirement System, California

CERTIFICATION OF BARGAINING UNIT

see Representation Elections, Recognition, and Decertification Procedures

CITIES

see Employers, California Public — Cities (for entries regarding each city by name)

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964, TITLE VII

see Title VII

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Addendum to CAHP Contract Will Affect Correctional Officers' Pay/168:49
AFSCME Snares Guaranteed Raises for Patient Care Workers/167:46
Agreements Awaiting the Governor/169:45

Attacks on Union Economic Pacts Fizzle/167:53

CSU and CSEA Agree to New Salary Structure, But No Money/168:60

CSU Doctors Gain Little Money in New Contract/169:36

CSU, SETC Wrap Up Reopeners in Two Months/167:51

Faculty's Tentative Pact With CSU Signals New Cooperative Effort/164:59

Legislative Counsel Opinion Undermines CCPOA's Multi-Year Salary Pact/165:40

Pay Raises Defeat Grad Student Strike Threat/164:64

U.C. Librarians Settle for Non-Economic Terms/164:66

What's Happening at DPA? /165:43

CONTRACTING OUT; PRESERVATION OF UNIT WORK

Battle Over School Contract Law Heats Up/164:39

Legislature Rejects Schwarzenegger's Attempt to Repeal Contracting-Out Law/166:21

School District Violated PERB Order; Must Cancel Contract With Private Bus Company/167:31

COURT EMPLOYEES

Court Employees and Interpreters Added to PERB's Jurisdiction/168:39

Court Employees Fight Against Fiscal Cutbacks/166:55

D

DILLS ACT, Gov. Code Secs. 3512-3524

Expanded Scope for State Doctors, Notice to Supervisory Employees, But No Interest Arb for Firefighters/168:55

Legislative Counsel Opinion Undermines CCPOA's Multi-Year Salary Pact/165:40

DISABILITY

Civil Service Law Requires Interactive Process With Asthmatic Employee Before Medical Demotion/168:51

College Instructor Has Only 39 Months From Start of Disability Retirement to Seek Reinstatement/166:24

Firefighter Cannot Be Both Permanently Disabled and Ready to Work/169:62

Refusal to Rehire Employee Previously Fired for Drug Problem Does Not Violate ADA/164:79

Reinstatement With Backpay Warranted Following Dismissal for Work-Related Injury/169:27

DISABILITY RETIREMENT

Disability Retirement Application Foreclosed by Dismissal for Cause/167:24
 Disability Retirement Requires Statewide Incapacity (Vendrillo)/167:19

DISCIPLINE AND DISCHARGE (JUST CAUSE FOR)

Attack on SPB Redirected Toward Corrections/166:37
 Corrections Legislation Signed/169:42
 Disciplining Dishonest Employees: Protecting the Public Fisc and Preserving a Public Employer's Image (Valenzuela)/164:15
 Evidence Against Teacher in Local Disciplinary Proceeding Limited to Four Years/165:28
 Part-Time Program for Educators Not a Fundamental and Substantial Public Policy/167:40
 School Board Did Not Abuse Its Discretion by Imposing Harsher Penalty Than Recommended/167:38
 School District Need Not Retroactively Classify Teacher as Probationary/165:31
 SPB Has Jurisdiction to Consider Statute of Limitations Defense Under Procedural Bill of Rights Act/167:61
 Teacher Cannot Sue for Wrongful Termination or Deprivation of Right to Free Speech/168:28

DISCRIMINATION — AGE

Demotion of Women Over 40 Not Disparate Treatment/169:54
 Supreme Court Finds No Basis for Reverse Age Discrimination Claim in the ADEA/165:49
 Supreme Court to Decide Whether ADEA Prohibits Disparate Impact Discrimination/169:55

DISCRIMINATION — IN GENERAL

see also Americans With Disabilities Act
 Religion in Public Schools
 Reprisals
 Title VII
 A Conscious Look at Unconscious Bias (Laden)/169:6
 Local School Board Wins Confrontation With State Department of Education/166:22
 PSOPBRA Covers Discrimination Complaints Filed With Affirmative Action Office/168:71
 Supervisor Terminated for Harassing Gay Employee Cannot Claim Religious Discrimination/166:49

DISCRIMINATION — RACE

Utility District's Affirmative Action Program Violates Proposition 209/168:69

DISCRIMINATION — RELIGIOUS

see Religious Discrimination

DISCRIMINATION — SEX

see Sex Discrimination

DISMISSAL

Ninth Circuit Smites Devout Christian's Claim of Discrimination/164:77
 Refusal to Rehire Employee Previously Fired for Drug Problem Does Not Violate ADA/164:79
 Teacher Cannot Sue for Wrongful Termination or Deprivation of Right to Free Speech/168:28

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

The Compleat Ombuds: A Spectrum of Resolution Services (Wesley)/166:6

DUE PROCESS

Post-Termination Resignation Does Not Cut Off Backpay for Due Process Violation/168:46
 School Board Did Not Abuse Its Discretion by Imposing Harsher Penalty Than Recommended/167:38

DUES DEDUCTION

Union Did Not Violate Teacher's Civil Rights in Requiring Contribution to Charity/167:34

E

EDUCATION

Finding the Center of California Education (Dannis)/164:29

EDUCATIONAL EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS ACT (EERA)

See also Teachers
 PERB Again Set to Rule on Legality of Union Buttons Worn in Presence of Students/169:30
 School District Violated PERB Order; Must Cancel Contract With Private Bus Company/167:31
 Union Did Not Violate Teacher's Civil Rights in Requiring Contribution to Charity/167:34

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS — COURT EMPLOYEES**California Court Reporters Association**

Court Employees Fight Against Fiscal Cutbacks/166:55

California Official Court Reporters Association

Court Employees Fight Against Fiscal Cutbacks/166:55

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS — FIREFIGHTERS**California Department of Fire Fighters**

Expanded Scope for State Doctors, Notice to Supervisory Employees, But No Interest Arb for Firefighters/168:55

International Association of Firefighters, Loc. 188

City of Richmond Faces Massive Deficit, Tough Choices/165:21

International Association of Firefighters, Loc. 230

Firefighter Cannot Be Both Permanently Disabled and Ready to Work/169:62

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS — HIGHER EDUCATION**Academic Professionals of California**

Recognition Agreement Averts CSU Student Employee Strike/168:57

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees

AFSCME Snares Guaranteed Raises for Patient Care Workers/167:46

Association of Graduate Student Employees-United Auto Workers

Pay Raises Defeat Grad Student Strike Threat/164:64

California Alliance of Academic Student Employees/ UAW

New CSU Student Employee Unit Considers Strike/166:42
Recognition Agreement Averts CSU Student Employee Strike/168:57

California Faculty Association

Faculty's Tentative Pact With CSU Signals New Cooperative Effort/164:59

Recognition Agreement Averts CSU Student Employee Strike/168:57

Union-Sponsored Bills Vetoed/168:62

California School Employees Association

CSU and CSEA Agree to New Salary Structure, But No Money/168:60

Recognition Agreement Averts CSU Student Employee Strike/168:57

Union-Sponsored Bills Vetoed/168:62

State Employees Trades Council

CSU, SETC Wrap Up Reopens in Two Months/167:51

Union of American Physicians and Dentists

CSU Doctors Gain Little Money in New Contract/169:36

University Council of the American Federation of Teachers

U.C. Librarians Settle for Non-Economic Terms/164:66

U.C.'s Unilateral Change of Benefits Altered the Dynamic Status Quo/169:38

University Professional and Technical Employees

U.C.'s Administrative Professionals Reject Representation/165:38

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS — LAW ENFORCEMENT**California Association of Highway Patrolmen**

Legislative Counsel Opinion Undermines CCPOA's Multi-Year Salary Pact/165:40

Addendum to CAHP Contract Will Affect Correctional Officers' Pay/168:49

Claremont Police Officers Association

Supreme Court to Review Vehicle Stop Case/164:51

International Union of Police Associations

ERB Presides Over Tough Representation Battles in Department of Water and Power/167:26

Los Angeles County Professional Peace Officers Association

County Buyback Policy Not Available to Investigators on Disability/165:24

Richmond Police Officers Association

City of Richmond Faces Massive Deficit, Tough Choices/165:21

Sacramento Police Officers Association

Decision to Hire Retirees to Ease Staff Shortage Not Subject to Bargaining/166:26

Review Granted in Second MMBA Scope Case/168:42

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS — LOCAL GOVERNMENTS**County Counsel Attorneys Association**

Efforts to Win Binding Arbitration in Santa Clara County/166:32

Voters Reject Ballot Measure for Arbitration of Bargaining Impasses/169:25

Engineers and Architects Association

ERB Presides Over Tough Representation Battles in Department of Water and Power/167:26

Government Attorneys Association

Efforts to Win Binding Arbitration in Santa Clara County/
166:32

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Loc. 18

ERB Presides Over Tough Representation Battles in Department of Water and Power/167:26

Orange County Employees Association

No Disclosure of Court Documents Under Public Records Act/167:28

Santa Clara County Government Attorneys Association

Voters Reject Ballot Measure for Arbitration of Bargaining Impasses/169:25

Service Employees International Union

ERB Presides Over Tough Representation Battles in Department of Water and Power/167:26

Service Employees International Union, Loc. 535

Dog's Death Does Not Warrant Termination for Animal Control Officer/168:73

Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790

SEIU Local 790, Port of Oakland Reach Accord on Four-Year Pact/165:23

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS — PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES**American Federation of Teachers**

Education Unions: Part of the Solution (Bergan)/165:6

Associated Chino Teachers

Union Did Not Violate Teacher's Civil Rights in Requiring Contribution to Charity/167:34

California Federation of Teachers

Education Unions: Part of the Solution (Bergan)/165:6

California Teachers Association

CTA and Schwarzenegger: Unlikely Bedfellows Cut School Funds/164:35

East Whittier Education Association

PERB Again Set to Rule on Legality of Union Buttons Worn in Presence of Students/169:30

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS — STATE**American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees**

PECG's Contracting-Out Battle Spills Over to Other Units/
166:34

Association of California State Supervisors

Expanded Scope for State Doctors, Notice to Supervisory Employees, But No Interest Arb for Firefighters/168:55

Supervisors' Affiliate Seeks Separation From CSEA/169:47

California Association of Psychiatric Technicians

Agreements Awaiting the Governor/169:45

What's Happening at DPA? /165:43

California Association of Professional Scientists

Pension Reform Faces Legal Challenge/169:44

California Correctional Peace Officers Association

Addendum to CAHP Contract Will Affect Correctional Officers' Pay/168:49

Attacks on Union Economic Pacts Fizzle/167:53

Corrections Performance Review Stresses Management Rights and Responsibilities/167:57

Legislative Counsel Opinion Undermines CCPOA's Multi-Year Salary Pact/165:40

Tinkering With the CCPOA Contract Modification/168:50

What's Happening at DPA? /165:43

California Department of Forestry Firefighters

Legislative Counsel Opinion Undermines CCPOA's Multi-Year Salary Pact/165:40

What's Happening at DPA? /165:43

California State Employees Association

CSEA Pact Thwarts Pension Contribution Increase/167:56

CSEA Retaliated Against Union Officers for Protected Activity/165:46

Pension Reform Faces Legal Challenge/169:44

Seasonal Employees Unable to Attain Health Care Benefits/164:86

Supervisors' Affiliate Seeks Separation From CSEA/169:47

Supreme Court to Determine if Post-and-Bid Pacts Violate Merit Principle/165:42

Using CPR to Blow Up Boxes/165:44

California Union of Safety Employees

Agreements Awaiting the Governor/169:45

Attacks on Union Economic Pacts Fizzle/167:53

Using CPR to Blow Up Boxes/165:44

Consulting Engineers and Land Surveyors of California

PECG's Contracting-Out Battle Spills Over to Other Units/
166:34

International Union of Operating Engineers

Agreements Awaiting the Governor/169:45

What's Happening at DPA? /165:43

Professional Engineers in California Government

PECG's Contracting-Out Battle Spills Over to Other Units/
166:34

Remedy for Defective Agency Fee Notice Is Not Automatic Refund/164:52

Using CPR to Blow Up Boxes/165:44

Union of American Physicians and Dentists

Agreements Awaiting the Governor/169:45

Expanded Scope for State Doctors, Notice to Supervisory Employees, But No Interest Arb for Firefighters/168:55

PECG's Contracting-Out Battle Spills Over to Other Units/166:34

Union of California State Workers

Agreements Awaiting the Governor/169:45

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS — TRANSIT Amalgamated Transit Union

Binding-Nonbinding Arbitration: A New Process to Resolve Interest Disputes (Edelman)(Mitchell)/164:6

Amalgamated Transit Union, Loc. 1277

Body Weight Not Hindrance to Promotion/167:74

EMPLOYERS, CALIFORNIA PUBLIC

Note: Employers are listed under subheadings indicating the type of agency.

California, State of

CSEA Pact Thwarts Pension Contribution Increase/167:56

Full Wages During Impasse/167:63

California Youth Authority

Attack on SPB Redirected Toward Corrections/166:37

Department of Corrections

Addendum to CAHP Contract Will Affect Correctional Officers' Pay/168:49

Attack on SPB Redirected Toward Corrections/166:37

Civil Service Law Requires Interactive Process With Asthmatic Employee Before Medical Demotion/168:51

Corrections Legislation Signed/169:42

Corrections Performance Review Stresses Management Rights and Responsibilities/167:57

Tinkering With the CCPOA Contract Modification/168:50

Department of Finance

Bonds Subject to Legal Approval/169:44

Department of Personnel Administration

Expanded Scope for State Doctors, Notice to Supervisory Employees, But No Interest Arb for Firefighters/168:55

Legislative Counsel Opinion Undermines CCPOA's Multi-Year Salary Pact/165:40

PECG's Contracting-Out Battle Spills Over to Other Units/166:34

Pension Reform Faces Legal Challenge/169:44

Seasonal Employees Unable to Attain Health Care Benefits/164:86

State Employees Win Some, But Contracts Still a Target/166:39

Supreme Court to Review *SPB v. DPA*/164:56

What's Happening at DPA? /165:43

State Personnel Board

Attack on SPB Redirected Toward Corrections/166:37

Civil Service Law Requires Interactive Process With Asthmatic Employee Before Medical Demotion/168:51

Constitutional Merit Principle Does Not Bar Post and Bid Provisions of MOU/164:55

Post-Termination Resignation Does Not Cut Off Backpay for Due Process Violation/168:46

SPB Has Jurisdiction to Consider Statute of Limitations Defense Under Procedural Bill of Rights Act/167:61

Supreme Court to Determine if Post-and-Bid Pacts Violate Merit Principle/165:42

Supreme Court to Review *SPB v. DPA*/164:56

California, University of (U.C.)

AFSCME Snares Guaranteed Raises for Patient Care Workers/167:46

Governor Slashes Labor Institute at U.C./164:62

Inequity in Academia/166:44

Pay Raises Defeat Grad Student Strike Threat/164:64

Retaliation Judgment Against U.C. Lab Reversed/165:34

The Compleat Ombuds: A Spectrum of Resolution Services (Wesley)/166:6

U.C. Faculty Favor Labs/167:49

U.C. Faculty Seeks Buffer From Federal Encroachments on Free Speech and Academic Freedom (Thomson)/168:23

U.C. Librarians Settle for Non-Economic Terms/164:66

U.C.'s Administrative Professionals Reject Representation/165:38

U.C.'s Unilateral Change of Benefits Altered the Dynamic Status Quo/169:38

California State University (CSU)

CSU and CSEA Agree to New Salary Structure, But No Money/168:60

CSU, SETC Wrap Up Reopeners in Two Months/167:51

Faculty's Tentative Pact With CSU Signals New Cooperative Effort/164:59

New CSU Student Employee Unit Considers Strike/166:42

Recognition Agreement Averts CSU Student Employee Strike/168:57

Union-Sponsored Bills Vetoed/168:62

Cities**Anaheim**

Disability Retirement Requires Statewide Incapacity (Vendrillo)/167:19

Claremont

Supreme Court to Review Vehicle Stop Case/164:51

East Whittier

PERB Again Set to Rule on Legality of Union Buttons Worn in Presence of Students/169:30

Monterey Park

Police Officer Penalized for Off-Duty Motorcycle Racing/165:64

Napa

Disability Retirement Application Foreclosed by Dismissal for Cause/167:24

Oakland

Newspapers, Cities, and Unions Tangle Over Disclosure of Salary Info/168:41

Richmond

City of Richmond Faces Massive Deficit, Tough Choices/165:21

Sacramento

Review Granted in Second MMBA Scope Case/168:42

San Diego

Police Officer's Pornographic Videos Shielded by First Amendment Protection/165:56

Underfunded Pension System Burdens City of San Diego/166:39

San Francisco

Attorneys Win Right to 'Safety Retirement' in S.F. /165:24

San Jose

Firefighter Cannot Be Both Permanently Disabled and Ready to Work/169:62

Newspapers, Cities, and Unions Tangle Over Disclosure of Salary Info/168:41

Santa Ana

Fairness Compromised Where Attorney Enjoys Advisory Relationship With Board/164:49

Counties**Alameda**

Alternatives to Layoffs (Holsey) /167:16

Los Angeles

County Buyback Policy Not Available to Investigators on Disability/165:24

Los Angeles (Civil Service Commission)

Failure to Exhaust Administrative, Judicial Remedies Defeats FEHA Claim for Damages/169:23

Los Angeles (Probation Department)

Failure to Exhaust Administrative, Judicial Remedies Defeats FEHA Claim for Damages/169:23

Sacramento

Decision to Hire Retirees to Ease Staff Shortage Not Subject to Bargaining/166:26

San Diego

Public Records Act May Trump Penal Code Confidentiality Provisions/168:43

San Francisco

Attorneys Win Right to 'Safety Retirement' in S.F. /165:24

Santa Clara

Efforts to Win Binding Arbitration in Santa Clara County/166:32

Voters Reject Ballot Measure for Arbitration of Bargaining Impasses/169:25

Stanislaus

Dog's Death Does Not Warrant Termination for Animal Control Officer/168:73

Tulare

Reinstatement With Backpay Warranted Following Dismissal for Work-Related Injury/169:27

School and Community College Districts**Bakersfield City SD**

School District Employee's Disciplinary Record Can Be Disclosed if Complaint Is Substantial and Well-Founded/167:44

Elk Grove USD

Credentialed Teacher Not Entitled to Permanent Status After Two Years/168:37

Long Beach CCD

PERB Reinstates Equitable Tolling Doctrine in Calculations of Limitations Period/164:82

Lucia Mar USD

School District Violated PERB Order; Must Cancel Contract With Private Bus Company/167:31

Oakland USD

Declining Attendance Forces School Closures/164:40

San Gabriel USD

District Not Required to Give Teacher Non-Reelection Notice by March 15/168:35

Santa Monica CCD

College Instructor Has Only 39 Months From Start of Disability Retirement to Seek Reinstatement/166:24

West Contra Costa County USD

West Contra Costa County School District — Wave of the Future? /165:27

Westminster School District

Local School Board Wins Confrontation With State Department of Education/166:22

Special Districts

Coachella Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District
MMBA Unfair Practices Restricted to Six-Month Statute of Limitations (Copeland)/164:25

Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
ERB Presides Over Tough Representation Battles in Department of Water and Power/167:26

Port of Oakland
SEIU Local 790, Port of Oakland Reach Accord on Four-Year Pact/165:23

Transit Districts and Public Transit Agencies
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority
Binding-Nonbinding Arbitration: A New Process to Resolve Interest Disputes (Edelman)(Mitchell)/164:6
Body Weight Not Hindrance to Promotion/167:74

EMPLOYMENT RECORDS
Opportunity to Object to Release of Employment Records Extended to Union Members/167:71

EQUITABLE TOLLING
PERB Reinstates Equitable Tolling Doctrine in Calculations of Limitations Period/164:82

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES
Failure to Exhaust Administrative, Judicial Remedies Defeats FEHA Claim for Damages/169:23
No Exhaustion of Internal Remedies Required Before Filing FEHA Complaint/164:44

F

FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT (FEHA)
Broad Definition of Supervisor Under FEHA/166:52
California Supreme Court Gives Employers Big Break in Harassment Cases/164:69
California Supreme Court Rebukes Legislature for Interpreting Laws/169:50

California Supreme Court to Review Hostile Environment Case/165:52
Coworker's Harassment Outside the Workplace Creates Hostile Work Environment/164:73
Defeats FEHA Claim for Damages/169:23
Demotion of Women Over 40 Not Disparate Treatment/169:54
Districts Split on Retroactivity of Employer Liability for Third-Party Acts/168:63
Employee Leaves of Absence (Backstrom)(Kenny)/169:13
Employer Liable Under FEHA for Client's Harassment of Employee/166:47
Failure to Exhaust Administrative, Judicial Remedies If Supervisor's Retaliatory Motive Is Cause of Dismissal, Employer Is Liable/168:67
New Bill Establishes Uniformity Among Laws Prohibiting Employment Discrimination/169:53
No Exhaustion of Internal Remedies Required Before Filing FEHA Complaint/164:44
Part-Time Program for Educators Not a Fundamental and Substantial Public Policy/167:40
Refusal to Let Employee Attend Convention Is Religious Discrimination/169:56

FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING COMMISSION
Cases
No sexual harassment found where no relationship existed between parties (DFEH v. Mohsen Hossienipoor and Magic Spray) No. 04-02-P/169:92

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT (FLSA)
Changing Into Plant Uniforms Is Compensable Work Time Under FLSA/167:69
Contractually Set Compensation for Canine Duty Not Per Se Exemption From FLSA Overtime Rate/165:59
DOL Regulations Update: Several Changes Affect Public Employment (Walter)/168:6
Full Wages During Impasse/167:63

FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT (FMLA)
Employee Leaves of Absence (Backstrom)(Kenny)/169:13
Schwarzenegger Vetoes Family Leave Benefit for Educational Employees/169:34

FAMILY RIGHTS ACT
see California Family Rights Act

FIREFIGHTERS

Firefighters Take Their Case to the Voters/166:30

FIRST AMENDMENT

Police Officer's Pornographic Videos Shielded by First Amendment Protection/165:56

Verdict in Favor of Teacher Terminated for Defending Disabled Students Upheld/166:18

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

see Due Process

FREE SPEECH

Police Officer's Pornographic Videos Shielded by First Amendment Protection/165:56

Teacher Cannot Sue for Wrongful Termination or Deprivation of Right to Free Speech/168:28

U.C. Faculty Seeks Buffer From Federal Encroachments on Free Speech and Academic Freedom (Thomson)/168:23

Verdict in Favor of Teacher Terminated for Defending Disabled Students Upheld/166:18

G

GAY RIGHTS

see Sex Discrimination

GOVERNMENT CODE

New Bill Establishes Uniformity Among Laws Prohibiting Employment Discrimination/169:53

GRADUATE STUDENTS

Recognition Agreement Averts CSU Student Employee Strike/168:57

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

see Arbitration

H

HARASSMENT

see Discrimination, Sexual Harassment

HIGHER EDUCATION

see Employers, California Public:
— California, University of
— California State University
Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA)

HIGHER EDUCATION EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONS ACT (HEERA), Gov. Code Secs. 3560-3599

see also Employers, California Public:
— California, University of
— California State University
Table of PERB Orders and Decisions (Part III of Index) for PERB rulings listed under 'HEERA'
EAP Not Within HEERA's Scope of Bargaining/168:61
Student Athletes Compete for Employee Rights (Yergovich)/165:17

HOURS OF WORK, OVERTIME, SHIFT AND DUTY ASSIGNMENTS

see Fair Labor Standards Act

I

IMMUNITY OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES/EMPLOYERS

Verdict in Favor of Teacher Terminated for Defending Disabled Students Upheld/166:18

IMPASSE

see Arbitration

INTERFERENCE WITH EMPLOYEES' RIGHTS

PERB Again Set to Rule on Legality of Union Buttons Worn in Presence of Students/169:30

Supreme Court Refuses to Hear *Turlock*: Court of Appeal Decision Depublished/164:38

INTERNET

Civil Service Division Wins Charter, Welcomes New CSEA Officers/163:61

J-K

JURY DUTY

Employee Leaves of Absence (Backstrom)(Kenny)/169:13

L

LABOR CODE

New Bill Establishes Uniformity Among Laws Prohibiting Employment Discrimination/169:53

LAW ENFORCEMENT

see Employee Organizations — Law Enforcement
Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act

LAYOFFS

Alternatives to Layoffs (Holsey) /167:16
OAH, Districts, and Employees Gear Up for 2004 ‘Teacher Layoff Season’/164:36

LEAVES — ANNUAL, DISABILITY, FAMILY, JURY DUTY, MATERNITY, MILITARY, SICK

see California Family Rights Act
Family and Medical Leave Act
Pay and Benefits

LEGISLATION

Battle Over School Contract Law Heats Up (S.B. 1419)/164:39
Corrections Legislation Signed (S.B. 1342)(S.B. 1352)(S.B. 1400)(S.B. 1431) /169:42
Governor Signs Bill to Curb ‘Triple Dipping’ (S.B. 1429)/168:55
Legislature Rejects Schwarzenegger’s Attempt to Repeal Contracting-Out Law (A.B. 2992)(S.B. 1419)/166:21
New Bill Establishes Uniformity Among Laws Prohibiting Employment Discrimination (A.B. 2900)/169:53
New Law Mandates Sexual Harassment Training for Supervisors (A.B. 1825)/169:59
Schwarzenegger Vetoes Family Leave Benefit for Educational Employees (A.B. 1918)/169:34
Teachers Lose All Tax Breaks for Buying Classroom Supplies/169:34
Union-Sponsored Bills Vetoed (A.B. 2849)(A.B. 2339)/168:62

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IN GENERAL)

see also Employers, California Public
— Cities
— Counties
— Special Districts and Authorities
— Transit Districts and Public Transit Agencies
— Meyers-Milias-Brown Act
Local Governments Ride Budget Roller Coaster/164:42

M-N

MAINTENANCE OF MEMBERSHIP

see Agency Shop, Other Organizational Security, and Dues Deduction

MANAGEMENT RIGHTS

see Scope of Bargaining

MANAGERIAL EMPLOYEES

see Supervisory and Managerial Employees

MEYERS-MILIAS-BROWN ACT (MMBA), Gov. Code Secs. 3500-3510

see also Employee Organizations
— Fire
— Law Enforcement
— Local Government
Employers, California Public
— Cities
— Counties
— Table of PERB Orders and Decisions (Part III of Index) for PERB rulings listed under ‘MMBA’
Decision to Hire Retirees to Ease Staff Shortage Not Subject to Bargaining/166:26
MMBA Unfair Practices Restricted to Six-Month Statute of Limitations (Copeland)/164:25
Review Granted in Second MMBA Scope Case/168:42
Supreme Court to Review Vehicle Stop Case/164:51

MILITARY VETERANS CODE

New Bill Establishes Uniformity Among Laws Prohibiting Employment Discrimination/169:53

O**ORGANIZATIONAL SECURITY**

see Agency Shop, Other Organizational Security, and Dues Deduction

OVERTIME

see also Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA)
Pay and Benefits

Contractually Set Compensation for Canine Duty Not Per Se Exemption From FLSA Overtime Rate/165:59
DOL Regulations Update: Several Changes Affect Public Employment (Walter)/168:6

P-Q**PAST PRACTICE**

see Duty to Bargain (Meet and Confer) in Good Faith

PAY AND BENEFITS

see also Retirement and Pensions
CalPERS Moves to Contain Health and Retirement Costs (Thomson)/166:14
Full Wages During Impasse/167:63
Inequity in Academia/166:44

PENSIONS

see also Retirement and Pensions
Underfunded Pension System Burdens City of San Diego/166:39

PICKETING

see Strikes and Job Actions

POLICE

see Employee Organizations — Law Enforcement
Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act

PREGNANCY LEAVE

Employee Leaves of Absence (Backstrom)(Kenny)/169:13

PRIVACY

School District Employee's Disciplinary Record Can Be Disclosed if Complaint Is Substantial and Well-Founded/167:44
U.C. Faculty Seeks Buffer From Federal Encroachments on Free Speech and Academic Freedom (Thomson)/168:23

PRIVATIZATION

see also Contracting Out; Preservation of Unit Work
PECG's Contracting-Out Battle Spills Over to Other Units/166:34

PRIVATIZATION OF GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS

Using CPR to Blow Up Boxes/165:44

PROMOTION

Body Weight Not Hindrance to Promotion/167:74
Constitutional Merit Principle Does Not Bar Post and Bid Provisions of MOU/164:55

PROTECTION AND GOVERNANCE ACT

No Disclosure of Court Documents Under Public Records Act/167:28

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM (PERS)

see also Retirement and Pensions
CalPERS Moves to Contain Health and Retirement Costs (Thomson)/166:14
Governor Signs Bill to Curb 'Triple Dipping'/168:55

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD

'Don't Mess With PERB': Public Testimony Resoundingly Rejects Plans to Alter PERB (Vendriello)/168:17
PERB Appointment Announced/169:60

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD — DUTY OF FAIR REPRESENTATION RULINGS**Dills Act**

Appeal failed to address untimeliness (Toran v. California State Employees Assn.) No. 1593-S/165:73

Limitations period not retrIGGERED each time request for union representation is denied (Sutton v. California State Employees Assn., Loc. 1000) No. 1553-S/164:106

EERA

Allegation deemed timely, but failed to show DFR violation (Gutierrez v. California School Employees Assn., Chap. 244) No. 1606/166:74

Appeal denied where charging party failed to make an effort to understand filing procedures (Henderson v. Teamsters Loc. 572) No. Ad-335/167:93

- Charge dismissed as untimely (*Kaiser v. Fremont Unified Dist. Teachers Assn.*) No. 1572/164:116
- Charge dismissed for failure to state a prima facie case (*Malik v. California Federation of Teachers*) No. 1662/168:100
- Charge failed to state clear and concise statement of facts (*Kestin v. United Teachers of Los Angeles*) No. 1594/165:75
- Charging party's factual allegations assumed true, yet case dismissed (*Larkins v. Chula Vista Elementary Educators Assn.*) No. 1575/164:116
- Late-filed amended charge dismissed (*Sloan v. Shasta College Faculty Assn.*) No. 1603/166:73
- Limitations period does not toll during period when seeking resolution of internal union matter (*Abrams v. Chula Vista Elementary Educators Assn.*) No. 1554/164:115
- Misunderstanding does not rise to level of breach of duty of fair representation (*Ferguson v. Oakland Education Assn.*) No. 1646/168:99
- Request for reconsideration denied for failure to present a valid ground (*Larkins v. Chula Vista Elementary Educators Assn.*) No. 1575a/167:93
- Statute of limitations criticized by individual charging party (*Rossmann et al. v. Orange Unified Education Assn. and California Teachers Assn.*) No. 1569/164:115
- Union has no DFR where it does not control the exclusive means of representation (*Simpson v. California School Employees Assn., Chap. 130*) No. 1550/164:113
- Union has no duty to arbitrate teacher's grievance (*Holford v. United Teachers of Richmond*) No. 1604/166:73
- Union representative can ask employee questions at disciplinary meeting (*Hein v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790*) No. 1677/169:79

HEERA

- Dismissal affirmed for failure to state prima facie case. (*Sarca v. California State Employees Assn., CSU Div.*) No. 1626-H/167:96

MMBA

- Breach of duty of fair representation charge dismissed for failure to state prima facie case (*Banks and Molidpiree v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790, AFL-CIO*) No. 1636-M/167:104
- Charge dismissed a second time for untimeliness (*Montgomery v. SEIU Loc. 790*) No. 1644-M/168:115
- Charge dismissed for failure to establish prima facie violation (*Adza v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790*) No. 1632-M/167:103

- Charge failed to show abuse of discretion (*Siroky v. International Union of Operating Engineers, Loc. 39*) No. 1618-M/166:82
- Denial of representation allowed where grievance lacks merit (*Lowery v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790*) No. 1666-M/169:85
- Five-year contract no bar to unit modification petition (*Sacramento County Aircraft Rescue Firefighters Assn. v. Sacramento Co.*) No. 1581-M/165:82
- No breach of DFR when some employees are dissatisfied with union contract (*Stewart [Mental Health Workers] v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 250*) No. 1610-M/166:81
- No breach of duty of fair representation when grievance lacked merit (*Jeffers v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 616*) No. 1675-M/169:85
- Parties' agreement prohibits 'strikes' but not 'sympathy strikes' (*Oxnard Harbor Dist. v. SEIU Loc. 998*) No. 1580-M/165:80
- Request for reconsideration denied for failure to state a valid ground (*Waqia v. International Association of Firefighters, Loc. 55*) No. 1621a-M/168:116
- Union had no obligation to pursue grievance where success was doubtful (*Waqia v. International Association of Firefighters*) No. 1621-M/166:82

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD — JURISDICTION

- PERB Reinstates Equitable Tolling Doctrine in Calculations of Limitations Period/164:82

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD — REPRESENTATION RULINGS

EERA

- Administrative appeal withdrawn (*Santa Clarita Community College Dist. v. Part-Time Faculty United, AFT*) No. Ad-332/166:73
- Classifications were within existing bargaining unit when new request for recognition was filed (*Delano Joint Union High School Dist., Association of Student Affairs Support Specialists, and California School Employees Assn., Chap. 79*) No. 1678/169:78
- Dismissal of objections affirmed for failure to present specific facts showing interference with union election process (*Pleasant Valley Elementary School Dist. and Group of Employees and SEIU Loc. 998*) No. Ad-333/167:89

Migrant education unit approved (San Joaquin County Office of Education and California School Employees Assn.) No. 1627/167:92

Petition for unit modification granted (Fontana Unified School Dist. and United Steelworkers of America) No. 1623/167:91

Violations found where classifications were improperly designated as management (Associated Administrators of Los Angeles v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist.) No. 1665/169:77

MMBA

Administrative decision affirmed where no good cause exists to excuse untimely petition (Coachella Valley Mosquito & Vector Control Dist. and California School Employees Assn. and its Chap. 2001) No. Ad-336-M/167:101

MTA subsidiary agency not subject to provisions of MMBA (Engineers & Architects Assn. v. Public Transportation Services Corp., No. 1637-M/167:102

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD — UNFAIR PRACTICE RULINGS

CSEA Retaliated Against Union Officers for Protected Activity/165:46

PERB Again Set to Rule on Legality of Union Buttons Worn in Presence of Students/169:30

Dills Act

Board upholds deferral to arbitration (California Union of Safety Employees v. State of California [Department of Parks and Recreation]) No. 1566-S/164:104

Change in monitoring employee timekeeping not within scope of representation (California State Employees Assn. v. State of California [Department of Motor Vehicles]) No. 1558-S/164:102

Charge fails to show retaliation (Kunkel v. State of California) No. 1617-S/166:70

CSEA withdraws exceptions to ALJ's decision (Hard, Hackett, and Perkins v. California State Employees Assn.) No. 1583-S/165:73

Identical appeal receives identical board treatment (California Union of Safety Employees v. State of California [Department of Mental Health]) No. 1567-S/164:104

Implementation of new lifeguard safety policy deferred to arbitration (California Union of Safety Employees v. State of California [Department of Parks and Recreation]), No. 1562-S/164:103

New evidence rejected, untimeliness unexcused (Sarinana v. State of California [Department of Forestry and Fire Protection]) No. 1619-S/166:70

No good cause to file late amended charge (Vickers v. State of California [Department of Corrections]), No. 1559-S/164:103

Procedures for authorizing union leave are negotiable (State of California:[Department of Personnel Administration] v. California State Employees Assn., SEIU Loc. 1000) No. 1601-S/166:68

Provision of security at disciplinary hearing not exclusive to security guard union (California Union of Safety Employees v. State of California:[Department of Developmental Services]) No. 1614-S/166:69

Reconsideration request lacks specificity (Vickers v. State of California[Department of Corrections]) No. 1559a-S/166:67

Removal of bargaining unit chairpersons did not violate Dills Act (Barker and Osuna v. California State Employees Assn.) No. 1551-S/164:101

Request for reconsideration approved where union lacks right to pursue grievance to arbitration (Vickers v. State of California [Department of Corrections]) No. 1540a-S/166:67

Request for writ of prohibition is insufficient on its own to support a finding of discrimination (International Union of Operating Engineers v. State of California [State Personnel Board]), No. 1680-S/169:72

State investigations into fraud constitute adverse action against employee (Zanchi v. State of California [Department of Corrections]) No. 1579-S/164:105

Union appeal withdrawn (California Union of Safety Employees v. State of California Highway Patrol) No. 1574-S/164:105

EERA

Allegation of forced retirement dismissed. (Mrvichin v. Los Angeles Community College Dist.) No. 1667/169:73

Ambiguity in contract language warranted evidentiary hearing (California School Employees Assn., Chap. 82 v. Fullerton Joint Union School Dist.) No. 1633/167:88

Appeal denied for failure to state a prima facie case (Malik v. Compton Community College Dist.) No. 1653/168:96

Appeal denied where charging party failed to make an effort to understand filing procedures (Henderson v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist.) No. Ad-334/167:84

Arbitration decision not repugnant to EERA (Newark Teachers Assn. v. Newark Unified School Dist.) No. 1595/165:74

Board finds teacher's transfer not triggered by protected activity (Las Virgenes Educators Assn. v. Las Virgenes Unified School Dist.) No. 1605/166:71

- Board grants request for withdrawal (Ravenswood Teachers Assn. v. Ravenswood City Elementary School Dist.) No. 1556/164:108
- Board overturns dismissal, orders issuance of complaint alleging contracting out (Long Beach Community College Dist. Police Officers Assn. v. Long Beach Community College Dist.) No. 1568/164:110
- Board reverses dismissal, accepts charging party's allegations as true (American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Loc. 101 v. San Jose Unified School Dist.) No. 1555/164:108
- Change in wage calculation policy was unilateral and unlawful (California School Employees Assn., Chap. 802 v. Lost Hills Union Elementary School Dist.) No. 1652/168:95
- Charge dismissed after California Supreme Court denies review (Turlock Teachers Assn. v. Turlock Joint Elementary School Dist.) No. 1490a/166:70
- Charge dismissed for failure to state a prima facie case of discrimination (Grosfield v. Oxnard Elementary School Dist.) No. 1679/169:76
- Charge dismissed for mootness (Ravenswood Teachers Assn., CTA/NEA v. Edison Schools, Inc.) No. 1661/168:99
- Charge failed to establish past practice to show unilateral change (San Juan Teachers Assn., CTA/NEA v. San Juan Unified School Dist.) No. 1616/166:72
- Charge omits dates and parties involved (DeLauer v. Sonoma Valley Unified School Dist.) No. 1613/166:72
- Charging party fails to state prima facie case for discrimination, lacks standing; PERB lacks jurisdiction (Lee v. Peralta Community College Dist.) No. 1576/164:113
- Charter school deemed public school employer of its teachers (Ravenswood Teachers Assn. v. Ravenswood City Elementary School Dist.; Ravenswood Teachers Assn. v. Edison Brentwood Academy) No. 1660/168:98
- Despite board agent's omissions, charging party did not allege sufficient facts to demonstrate retaliation (Larkins v. Chula Vista Elementary School Dist.) No. 1557/164:108
- Dismissal affirmed for failure to state prima facie case (Salinas Valley Federation of Teachers, AFT Loc. 1020, AFL-CIO v. Salinas Union High School Dist.) No. 1639/167:89
- Dismissal affirmed for failure to state prima facie violation (Stryker v. Antelope Valley College Federation of Teachers) No. 1624/167:85
- District defeats retaliation charge by proving affirmative defense (Maurer v. Coast Community College Dist.) No. 1560/164:109
- District followed removal policy, did not retaliate for protected activity (San Bernardino Association of Substitute Teachers v. San Bernardino City Unified School Dist.) No. 1602/166:71
- District retaliated against three teachers for protected activities (Empire Teachers Assn. v. Empire Union School Dist.) No. 1650/168:92
- District violated PERB order by failing to cancel contract with bus company (California School Employees Assn. v. Lucia Mar Unified School Dist.) No. 1640/167:89
- Employee's complaint is unprotected when taken for her sole benefit (Bailey v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist.) No. 1552/164:107
- Employer may not discipline employee after denying right to union representation in an informational interview (Lake Elsinore Teachers Assn., CTA/NEA v. Lake Elsinore Unified School Dist.) No. 1648/168:89
- Late filing allowed for good cause (Perez v. Fullerton Elementary School Dist.) No. Ad-339/169:74
- No adverse action where employer did not know of protected activity (Astrachan v. Los Angeles Community College Dist.) No. 1668/169:73
- No retaliation found where discipline was justified (Perez v. Fullerton Elementary School Dist.) No. 1671/169:74
- Parties' contractual language insufficient to defer charge (Kaiser v. Fremont USD) No. 1571/164:112
- PERB reinstates equitable tolling doctrine in calculations of limitations period (Long Beach Council of Classified Employees v. Long Beach Community College Dist.) No. 1564/164:110
- Request for reconsideration denied for failure to present a valid ground (Larkins v. Chula Vista Elementary School Dist.) No. 1557a/167:85
- Request for reconsideration denied for failure to state a valid ground (Ferguson v. Oakland Education Assn.) No. 1646a/169:75
- Request to withdraw appeal with prejudice granted (California School Employees Assn., Chap. 209 v. Yucaipa-Calimesa Joint Unified School Dist.) No. 1629/167:86
- Results of election set aside due to unlawful interference (Chula Vista Elementary Education Assn., CTA/NEA v. Chula Vista Elementary School Dist.) No. 1647/168:88
- Retaliation not found where no adverse action occurred (Ferguson v. Oakland Unified School Dist.) No. 1645/168:87

- Revocation of form detailing commitment to school not protected conduct (*United Teachers of Los Angeles v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist.*) No. 1657/168:97
- Teachers denied permanent status because they were not ranked superior (*Bellevue Educators Assn. v. Bellevue Union Elementary School Dist.*) No. 1561/164:109
- Teachers suffered retaliation for protected activities (*Fresno County Office Schools Educators Assn. v. Fresno County Office of Education*) No. 1674/169:75
- Unfair practice charge barred by statute of limitations (*Deglow v. Los Rios Community College Dist.*) No. 1631/167:86
- Unfair practice charge dismissed for lack of standing (*Rossmann v. Orange Unified School Dist.*) No. 1670/169:73
- Union collects agency fees without providing proper *Hudson* notice (*Andrus, Miller, Mettier, and Kerr v. Paso Robles Public Educators*) No. 1589-E/165:73
- Wrong entity charged (*DeLauer v. Santa Rosa Junior College*) No. 1612/166:72
- HEERA**
- 300-page charge fails to provide clear statement of facts (*Sarka and Malkes v. Regents of the University of California*) No. 1592-H/165:79
- Allegation of unilateral change failed without evidence of past practice (*California Faculty Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University*) No. 1672-H/169:80
- Allegations fail to state prima facie case (*Webb v. Trustees of the California State University [San Bernardino]*) No. 1609-H/166:75
- Appeal and charge withdrawn (*Regents of the University of California v. Associate of Graduate Student Employees, United Auto Workers*) No. 1596-H/165:80
- Association's compliance with document request renders complaint moot (*O'Malley v. California Nurses Assn.*) No. 1578-H/164:117
- Board lacks jurisdiction to hear case concerning association not covered by act (*O'Malley v. American Arbitration Assn.*) No. 1573-H/164:117
- Charge dismissed for failure to state a prima facie case (*Academic Professionals of California v. Trustees of the California State University*) No. 1642-H/168:101
- Charge withdrawn (*Security Police Officers Assn. v. Regents of the University of California [Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory]*) No. 1615-H/166:76
- CSEA withdraws charge alleging unilateral student fee increase (*California State Employees Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University*) No. 1599-H/166:74
- Employee lacked standing to challenge refunded agency fees (*O'Malley v. California Nurses Assn.*) No. 1607-H/166:74
- Implementation of student fee increase not within scope of representation (*Academic Professionals of California v. Trustees of the California State University*) No. 1586-H/165:78
- Implementation of student fee increase not within the scope of representation (*California State Employees Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University [San Marcos]*) No. 1584-H/165:76
- Modification of fee waiver program not unlawful unilateral change (*Academic Professionals of California v. Trustees of the California State University*) No. 1654-H/168:102
- Non-agency fee payers have no standing to challenge agency fee payer rights (*O'Malley v. California Nurses Assn.*) No. 1651-H/168:102
- Non-member lacks authority to compel release of union financial report (*Trout v. University Professional and Technical Employees, CWA Loc. 9119*) No. 1582-H/165:75
- Partial abeyance granted pending outcome of arbitration (*State Employees Trades Council United v. Trustees of the California State University [Stanislaus]*) No. 1659-H/168:105
- Public Records Act provides no exemption from information request (*California Faculty Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University*) No. 1591-H/165:79
- Reconsideration request denied for failure to state proper grounds (*Sarka v. Regents of the University of California*) No. 1585a-H/167:93
- Request for reconsideration denied for failure to state a valid ground (*Webb v. Trustees of the California State University [San Bernardino]*) No. 1609a-H/168:102
- Request for reconsideration denied for failure to state a valid ground (*Sarka v. Regents of the University of California*) No. Ad-337a-H/169:81
- Request for special permission denied (*Sarka v. Regents of the University of California*) No. Ad-337-H/167:95
- Return of agency fees cures *Hudson* violation (*O'Malley v. California Nurses Assn.*) No. 1673-H/169:80
- Rule announced in *Sarka* renders charge timely (*American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees v. Regents of the University of California: Davis*), No. 1590-H/165:78
- Statute of limitations does not begin until actual termination (*Sarka v. Regents of the University of California*) No. 1585-H/165:77

- U.C.'s unilateral change of benefits altered the dynamic status quo (University Council American Federation of Teachers v. Regents of the University of California) No. 1689-H/169:81
- Unfair practice charge remanded to evaluate evidence of mutual intent (Regents of the University of California v. California Nurses Assn.) No. 1638-H/167:95
- Unilateral change to employee evaluation system deemed unfair practice (California State Employees Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University [San Marcos]) No. 1635-H/167:94
- Unilateral implementation of non-discrimination policy not unlawful change (Academic Professionals of California v. Trustees of the California State University) No. 1656-H/168:103
- Union reneged on promise to pay for requested documents (California Faculty Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University) No. 1597-H/165:80
- Whistleblower policy does not constitute unilateral change (Academic Professionals of California v. Trustees of the California State University) No. 1658-H/168:104
- MMBA**
- Assignment of duties not within scope of representation (Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790, AFL-CIO v. City and County of San Francisco) No. 1608-M/166:78
- B.A. decision reversed, case remanded to provide union chance to prove impasse involves subject within scope of representation (Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790 v. San Joaquin County) No. 1570-M/164:119
- Board adopts dismissal for failure to file timely charge (International Union of Operating Engineers, Loc. 39, AFL-CIO v. County of Placer) No. 1630-M/167:99
- Board refuses to enforce mediator's recommendation (SEIU, Loc. 790 v. San Joaquin County) No. 1600-M/166:77
- Charge challenging validity of decertification petition dismissed (International Federation of Professional & Technical Engineers, Loc. 21, AFL-CIO v. Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation Dist.) No. 1669-M/169:83
- Charge dismissed a second time for untimeliness (Montgomery v. City and County of San Francisco) No. 1643-M/168:109
- City council permitted to hire consultant to help review grievances (AFSCME Loc. 512 v. City of Pittsburg) No. 1563-M/164:118
- County unlawfully refused to process grievance (Service Employees International Union v. Riverside County) No. 1577-M/164:120
- Dismissal of unfair practice charge affirmed (Brady v. City of Santa Barbara) No. 1628-M/167:98
- District unlawfully denied association access to facilities (Fresno Irrigation District Employees Assn. v. Fresno Irrigation Dist.) No. 1565-M/164:118
- District violated local rules by conducting unit modification election (Operating Engineers, Loc. 3 v. Westlands Water Dist.) No. 1622-M/166:80
- Employer not obligated to meet with employee (Kimbrough v. Alameda County Medical Center) No. 1620-M/166:80
- Employer violated duty of neutrality between employee organizations (Service Employees International Union, Loc. 817 v. County of Monterey) No. 1663-M/168:113
- Good cause exists to sever cases (Service Employees International Union, Loc. 817 v. Monterey County) No. Ad-331-M/166:78
- Informal petition rejected, charge dismissed (SEIU Loc. 1280, AFL-CIO v. Solano County [Human Resources Dept.]) No. 1598-M/166:76
- Insufficient evidence to show alleged promotion delay was retaliation (Lopez v. City of Milpitas) No. 1641-M/168:106
- No liability for expenses beyond backpay and benefits (Bartlett-May et al. v. Otay Water Dist.) No. 1634-M/167:100
- No retaliation where employer would have taken same action regardless (Union of American Physicians and Dentists v. County of San Joaquin [Health Care Services]) No. 1649-M/168:110
- Reconsideration request denied because newly discovered evidence does not render case moot (Service Employees International Union v. County of Riverside) No. 1577a-M/167:97
- Redecoration of book shelving cart not protected activity (Geismar v. Marin County Law Library) No. 1655-M/168:112
- Request for reconsideration denied for failure to state a valid ground (Kimbrough v. Alameda County Medical Center) No. 1620a-M/168:110
- Request to withdraw appeal granted (International Union of Operating Engineers, Loc. 3 v. McCloud Community Services Dist.) No. 1625-M/167:98
- Settlement of past disciplinary actions prevents establishment of past policy (San Francisco Firefighters Union, Loc. 798, IAFF, AFL-CIO v. City and County of San Francisco) No. 1611-M/166:79

Unlawful retaliation found where employee reported illegal activity (Goddard v. Rainbow Municipal Water Dist.) No. 1676-M/169:84

Untimely appeal to file amended charge dismissed (Geismar v. Marin County Law Library) No. Ad-338-M/168:115

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS PROCEDURAL BILL OF RIGHTS ACT

PSOPBRA Covers Discrimination Complaints Filed With Affirmative Action Office/168:71

SPB Has Jurisdiction to Consider Statute of Limitations Defense Under Procedural Bill of Rights Act/167:61

PUBLIC SCHOOLS — GENERAL

Battle Over School Contract Law Heats Up/164:39

CTA and Schwarzenegger: Unlikely Bedfellows Cut School Funds/164:35

Declining Attendance Forces School Closures/164:40

Finding the Center of California Education (Dannis)/164:29

Legislature Rejects Schwarzenegger's Attempt to Repeal Contracting-Out Law/166:21

Local School Board Wins Confrontation With State Department of Education/166:22

OAH, Districts, and Employees Gear Up for 2004 'Teacher Layoff Season'/164:36

School District Employee's Disciplinary Record Can Be Disclosed if Complaint Is Substantial and Well-Founded/167:44

School District Violated PERB Order; Must Cancel Contract With Private Bus Company/167:31

The *Williams* Settlement: How Much Will It Help? /168:32

West Contra Costa County School District — Wave of the Future? /165:27

PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE

New Bill Establishes Uniformity Among Laws Prohibiting Employment Discrimination/169:53

R

RACE DISCRIMINATION

Utility District's Affirmative Action Program Violates Proposition 209/168:69

REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

see also Americans With Disabilities Act

Refusal to Let Employee Attend Convention Is Religious Discrimination/169:56

RECOGNITION

see Representation Elections, Recognition, and Decertification Procedures

REHABILITATION ACT

see also Americans With Disabilities Act

Verdict in Favor of Teacher Terminated for Defending Disabled Students Upheld/166:18

RELIGION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Local School Board Wins Confrontation With State Department of Education/166:22

RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION

Ninth Circuit Smites Devout Christian's Claim of Discrimination/164:77

Refusal to Let Employee Attend Convention Is Religious Discrimination/169:56

Supervisor Terminated for Harassing Gay Employee Cannot Claim Religious Discrimination/166:49

Union Did Not Violate Teacher's Civil Rights in Requiring Contribution to Charity/167:34

REPRESENTATION (REORGANIZATION)

Recognition Agreement Averts CSU Student Employee Strike/168:57

REPRESENTATION ELECTIONS, RECOGNITION, AND DECERTIFICATION PROCEDURES

Supervisors' Affiliate Seeks Separation From CSEA/169:47
U.C.'s Administrative Professionals Reject Representation/165:38

REPRISALS

CSEA Retaliated Against Union Officers for Protected Activity/165:46

Retaliation Judgment Against U.C. Lab Reversed/165:34

RETIREMENT AND PENSIONS

see also Public Employees Retirement System (PERS)

Attorneys Win Right to 'Safety Retirement' in S.F. /165:24
Bonds Subject to Legal Approval/169:44

CalPERS Moves to Contain Health and Retirement Costs (Thomson) /166:14

CSEA Pact Thwarts Pension Contribution Increase/167:56
 Decision to Hire Retirees to Ease Staff Shortage Not Subject to Bargaining/166:26
 Disability Retirement Application Foreclosed by Dismissal for Cause/167:24
 Disability Retirement Requires Statewide Incapacity (Vendrillo)/167:19
 Pension Reform Faces Legal Challenge/169:44

RIGHT TO WORK

see Agency Shop, Other Organizational Security, and Dues Deduction

S

SAFETY SERVICES EMPLOYEES

see Employee Organizations — Firefighters
 Employee Organizations — Law Enforcement

SCOPE OF BARGAINING/REPRESENTATION

Decision to Hire Retirees to Ease Staff Shortage Not Subject to Bargaining/166:26
 EAP Not Within HEERA's Scope of Bargaining/168:61
 Expanded Scope for State Doctors, Notice to Supervisory Employees, But No Interest Arb for Firefighters/168:55
 Review Granted in Second MMBA Scope Case/168:42
 Supreme Court to Review Vehicle Stop Case/164:51

SEX DISCRIMINATION

see also Sex Discrimination
 Demotion of Women Over 40 Not Disparate Treatment/169:54

SEXUAL HARASSMENT

see also Discrimination
 Broad Definition of Supervisor Under FEHA/166:52
 California Supreme Court Gives Employers Big Break in Harassment Cases/164:69
 California Supreme Court to Review Hostile Environment Case/165:52
 Coworker's Harassment Outside the Workplace Creates Hostile Work Environment/164:73
 Districts Split on Retroactivity of Employer Liability for Third-Party Acts/168:63

Employer Liable Under FEHA for Client's Harassment of Employee/166:47
 Hostile Work Environment Must Be as Viewed by Reasonable Member of Affected Group/165:53
 If Supervisor's Retaliatory Motive Is Cause of Dismissal, Employer Is Liable/168:67
 New Law Mandates Sexual Harassment Training for Supervisors/169:59
 Sexual Harassment Victim Who Quit Job May Sue Employer/167:65
 Supervisor Terminated for Harassing Gay Employee Cannot Claim Religious Discrimination/166:49

SEXUAL ORIENTATION

see also Discrimination
 Local School Board Wins Confrontation With State Department of Education/166:22

SHIFT DIFFERENTIAL PAY

see Pay and Benefits

SICK LEAVE

see California Family Rights Act (CFRA)
 Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA)
 Pay and Benefits

STATE EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONS ACT (SEERA)

see Dills Act

STATE TEACHERS RETIREMENT SYSTEM, CALIFORNIA (CalSTRS)

College Instructor Has Only 39 Months From Start of Disability Retirement to Seek Reinstatement/166:24

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

MMBA Unfair Practices Restricted to Six-Month Statute of Limitations (Copeland)/164:25
 PERB Reinstates Equitable Tolling Doctrine in Calculations of Limitations Period/164:82

STUDENT EMPLOYEES

Student Athletes Compete for Employee Rights (Yergovich)/165:17

SUBCONTRACTING

see Contracting Out; Preservation of Unit Work

SUPERVISORY AND MANAGERIAL EMPLOYEES

- Broad Definition of Supervisor Under FEHA/166:52
 Expanded Scope for State Doctors, Notice to Supervisory Employees, But No Interest Arb for Firefighters/168:55

T**TEACHERS**

- See also* Employee Organizations — Public School and Community College Employers, California Public — School and Community College Districts Public Schools — General
 College Instructor Has Only 39 Months From Start of Disability Retirement to Seek Reinstatement/166:24
 Conviction of Felony Later Reduced to Misdemeanor No Bar to Teaching Credential/167:42
 Credentialed Teacher Not Entitled to Permanent Status After Two Years/168:37
 District Not Required to Give Teacher Non-Reelection Notice by March 15/168:35
 Evidence Against Teacher in Local Disciplinary Proceeding Limited to Four Years/165:28
 OAH, Districts, and Employees Gear Up for 2004 ‘Teacher Layoff Season’/164:36
 School District Need Not Retroactively Classify Teacher as Probationary/165:31
 Schwarzenegger Vetoes Family Leave Benefit for Educational Employees/169:34
 Supreme Court Refuses to Hear *Turlock*: Court of Appeal Decision Depublished/164:38
 Teacher Cannot Sue for Wrongful Termination or Deprivation of Right to Free Speech/168:28
 Teachers Lose All Tax Breaks for Buying Classroom Supplies/169:34
 Union Did Not Violate Teacher’s Civil Rights in Requiring Contribution to Charity/167:34
 Verdict in Favor of Teacher Terminated for Defending Disabled Students Upheld/166:18

TERMINATION

- see* Discipline and Discharge
 Due Process

TITLE VII

- Hostile Work Environment Must Be as Viewed by Reasonable Member of Affected Group/165:53
 Ninth Circuit Smites Devout Christian’s Claim of Discrimination/164:77
 Sexual Harassment Victim Who Quit Job May Sue Employer/167:65
 Supervisor Terminated for Harassing Gay Employee Cannot Claim Religious Discrimination/166:49

TRANSIT

- Binding-Nonbinding Arbitration: A New Process to Resolve Interest Disputes (Edelman)(Mitchell)/164:6

TRANSFERS

- see also* Discipline and Discharge
 Body Weight Not Hindrance to Promotion/167:74

TRIAL COURT EMPLOYMENT

- No Disclosure of Court Documents Under Public Records Act/167:28

TRIAL COURT EMPLOYMENT PROTECTION AND GOVERNANCE ACT

- Court Employees and Interpreters Added to PERB’s Jurisdiction/168:39

TRIAL COURT INTERPRETER EMPLOYMENT AND LABOR RELATIONS ACT

- Court Employees and Interpreters Added to PERB’s Jurisdiction/168:39

U**UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

- Governor Signs Bill to Curb ‘Triple Dipping’/168:55

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE CODE

- New Bill Establishes Uniformity Among Laws Prohibiting Employment Discrimination/169:53

UNFAIR PRACTICES (IN GENERAL)

see rulings under Public Employment Relations Board and separate subject headings for specific unfair practice issues:

Duty of Fair Representation
Scope of Bargaining
Unilateral Action

UNILATERAL ACTION

see also Scope of Bargaining
U.C.'s Unilateral Change of Benefits Altered the Dynamic Status Quo/169:38

UNION SECURITY

see Agency Shop, Other Organizational Security, and Dues Deduction

UNION MEMBERSHIP

Union Membership Shows Decline in 2003/165:62

UNIONS

see also Employee Organizations
Attitudes Toward Unions Polled/167:72
Education Unions: Part of the Solution (Bergan)/165:6
Supreme Court Refuses to Hear *Turlock*: Court of Appeal Decision Depublished/164:38

UNIT DETERMINATION OR MODIFICATION

see Representation Elections, Recognition, and Decertification Procedures

UNIVERSITIES

see Employers, California Public
— California, University of
— California State University

V

VACATION, ANNUAL LEAVE

see Pay and Benefits

W-Z

WAGES AND BENEFITS

see Pay and Benefits

WELFARE AND INSTITUTIONS CODE

New Bill Establishes Uniformity Among Laws Prohibiting Employment Discrimination/169:53

WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Employee Leaves of Absence (Backstrom)(Kenny)/169:13

WORKING CONDITIONS

see Pay and Benefits
Scope of Bargaining

WRONGFUL TERMINATION

see also Dismissal
Teacher Cannot Sue for Wrongful Termination or Deprivation of Right to Free Speech/168:28

PART II

TABLE OF CASES

Alameida v. State Personnel Board [Lomeli]

When reviewing disciplinary action against a public safety officer, the State Personnel Board has jurisdiction to consider the officer's defense that his state employer did not notify him of an adverse action within the one-year statute of limitations set out in the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act. In addition to the jurisdictional ruling, the court found the state employer could not evade the statute of limitations by proceeding on a charge of dishonesty for lying during the investigation leading to the discipline, even if the charge is timely.

(6-30-04) 120 Cal.App.4th 46, 167 CPER 61

Associated Chino Teachers

see **Madsen v. Associated Chino Teachers**

Atwater Elementary School Dist. v. Department of General Services

Evidence of misconduct occurring more than four years before a notice of intention to dismiss a credentialed teacher was filed cannot be introduced at the local district's disciplinary hearing.

(5th Cir. 3-8-04) 116 Cal.App.4th 844, 165 CPER 28

Bakersfield City School Dist. v. The Superior Court of Kern County; The Bakersfield Californian, RPI

The disciplinary records of a school district employee can be disclosed to the public under the California Public Records Act in certain circumstances if the complaint is substantial in nature and there is reasonable cause to believe the complaint or cause of misconduct is well-founded.

(5-20-04) 118 Cal.App.4th 1041, 167 CPER 44

Ballaris v. Wacker Siltronic Corp.

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, the time spent by employees when they are changing into uniforms is work time. When donning special clothes is done for the employer's benefit, it is an integral and indispensable part of the job and is compensable under federal law. The court also ruled that the employer could not use compensated lunch periods as "credits" toward over-time compensation.

(9th Cir. 6-3-04) 370 F.3d 901, 167 CPER 69

Bodett v. Coxcom, Inc.

The court rejected the case of a woman fired from her job for harassing a lesbian subordinate who claimed that her termination violated Title VII's prohibition against religious discrimination. The court upheld the trial court's finding that the plaintiff was unable to rebut the evidence submitted by her employer demonstrating a legitimate nondiscriminatory reason for the firing.

(9th Cir. 4-26-04) 366 F.3d 736, 166 CPER 49

C & C Construction, Inc. v. Sacramento Municipal Utility Dist.

An affirmative action plan used by the municipal utility district to select contractors on public projects violated Article I, Section 31, of the California Constitution. The state governmental agency, before imposing race-based measures, need not obtain a federal adjudication that race-based discrimination is necessary to maintain federal funding; however, in order to discriminate based on race, the governmental agency must have substantial evidence that it will lose federal funding if it does not use race-based measures and must narrowly tailor those measures to minimize race-based discrimination.

(9-14-04) 122 Cal.App.4th 284, 168 CPER 69

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

see **Gebremicael v. California Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

California Department of Corrections v. State Personnel Board (Henning)

The Department of Corrections improperly demoted an asthmatic employee under Government Code Sec. 19253.5 because it did not engage first in an interactive process to obtain "pertinent information" from the employee about her potential reassignment. The court also held that the definition of "disability" contained in Sec. 19231 at the time of the demotion applied in the case, rather than the standard that appeared in the statute at the time the State Personnel Board heard the case.

(9-3-04) partially certified for publication, 121 Cal.App.4th 1601, 168 CPER 51

California Department of Veterans Affairs

see **Carter v. California Department of Veterans Affairs**

California Fair Employment and Housing Commission v. Gemini Aluminum Corp.

An employer's refusal to allow an employee time off to attend a Jehovah's Witness convention constitutes religious discrimination. The fact that the employee was not required to attend the conference by the tenets of his religion did not excuse the employer's failure to accommodate the employee's religious belief; employers must reasonably accommodate an employee's desire to participate in a religious observance.

(9-30-04) 122 Cal.App.4th 1004, 169 CPER 54

California State Employees

see **State Personnel Board v. California State Employees**

California State Employees Assn., Loc. 1000, SEIU, AFL-CIO

see **State Personnel Board v. California State Employees Assn., Loc. 1000, SEIU, AFL-CIO**

Carter v. California Department of Veterans Affairs

Although the legislature intended Sec. 12940(j)(1) of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act to be retroactive, to do so would be "constitutionally objectionable."

(8-17-04) 121 Cal.App.4th 840, 168 CPER 63

Carter v. Richard Ellis, Inc.

The court overturned a jury verdict awarding more than \$1 million to a woman who had been demoted as part of a companywide reorganization. The court determined she had failed to show disparate treatment of women over the age of 40 and, accordingly, that the jury's finding of sex and age discrimination in violation of California's Fair Employment and Housing Act must be reversed.

(10-4-04) 122 Cal.App.4th 1313, 169 CPER 54

Chapman v. Enos

A supervisor for purposes of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act is anyone who has the responsibility for directing the complaining employee's day-to-day duties. The court found the trial court had given an erroneous jury instruction that impermissibly narrowed the definition of supervisor under the FEHA.

(3-10-04) 116 Cal.App.4th 920, 166 CPER 52

Chico Unified School Dist.

see **Sinatra v. Chico Unified School Dist.**

City of Anaheim

see **Nolan v. City of Anaheim**

City of Carson

see **Leever v. City of Carson**

City of Claremont

see **Claremont Police Officers Assn. v. City of Claremont**

City of Jackson, Miss.

see **Smith v. City of Jackson, Miss.**

City of Los Angeles

see **Schifando v. City of Los Angeles**

City of Napa

see **Smith v. City of Napa**

City of Sacramento

see **Sacramento Police Officers Assn. v. City of Sacramento**

City of San Diego

see **Roe v. City of San Diego**

City of Santa Ana*see* **Quintero v. City of Santa Ana****Claremont Police Officers Assn. v. City of Claremont**

The California Supreme Court voted unanimously to grant review of Court of Appeal ruling that the city was required to meet and confer with the police officers association before it adopted a vehicle stop policy. The appeal court found that the policy, which required officers to record information concerning the race and ethnicity of persons they detained, was a matter within the scope of representation under the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act.

164 CPER 51

Cline*see* **General Dynamics Land Systems, Inc. v. Cline****County of Los Angeles***see* **Los Angeles County Professional Peace Officers Assn. v. County of Los Angeles****Country of Tulare***see* **Stephens v. County of Tulare****Coxcom, Inc.***see* **Bodett v. Coxcom, Inc.****Culbertson v. San Gabriel Unified School Dist. and the Board of Education of the San Gabriel Unified School Dist.**

School districts are not required to give a March 15 notice of non-reelection to an employee pursuant to Education Code Sec. 44929.21(b) unless that employee is eligible for permanent employment under the provisions of the same code section.

(8-31-04) 121 Cal.App.4th 1392, 168 CPER 35

Day*see* **Seligsohn v. Day****Department of General Services***see* **Atwater Elementary School Dist. v. Department of General Services****Department of Personnel Administration***see* **State Personnel Board v. Department of Personnel Administration**
Stephens v. County of Tulare**Diversified Paratransit, Inc.***see* **Salazar v. Diversified Paratransit, Inc.****Employment Development Dept.***see* **McClung v. Employment Development Dept.****Enos***see* **Chapman v. Enos****Fine v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist.**

When faced with the issue of whether a school district was required to reclassify a teacher as probationary retroactive to the date when she received her teaching credential, the court ruled in favor of the district, finding that the teacher's probationary status began on the date stated in her contract, not on the date her credential was issued.

(3-12-04) 116 Cal.App.4th 1070, 165 CPER 31

Franzosi v. Santa Monica Community College Dist.

A tenured college instructor is entitled to reinstatement after a period of disability only if he applies within 39 months from the beginning of the term of disability. The court rejected the instructor's argument that the time should begin running from the date it was determined that he was eligible for a disability allowance.

(5-10-04) 118 Cal.App.4th 442, 166 CPER 24

Gebremicael v. California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

An individual convicted of a felony later reduced to a misdemeanor is not barred from applying for a teaching credential by Education Code Sec. 44346.1.

(5-27-04) 118 Cal.App.4th 1477, 167 CPER 42

Gemini Aluminum Corp.*see* **California Fair Employment and Housing Commission v. Gemini Aluminum Corp.****General Dynamics Land Systems, Inc. v. Cline**

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act does not protect relatively younger workers from discrimination on the basis of age. The ruling left intact a number of programs and statutes that favor older workers.

(2-24-04) 540 U.S. 581, 165 CPER 49

Governing Board of the Elk Grove Unified School Dist.*see* **Smith v. Governing Board of the Elk Grove Unified School Dist.**

GTE Service Corp.*see* **McGinest v. GTE Service Corp.****Hernandez***see* **Raytheon Co. v. Hernandez****Hewlett-Packard Co.***see* **Peterson v. Hewlett-Packard Co.****International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators of the United States and Canada, Local 16 v. Laughon**

The court vacated an arbitration award because the arbitrator failed to disclose prior service in a case involving the same law firm that was representing one of the parties in the dispute currently before him.

(4-22-04) 117 Cal.App.4th 1188, 166 CPER 56

Kotla v. Regents of the University of California

The Court of Appeal overturned a \$745,000 judgment awarded for retaliation. The court decided the jury was capable of ascertaining U.C.'s motive without testimony from a human resource expert about the significance of the evidence. In an unpublished section of the opinion, the court advised the trial court how to determine the admissibility of evidence regarding the lab's treatment of other employees accused of violating computer-use policies

(1-28-04) 115 Cal.App.4th 283, 165 CPER 34

Laughon*see* **International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators of the United States and Canada, Local 16 v. Laughon****Leever v. City of Carson**

Compensation for canine duty set out in the terms of a collective bargaining agreement did not, as a matter of law, establish an alternative way by which to calculate overtime pay for purposes of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

(9th Cir. 3-4-04) 340 F.3d 1014, 165 CPER 59

Los Angeles County Probation Dept.*see* **Page v. Los Angeles County Probation Dept.****Los Angeles County Professional Peace Officers Assn. v. County of Los Angeles**

Two investigators for the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office were not entitled to have their accrued vacation time cashed out while on disability leave and counted for purposes of their retirement calculation. The D.A.'s practice was to urge employees to use their accumulated vacation leave in excess of the 320-hour limit, and cash outs were a rare occurrence to which the investigators were not entitled.

(2-11-04) 115 Cal.App.4th 866, 165 CPER 24

Los Angeles Unified School Dist.*see* **Fine v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. Motevalli v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist.****Madsen v. Associated Chino Teachers**

A public school teacher who objected on religious grounds to being required to donate to a charity an amount equal to full union dues was not a victim of religious discrimination and her constitutional rights were not violated. The court rejected the teacher's argument that she should not have to donate any amount in excess of the cost of the union's representation activities.

(4-19-04) 317 F.Supp.2d 1175, 167 CPER 34

McClung v. Employment Development Dept.

An amendment to the Fair Employment and Housing Act making coworkers liable for sexual harassment applies to conduct that occurred before its enactment and includes conduct that occurred away from the workplace

(11-14-03) 34 Cal.App.4th 467, 2003 DJDAR 12389, 164 CPER 73

McClung v. Employment Development Dept.

State Supreme Court unanimously granted the petition for review of appellate court decision in McClung v. Employment Development Dept., which held that a plaintiff's coworker would be liable for alleged sexual harassment, if proved, under California's Fair Employment and Housing Act.

165 CPER 52

McClung v. Employment Development Dept.

The court overturned the Court of Appeal's finding that a coworker could be held liable for hostile work envi-

ronment sexual harassment under the Fair Employment and Housing Act, even though the actions complained of occurred prior to the effective date of the legislature's amendment to that act imposing personal liability on coworkers. In the decision, the court defended its territory against encroachment by the state legislature.

(11-4-04) 34 Cal.4th 467, 169 CPER 50

McGinest v. GTE Service Corp.

Expanding on its decision in *Ellison v. Brady*, which created the "reasonable woman" standard in sexual harassment cases, the court held that racial hostility at work must be assessed from the point of view of a reasonable member of the affected group

(9th Cir. 3-11-04) 360 F.3d 1103, 165 CPER 53

Motevalli v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist.

A teacher may not claim that the district's nonrenewal of her contract violated public policy. Nor does she have the right to sue the district for damages resulting from deprivation of the right to free speech protected by the California Constitution.

(9-9-04) 122 Cal.App.4th 97, 168 CPER 28

Nolan v. City of Anaheim

A police officer is entitled to disability retirement benefits only if he can prove he is incapacitated from performing the usual duties of a patrol officer for all other California law enforcement agencies, not just from the local entity where he worked.

(7-1-04) 33 Cal.4th 335, 167 CPER 19

Orange County Employees Assn., Inc. v. Superior Court of Orange County

The request for a court's financial records must comply with applicable California Rules of Court; the California Public Records Act is not controlling.

(6-30-04) 120 Cal.App.4th 287, 167 CPER 28

Page v. Los Angeles County Probation Dept.

When a plaintiff opts to pursue her employment discrimination case by filing a grievance with the county's civil service commission, she must exhaust her administrative remedy and challenge any adverse findings in court before she can pursue a lawsuit under the Fair Employment and Housing Act.

(11-3-04) 123 Cal.App.4th 1135, 169 CPER 23

Pennsylvania State Police v. Suders

An employee who quit her job because of sexual harassment may sue her employer for damages. However, unless the employer takes a tangible employment action, it will not be held strictly liable and can present an affirmative defense. The court, for the first time, recognized a "constructive discharge" under Title VII, which means that quitting a job with intolerable working conditions should be treated as a termination. However, the court held that, in such a situation, employers should have the right to defend themselves by showing they did everything possible to prevent the employee from being harassed.

(6-14-04) 542 U.S. 129, 167 CPER 65

Peterson v. Hewlett-Packard Co.

The employer had not engaged in disparate treatment of the plaintiff when it discharged him for posting biblical scriptures that were offensive to gay people. There was no merit in his claim that the employer failed to accommodate his religious beliefs.

(1-6-04) 01-35795 (9th Cir.) ___F.3d___, 2004 DJDAR 170, 164 CPER 77

Portland Public Schools

see **Settlegoode v. Portland Public Schools**

Professional Engineers in California Government

see **Wagner v. Professional Engineers in California Government**

Public Employment Relations Board

see **Turlock Joint Elementary School Dist. v. Public Employment Relations Board**

Quintero v. City of Santa Ana

An employee was deprived of a fair hearing before the personnel board because the city attorney serving as prosecutor on behalf of the police department had an ongoing advisory relationship with the administrative body adjudicating the termination appeal. The attorney's frequent contact with the board blurred the line between advocate and advisor, and caused the appearance of unfairness sufficient to invalidate the hearing.

(12-23-03) 114 Cal.App.4th 810, 164 CPER 49

Rancho Santiago Community College Dist.

see **Spanner v. Rancho Santiago Community College Dist.**

Raytheon Co. v. Hernandez

The appellate court erred in finding that an employer had violated the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 when it refused to rehire an employee previously discharged for drug abuse. The Ninth Circuit improperly applied a disparate impact analysis to a disparate treatment case.

(12-2-03) 540 U.S. 44, 164 CPER 79

Reeves v. Safeway Stores, Inc.

When a supervisor initiates disciplinary action with retaliatory animus that results in the termination of an employee who has engaged in protected activity, the employer can be held liable for retaliatory discharge. The employer will be held liable even if the manager who made the decision to terminate had no knowledge of the worker's protected activities.

(7-29-04) 121 Cal.App.4th 95, 168 CPER 67

Regents of the University of California

see **Kotla v. Regents of the University of California**

Richard Ellis, Inc.

see **Carter v. Richard Ellis, Inc.**

Roe v. City of San Diego

A police officer who was fired for selling sexually explicit videos of himself on eBay can challenge the dismissal based on constitutional protections conveyed by the First Amendment. The videotapes amounted to citizen comment on matters of public concern and were deserving of protection.

(9th Cir. 1-29-04) 356 F.3d. 1108, 165 CPER 56

Roe v. State Personnel Board

A Department of Justice attorney is entitled to backpay from his termination until the State Personnel Board rendered a decision following a hearing on the misconduct charges. But since the board erroneously decided the attorney's resignation was effective and did not rule whether the termination for misconduct was justified, the attorney is still due a decision on whether there was cause for his discharge.

(7-22-04) 120 Cal.App.4th 1029, 168 CPER 46

Sacramento Police Officers Assn. v. City of Sacramento

The city was not required to meet and confer with the association over the decision to hire retirees to serve as

limited-term employees until the police department could replenish its ranks with new recruits. The proposal to temporarily hire annuitants was prompted by an abrupt staffing shortage and involved a fundamental public policy decision designed to maintain the existing level of public safety in the community.

(3-30-04, certified for publication 4-27-04) C042493, C043377 (3d Dist.), ___ Cal.App.4th ___, 2004 DJDAR 5033, 166 CPER 26

Sacramento Police Officers Assn. v. City of Sacramento

The State Supreme Court has granted a petition for review of *Sacramento Police Officers Assn. v. City of Sacramento*, where the appellate court ruled that the city police department was not required to meet and confer with the association before it decided to use retired police officers to boost its ranks while it waited for new recruits to complete their training.

(petition for review granted 7-19-04), Supreme Court No. S124395, 168 CPER 42

Sacramento Municipal Utility Dist.

see **C & C Construction, Inc. v. Sacramento Municipal Utility Dist.**

Safeway Stores, Inc.

see **Reeves v. Safeway Stores, Inc.**

Salazar v. Diversified Paratransit, Inc.

An employer can be held liable for the sexual harassment of one of its employees by a third party under California's Fair Employment and Housing Act, even though the harassment took place years prior to passage of an amendment to the FEHA which specified that employers are responsible for the third party's conduct

(3-30-04) 117 Cal.App.4th 318, 166 CPER 47

San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit Dist.

see **Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790 v. San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit Dist.**

San Gabriel Unified School Dist. and the Board of Education of the San Gabriel Unified School Dist.

see **Culbertson v. San Gabriel Unified School Dist. and the Board of Education of the San Gabriel Unified School Dist.**

Santa Monica Community College Dist.

see **Franzosi v. Santa Monica Community College Dist.**

Schifando v. City of Los Angeles

California Supreme Court announced that employees need not exhaust internal administrative remedies provided by a city charter before filing a discrimination lawsuit in superior court; a plaintiff may litigate a claim alleging violations of the state Fair Employment and Housing Act once a "right to sue" letter is issued.

(12-23-03) 31 Cal.4th 1074, 164 CPER 44

Seligsohn v. Day

Two police officers employed by City College of San Francisco were entitled to inspect the discrimination complaints under investigation by the campus officer of affirmative action because the documents were turned over to the chief of campus police and had the potential of influencing future personnel decisions. The court emphasized that the label placed on an investigation file is irrelevant; what is critical is whether the materials in the file may affect the status of the officer's employment.

(8-10-04) 121 Cal.App.4th 518, 168 CPER 71

Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790 v. San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit Dist.

In an unpublished decision, the court upheld an arbitrator's award of attorneys' fees to the prevailing party. The court ruled that the fee award did not exceed the arbitrator's authority and was a proper disposition of the grievance that demanded the court's deference.

(9-17-03) A099441 (1st Dist.) not certified for publication, 164 CPER 88

Settlegoode v. Portland Public Schools

The court reinstated a jury verdict in favor of a teacher who was terminated following her complaints about the way disabled students were treated. The district court should not have rejected the jury's decision that the teacher had been punished for exercising her First Amendment rights and that her termination violated Sec. 504 of the Rehabilitation, Comprehensive Services, and Developmental Disabilities Act of 1978.

(9th Cir. 4-5-04) 362 F.3d. 1118, 166 CPER 18

Sinatra v. Chico Unified School Dist.

A program allowing educators to work part time rather than retire is not a fundamental and substantial policy of the State of California. The court ordered published that portion of its opinion addressing this issue, while declining to publish the portion addressing the timeliness of a claim under the Fair Employment and Housing Act.

(6-18-04) 119 Cal.App.4th 701, 167 CPER 40

Smith v. City of Jackson, Miss.

The U.S. Supreme Court heard arguments in a case that will determine whether the Age Discrimination in Employment Act prohibits discrimination against older workers that results from an employer's facially neutral policy.

(11-03-04) Supreme Ct. 03-1160, 169 CPER 55

Smith v. City of Napa

In a partially published decision, the court ruled a firefighter who was terminated for cause by the city cannot subsequently apply for a disability retirement because he no longer had an employment relationship with the city. In the published portion, the court gave further guidance on language in *Hayward v. American River Fire Protection Dist.* that precludes an employer from using a dismissal to "preempt" a valid disability claim.

(6-30-04) 120 Cal. App.4th 194, 167 CPER 24

Smith v. Governing Board of the Elk Grove Unified School Dist.

Interpreting Education Code Sec. 44929.21(b), the court ruled that a teacher holding a California teaching credential was not entitled to permanent status even though she had taught for two consecutive years.

(6-9-04; certified for publication 7-9-04) 120 Cal.App.4th 563, 168 CPER 37

Spanner v. Rancho Santiago Community College Dist.

An employee found to have committed misconduct was not deprived of due process when the governing board rejected the hearing officer's recommendation of a six-month demotion and imposed a penalty of permanent demotion without an independent review of the record.

(6-17-04) 119 Cal.App.4th 584, 167 CPER 38

State Department of Health Services v. Superior Court of Sacramento County

The court unanimously determined that employers with strong anti-harassment policies may avoid an award of damages for a victim who unreasonably fails to report harassment promptly.

(11-24-03) 31 Cal.4th 1026, 164 CPER 69

State of California

see **Williams v. State of California**

State Personnel Board

see **Roe v. State Personnel Board**

State Personnel Board (Henning)

see **California Department of Corrections v. State Personnel Board (Henning)**

State Personnel Board [Lomeli]

see **Alameida v. State Personnel Board [Lomeli]**

State Personnel Board v. California State Employees Assn., Loc. 1000, SEIU, AFL-CIO

Labor contracts that require a state agency to select the most-senior candidate for a position from among the top three ranks after a competitive examination do not contravene the constitutional mandate that permanent appointments and promotions in the state civil service be based on merit.

(12-9-03) 114 Cal.App.4th 11, 164 CPER 55

State Personnel Board v. California State Employees

The State Supreme Court granted a petition for review of the appellate court decision that held memoranda of understanding which require state agencies to select the most-senior candidate for a position from among the top three ranks after a competitive examination do not contravene the constitutional mandate that permanent appointments and promotions in the state civil service be based on merit.

(2-24-04) Supreme Ct. S122058, 165 CPER 42

State Personnel Board v. Department of Personnel Administration

The Supreme Court granted a petition for review of the appellate court decision that holds memoranda of understanding that allow employees facing discipline to choose either arbitration or review before the State Per-

sonnel Board violated the California Constitution by divesting the SPB of its authority to review disciplinary actions.

(2-24-04) S119498, 164 CPER 57

Stephens v. County of Tulare

When a county employee is dismissed from his job due to a work-related disability, and the employee subsequently is denied a disability retirement on the grounds that he is not disabled, Gov. Code Sec. 31725 requires the employer to reinstate the employee with backpay. The intent of the statutory provision is to avoid putting a disabled worker in the position of having neither a job nor a retirement income. The question before the court was the meaning of the word "dismissed" for purposes of Sec. 31725.

(10-29-04) 123 Cal.App.4th 964, 169 CPER 27

Suders

see **Pennsylvania State Police v. Suders**

Superior Court of Kern County; The Bakersfield Californian, RPI

see **Bakersfield City School Dist. v. The Superior Court of Kern County; The Bakersfield Californian, RPI**

Superior Court of Orange County

see **Orange County Employees Assn., Inc. v. Superior Court of Orange County**

Superior Court of Sacramento County

see **State Department of Health Services v. Superior Court of Sacramento County**

Superior Court of San Diego; County of San Diego, RPI

see **The Copley Press, Inc. v. The Superior Court of San Diego; County of San Diego, RPI**

The Copley Press, Inc. v. Superior Court of San Diego; County of San Diego, RPI

The court concluded that the county civil service commission was not required to deny public access to a peace officer's disciplinary appeal.

(9-16-04) 122 Cal.App.4th. 489, 168 CPER 43

Turlock Joint Elementary School Dist. v. Public Employment Relations Board

The State Supreme Court denied a petition for review of a Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal decision that overruled a decision by the Public Employment Relations Board and held that the wearing of union buttons by teachers in the classroom is “political activity” within the meaning of the Education Code and can be regulated by a school district.

164 CPER 38

Wacker Siltronic Corp.

see **Ballaris v. Wacker Siltronic Corp.**

Wagner v. Professional Engineers in California Government

A “good” notice is the appropriate remedy for an inadequate agency fee notice. The court rejected the complaining engineers’ claim that the union should not be able to keep fees collected from employees who were not union members until it corrected its previous inadequate notice. The complaining fee payers could not revive a claim that the union had improperly charged certain expenditures after asserting to the trial court that it was not making that claim in order to avoid a ruling on exhaustion of remedies.

(9th Cir. 1-14-04) 354 F.3d 1036, 164 CPER 52

Williams v. State of California

After four years, settlement was reached in this class-action lawsuit filed on behalf of more than one million public school students in grades K through 12. The plaintiffs alleged that the state has a duty under the California Constitution to ensure that all public school students are provided equal fundamental conditions and that it was not doing so.

168 CPER 32

PART III

TABLE OF PERB ORDERS AND DECISIONS

Section A: Annotated Table of PERB Orders and Decisions

Dills Act Cases

Barker and Osuna v. California State Employees Assn., No. 1551-S/164:101

(CSEA's removal of the charging parties from their positions as bargaining unit chairpersons did not violate the Dills Act because, under the circumstances, CSEA's choice of its bargaining representatives is purely an internal matter.)

California State Employees Assn. v. State of California (Department of Motor Vehicles), No. 1558-S/164:102

(The DMV's security system did not impact the length of the workday and therefore was not subject to bargaining.)

California Union of Safety Employees v. State of California (Department of Developmental Services), No. 1614-S/166:69

(The department did not unilaterally transfer work previously performed by CAUSE because there was an overlapping duty between CAUSE and the CHP to perform that work.)

California Union of Safety Employees v. State of California (Department of Mental Health), No. 1567-S/164:104

(The charge was properly dismissed and deferred to arbitration.)

California Union of Safety Employees v. State of California (Department of Parks and Recreation), No. 1562-S/164:103

(The state's unilateral implementation of a new life-guard safety policy involved interpretation of the parties' memorandum of understanding and was deferred to arbitration.)

California Union of Safety Employees v. State of California (Department of Parks and Recreation), No. 1566-S/164:104

(The charge was properly dismissed and deferred to arbitration.)

California Union of Safety Employees v. State of California (Highway Patrol), No. 1574-S/164:105

(Pursuant to the union's request on appeal, the charge was withdrawn.)

Hard, Hackett, and Perkins v. California State Employees Assn., No. 1583-S/165:73

(CSEA's request to withdraw its statement of exceptions to the ALJ's proposed decision was granted.)

International Union of Operating Engineers v. State of California (State Personnel Board), No. 1680-S/169:72

(The charging party failed to demonstrate that SPB's legal challenge to a pending PERB case constituted a prima facie case of discrimination.)

Kunkel v. State of California, No. 1617-S/166:70

(The charge failed to show any protected activity, any "nexus," or that the charge was within PERB jurisdiction.)

Sarinana v. State of California (Department of Forestry and Fire Protection), No. 1619-S/166:70

(New evidence offered to excuse the charge's untimeliness was denied because the charging party failed to file an amended charge including such evidence.)

State of California (Department of Personnel Administration) v. California State Employees Assn., SEIU Loc. 1000, No. 1601-S/166:68

(Procedures for authorizing union leave are negotiable where they directly impact the employment relationship. CSEA unilaterally changed its past practice for authorizing union leave.)

Sutton v. California State Employees Assn., Loc. 1000, No. 1553-S/164:106

(The charge was not filed within the statute of limitations period.)

Toran v. California State Employees Assn., No. 1593-S/165:73

(The charge was dismissed for untimeliness.)

Vickers v. State of California (Department of Corrections), No. 1540a-S/166:67

(No good cause exists to excuse the late filing; but upon reconsideration, deferral is inappropriate.)

Vickers v. State of California (Department of Corrections), No. 1559-S/164:103

(The charging party did not provide good cause to file a late amended charge.)

Vickers v. State of California (Department of Corrections), No. 1559a-S/166:67

(Vickers' request for reconsideration was denied because it did not contain the requisite specificity, nor did it allege the limited grounds that support a grant of reconsideration.)

Zanchi v. State of California (Department of Corrections), No. 1579-S/164:105

(Dismissal of the charge was reversed based on allegations that the state retaliated against the charging party for filing a grievance, damaged her career by instituting criminal and administrative investigations, and affected her promotional opportunities.)

(Accepting its allegations as true, AFSCME established the required nexus between the local union president's protected activities and his layoff.)

Andrus, Miller, Mettier, and Kerr v. Paso Robles Public Educators, No. 1589-E/165:73

(The union collected agency fees without providing a proper *Hudson* notice.)

Associated Administrators of Los Angeles v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist., No. 1665/169:77

(The district improperly designated eight classifications as management and committed an unlawful unilateral change with respect to two of the classifications.)

Astrachan v. Los Angeles Community College Dist., No. 1668/169:73

(The charging party failed to demonstrate that the district knew he had contacted his union and retaliated against him by failing to give him certain teaching assignments.)

Bailey v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist., No. 1552/164:107

(The charging party did not state a prima facie case for retaliation because she failed to show that she engaged in protected activity.)

California School Employees Assn. v. Lucia Mar Unified School Dist., No. 1640/167:89

(The district failed to comply with PERB's order that it cancel its contract with a bus company.)

California School Employees Assn., Chap. 209 v. Yucaipa-Calimesa Joint Unified School Dist., No. 1629/167:86

(CSEA's request to withdraw its appeal of the dismissal of its charge pursuant to a mutual settlement was granted.)

California School Employees Assn., Chap. 802 v. Lost Hills Union Elementary School Dist., No. 1652/168:95

(The district was ordered to restore its previous policy on calculating wages for employees with composite classifications because the change was implemented without offering the union the opportunity to negotiate.)

California School Employees Assn., Chap. 82 v. Fullerton Joint Union School Dist., No. 1633/167:88

(The board agent's dismissal was reversed because the disputed contract language was sufficiently ambiguous to warrant an evidentiary hearing to determine its meaning.)

Chula Vista Elementary Education Assn., CTA/NEA v. Chula Vista Elementary School Dist., No. 1647/168:88

EERA Cases

Abrams v. Chula Vista Elementary Educators Assn., No. 1554/164:115

(The charge was not filed within the statute of limitations period.)

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Loc. 101 v. San Jose Unified School Dist., No. 1555/164:108

(The election result was set aside because the school principal interfered with the teachers' rights to vote freely and without coercion.)

Deglow v. Los Rios Community College Dist., No. 1631/167:86

(The charge was dismissed because Deglow knew or should have known of the district's practices well before the statute of limitations barred the charge.)

Delano Joint Union High School Dist., Association of Student Affairs Support Specialists, and California School Employees Assn. Chap. 79, No. 1678/169:78

(Newly created classified positions were part of the existing classified unit at the time the Association of Student Affairs Support Specialists filed its request for recognition with PERB concerning those classifications.)

DeLauer v. Santa Rosa Junior College, No. 1612/166:72

(The charging party failed to state a prima facie case because she was not employed by the college, but was a student.)

DeLauer v. Sonoma Valley Unified School Dist., No. 1613/166:72

(The charge failed to include the dates and parties involved in the alleged retaliation, and failed to show a nexus between any of the district's alleged adverse actions and the charging party's protected conduct.)

Empire Teachers Assn. v. Empire Union School Dist., No. 1650/168:92

(Both the district superintendent and the school principal were motivated by unlawful animus when three teachers suffered retaliation for their protected activities.)

Ferguson v. Oakland Unified School Dist., No. 1645/168:87

(The unfair practice charge was dismissed because the transfer of the charging party from high school to middle school was not an adverse action according to the reasonable person standard.)

Ferguson v. Oakland Education Assn., No. 1646/168:99

(The charge was dismissed because the union representative acted reasonably and without bad faith in pursuing a settlement of the charging party's grievance.)

Ferguson v. Oakland Education Assn., No. 1646a/169:75

(The request for reconsideration was denied because the charging party merely reargued his case, which is not a valid ground for reconsideration.)

Fontana Unified School Dist. and United Steelworkers of America, No. 1623/167:91

(USWA's unit modification petition was granted because the duty aides shared a sufficient community of interest

with other employees in the wall-to-wall classified unit to warrant their inclusion.)

Fresno County Office Schools Educators Assn. v. Fresno County Office of Education, No. 1674/169:75

(The respondent made an unlawful unilateral change to the collective bargaining agreement and transferred two teachers in retaliation for their protected activities.)

Gutierrez v. California School Employees Assn., Chap. 244, No. 1606/166:74

(One allegation in the charge was untimely; others failed to state a prima facie case showing a breach of the duty of fair representation.)

Hein v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790, No. 1677/169:79

(The charging party failed to allege conduct that constituted a breach of the duty of fair representation.)

Henderson v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist., No. Ad-334/167:84

(Henderson's request that the board accept her late-filed documents or, alternatively, grant her appeal of an administrative determination was denied for failure to demonstrate good cause as required by PERB Reg. 32136.)

Henderson v. Teamsters Loc. 572, No. Ad-335/167:93

(Henderson's request that the board accept her late-filed documents or, alternatively, grant her appeal of an administrative determination was denied for failure to demonstrate good cause as required by PERB Reg. 32136.)

Holford v. United Teachers of Richmond, No. 1604/166:73

(The charge failed to state a prima facie case showing that the union breached its duty of fair representation.)

Kaiser v. Fremont Unified Dist. Teachers Assn., No. 1572/164:116

(The charge was dismissed as untimely.)

Kaiser v. Fremont Unified School Dist., No. 1571/164:112

(The sole timely charge did not establish the sufficient nexus between protected activity and the district's action. Language in the parties' agreement was insufficient to defer the charge.)

Kestin v. United Teachers of Los Angeles, No. 1594/165:75

(The charge was dismissed for failing to include a clear and concise statement of the facts.)

Lake Elsinore Teachers Assn., CTA/NEA v. Lake Elsinore Unified School Dist., No. 1648/168:89

(The board agent's partial dismissal of the charge was reversed because the charging party was denied union representation when the district told her that an interview was merely investigatory but later resulted in discipline.)

Larkins v. Chula Vista Elementary Educators Assn., No. 1575/164:116

(The board agent improperly accepted as true the factual allegations alleged by the association in letters to the B.A. However, the dismissal was affirmed for its failure to state a prima facie case.)

Larkins v. Chula Vista Elementary Educators Assn., No. 1575a/167:93

(Larkins' request for reconsideration was denied because she failed to present a valid ground for reconsideration under PERB Reg. 32410.)

Larkins v. Chula Vista Elementary School Dist., No. 1557/164:108

(The allegations contained in the charge, accepted as true, failed to state a prima facie case of retaliation.)

Larkins v. Chula Vista Elementary School Dist., No. 1557a/167:85

(Larkins' request for reconsideration was denied because she failed to present a valid ground for reconsideration as specified in PERB Reg. 32410.)

Las Virgenes Educators Assn. v. Las Virgenes Unified School Dist., No. 1605/166:71

(The district met its burden of establishing an affirmative defense that Shagin would have been transferred even absent any protected activity.)

Lee v. Peralta Community College Dist., No. 1576/164:113

(The charging party failed to state a prima facie case of discrimination and lacked standing to assert allegations protecting the union. The board lacked jurisdiction to enforce arbitration decisions and would not accept new allegations on appeal.)

Long Beach Community College Dist. Police Officers Assn. v. Long Beach Community College Dist., No. 1568/164:110

(A complaint shall issue in this case because the charge was timely filed and the association alleged sufficient facts that the district unilaterally contracted out all police services, and it did not unmistakably waive its right to bargain.)

Long Beach Council of Classified Employees v. Long Beach Community College Dist., No. 1564/164:110

(The board announced that it once again will permit the six-month statute of limitations period to be tolled for the time the parties make use of bilaterally agreed upon dispute resolution procedures. The statute of limitations period set forth in EERA is not a jurisdictional barrier to an unfair practice charge, but an affirmative defense that can be waived by the parties or tolled by the board.)

Malik v. California Federation of Teachers, No. 1662/168:100

(The charge was dismissed because it provided no facts or evidence to support the allegations contained therein.)

Malik v. Compton Community College Dist., No. 1653/168:96

(The appeal was rejected because the charging party failed to provide any information as to dates or conduct giving rise to his charge.)

Maurer v. Coast Community College Dist., No. 1560/164:109

(The district would have taken adverse action against the charging party even in the absence of any protected activity.)

Mrvichin v. Los Angeles Community College Dist., No. 1667/169:73

(The charging party did not provide sufficient facts to demonstrate that improper motivation influenced his termination.)

Newark Teachers Assn. v. Newark Unified School Dist., No. 1595/165:74

(The arbitration decision was not repugnant to EERA.)

Perez v. Fullerton Elementary School Dist., No. 1671/169:74

(The charging party was not retaliated against for his participation in protected activity because his inappropriate conduct justified the discipline.)

Perez v. Fullerton Elementary School Dist., No. Ad-339/169:74

(The late filing of the district's response to the charging party's exceptions was permitted because it was caused by an honest clerical error.)

Pleasant Valley Elementary School Dist. and Group of Employees and SEIU Loc. 998, No. Ad-333/167:89

(The board agent's dismissal of objections to a decertification election was affirmed because the objections did not describe with specificity how the alleged facts constituted objectionable conduct.)

Ravenswood Teachers Assn. v. Ravenswood City Elementary School Dist., No. 1556/164:108

(The charging party's request for withdrawal was granted.)

Ravenswood Teachers Assn. v. Ravenswood City Elementary School Dist.; Ravenswood Teachers Assn. v. Edison Brentwood Academy, No. 1660/168:98

(Edison Brentwood Academy was found to be the public school employer of its teachers for purposes of collective bargaining under EERA.)

Ravenswood Teachers Assn., CTA/NEA v. Edison Schools, Inc., No. 1661/168:99

(The charge was dismissed because the board already had determined the proper public employer in two other charges filed regarding the same incident.)

Rossmann v. Orange Unified School Dist., No. 1670/169:73

(The charging party lacked standing to assert that the district bargained with the exclusive representative in bad faith.)

Rossmann et al. v. Orange Unified Education Assn. and California Teachers Assn., No. 1569/164:115

(Absent specific exceptions, the board may not alter the statute of limitations for filing charges with PERB. The charging party was not required to proffer "smoking gun" documents showing DFR violations, but the union was given broad latitude in bargaining contract terms.)

Salinas Valley Federation of Teachers, AFT Loc. 1020, AFL-CIO v. Salinas Union High School Dist., No. 1639/167:89

(The regional attorney's dismissal of the federation's unfair practice charge was affirmed because the federation failed to allege any facts sufficient to state a prima facie case.)

San Bernardino Association of Substitute Teachers v. San Bernardino City Unified School Dist., No. 1602/166:71

(The district met its burden of showing it would have removed the two substitute teachers even in the absence of their protected activity. The ALJ's decision was reversed.)

San Joaquin County Office of Education and California School Employees Assn., No. 1627/167:92

(CSEA's petition to establish a migrant education unit was approved because the proposed unit had a community of interest that was separate and distinct from other

existing or potential bargaining units and because granting the petition falls within the objectives of EERA.)

San Juan Teachers Assn., CTA/NEA v. San Juan Unified School Dist., No. 1616/166:72

(The association failed to allege sufficient facts to establish a past practice, and the charge was dismissed for failing to state a prima facie case showing of a unilateral change.)

Santa Clarita Community College Dist. v. Part-Time Faculty United, AFT, No. Ad-332/166:73

(PFU's request to withdraw its administrative appeal was granted.)

Simpson v. California School Employees Assn., Chap. 130, No. 1550/164:113

(The duty of fair representation applies only to proceedings where representation is exclusively provided by the union, and does not apply in proceedings before the employer's personnel commission.)

Sloan v. Shasta College Faculty Assn., No. 1603/166:73

(The charge failed to state a prima facie case showing that the association breached its duty of fair representation.)

Stryker v. Antelope Valley College Federation of Teachers, No. 1624/167:85

(The dismissal was affirmed because removal from membership on a negotiating team, unlike removal from the employee organization, is not protected under EERA.)

Turlock Teachers Assn. v. Turlock Joint Elementary School Dist., No. 1490a/166:70

(The association's unfair practice charge was dismissed.)

United Teachers of Los Angeles v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist., No. 1657/168:97

(The charging party's revocation of his commitment form was not protected conduct because the form was a valid term or condition of employment.)

Ybarra-Grosfield v. Oxnard Elementary School Dist., No. 1679/169:76

(The charging party failed to state a prima facie case of discrimination.)

 HEERA Cases

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees v. Regents of the University of California (Davis), No. 1590-H/165:78

(Applying the rule announced in *Sarka* [PERB No. 1585-H], the board found the charge was timely and that it stated a prima facie case of discrimination.)

Academic Professionals of California v. Trustees of the California State University, No. 1586-H/165:78

(CSU's implementation of a student fee increase affecting all students is not within the scope of representation.)

Academic Professionals of California v. Trustees of the California State University, No. 1642-H/168:101

(The unfair practice charge was dismissed because the decision to implement the employee assistance program at the Sonoma and Long Beach campuses was outside the scope of representation and thus not an unlawful unilateral action.)

Academic Professionals of California v. Trustees of the California State University, No. 1654-H/168:102

(The modification that made the fee waiver program applicable to mandatory employee training courses was not an unlawful unilateral change because no actual change in the parties' policy occurred.)

Academic Professionals of California v. Trustees of the California State University, No. 1656-H/168:103

(No unlawful unilateral change was found because the non-discrimination policy applied to students and unrepresented employees, and thus did not fall within the scope of union representation.)

Academic Professionals of California v. Trustees of the California State University, No. 1658-H/168:104

(The new CSU whistleblower protection policies were not unlawful unilateral changes because they did not change existing disciplinary policy.)

California Faculty Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University, No. 1591-H/165:79

(Exemptions from disclosure provided by the Public Records Act cannot be used to deny an information request that is required by HEERA.)

California Faculty Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University, No. 1597-H/165:80

(CSU did not violate HEERA by failing to provide necessary and relevant information when CFA reneged on its promise to pay the costs of producing that information.)

California Faculty Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University, No. 1672-H/169:80

(The charging party did not demonstrate that the newly enacted policies were a break from past practice.)

California State Employees Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University (San Luis Obispo), No. 1599-H/166:74

(The request to withdraw the charge was granted.)

California State Employees Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University (San Marcos), No. 1584-H/165:76

(CSU's implementation of a student fee increase affecting all students is not within the scope of representation.)

California State Employees Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University (San Marcos), No. 1635-H/167:94

(CSU-San Marcos was ordered to cease and desist from using a new employee evaluation system because it was adopted without negotiating with the union.)

O'Malley v. American Arbitration Assn., No. 1573-H/164:117

(The board lacked jurisdiction to address the merits of the case because the association is not a covered entity under HEERA.)

O'Malley v. California Nurses Assn., No. 1578-H/164:117

(The only remedy for failure to make financial records available is a petition to compel compliance. Since the association made the records available, the issue is moot.)

O'Malley v. California Nurses Assn., No. 1607-H/166:74

(The charging party lacked standing to challenge the calculation of agency fees because they were refunded in full.)

O'Malley v. California Nurses Assn., No. 1673-H/169:80

(No unfair practice occurred because the charging party received a refund of his agency fees.)

Regents of the University of California v. Association of Graduate Student Employees, United Auto Workers, No. 1596-H/165:80

(The appeal and charge were withdrawn.)

Regents of the University of California v. California Nurses Assn., No. 1638-H/167:95

(The board agent erred in dismissing the charge because evidence may exist to show a clear mutual intent to include sympathy strikes within the no-strike clause of the contract.)

Sarca v. California State Employees Assn., CSU Div., No. 1626-H/167:96

(The charge was dismissed because there was no support for the allegation that CSEA improperly calculated agency fees.)

Sarka v. Regents of the University of California, No. 1585-H/165:77

(The statute of limitations does not begin to run until actual termination, rather than at the time notice of termination is received. Although application of this rule rendered the charge timely, it was dismissed for failure to state a prima facie case of discrimination.)

Sarka v. Regents of the University of California, No. 1585a-H/167:93

(Sarka's request for reconsideration was denied because of his failure to state a proper ground as specified by PERB Reg. 32410.)

Sarka v. Regents of the University of California, No. Ad-337-H/167:95

(The board denied Sarka's request for special permission to appeal the refusal of a board agent to disqualify herself.)

Sarka v. Regents of the University of California, No. Ad-337a-H/169:81

(The request for reconsideration was denied because the charging party's request did not state either of two statutory grounds for reconsideration.)

Sarka and Malkes v. Regents of the University of California, No. 1592-H/165:79

(The charge failed to allege a clear and concise statement of the facts.)

Security Police Officers Assn. v. Regents of the University of California (Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory), No. 1615-H/166:76

(The request for withdrawal was granted.)

State Employees Trades Council United v. Trustees of the California State University (Stanislaus), No. 1659-H/168:105

(The remaining portion of the charge was placed in abeyance and deferred to arbitration because the parties' agreement requires final and binding arbitration of grievances.)

Trout v. University Professional and Technical Employees, CWA Loc. 9119, No. 1582-H/165:75

(As an agency fee payer, the charging party has no authority under PERB Reg. 32125(a) to petition to compel UPTE to certify its financial report.)

University Council American Federation of Teachers v. Regents of the University of California, No. 1689-H/169:81

(The University of California violated its duty to bargain when it changed benefit levels and premium contributions without providing notice or an opportunity for bargaining to the University Council American Federation of Teachers.)

Webb v. Trustees of the California State University (San Bernardino), No. 1609-H/166:75

(The charge failed to state a prima facie case of retaliation.)

Webb v. Trustees of the California State University (San Bernardino), No. 1609a-H/168:102

(The request for reconsideration was denied because it did not state either of the appropriate grounds for the board to reconsider a case.)

MMBA Cases

Adza v. Service Employees International Union, No. 790, No. 1632-M/167:103

(The charge was dismissed because there was no evidence that SEIU breached its duty of fair representation.)

AFSCME Loc. 512 v. City of Pittsburg, No. 1563-M/164:118

(The city council's decision to employ a consultant to assist in reviewing AFSCME's grievances was a non-negotiable matter of managerial prerogative.)

Banks and Molidpiree v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790, AFL-CIO, No. 1636-M/167:104

(The charge was dismissed because the charging parties failed to demonstrate that SEIU breached its duty of fair representation by acting without a rational basis or that its actions were devoid of honest judgment.)

Bartlett-May et al. v. Otay Water Dist., No. 1634-M/167:100

(The charging parties were not entitled to additional money for tax liability and expenses incurred in obtaining new employment.)

Brady v. City of Santa Barbara, No. 1628-M/167:98

(Brady's unfair practice charge, which alleged that his right to union representation was violated, was dismissed for failure to state a prima facie case.)

Coachella Valley Mosquito & Vector Control Dist. and California School Employees Assn. and its Chap. 2001, No. Ad-336-M/167:101

(CSEA's administrative appeal that asked the board to excuse its late-filed petition for review was denied because the failure to timely file was not caused by circumstances beyond the association's control.)

Engineers & Architects Assn. v. Public Transportation Services Corp., No. 1637-M/167:102

(The Public Transportation Services Corporation is not a public agency within the meaning of the MMBA because it is more properly viewed as a subsidiary of the MTA and should be covered by the same portions of the Public Utilities Code.)

Fresno Irrigation District Employees Assn. v. Fresno Irrigation Dist., No. 1565-M/164:118

(The district violated its own local policy, unlawfully changed the terms and conditions of employment, and discriminated in response to the association's protected activity.)

Geismar v. Marin County Law Library, No. 1655-M/168:112

(The retaliation charge was rejected because the charging party's actions did not rise to the level of protected activity.)

Geismar v. Marin County Law Library, No. Ad-338-M/168:115

(The board denied the charging party's appeal of an administrative decision denying her the right to file an amended charge.)

Goddard v. Rainbow Municipal Water Dist., No. 1676-M/169:84

(The district unlawfully retaliated against the charging party for reporting illegal anti-union activity.)

International Federation of Professional & Technical Engineers, Loc. 21, AFL-CIO v. Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation Dist., No. 1669-M/169:83

(The charging party failed to demonstrate that the district's acceptance of a decertification petition violated the MMBA.)

International Union of Operating Engineers, Loc. 3 v. McCloud Community Services Dist., No. 1625-M/167:98

(IUOE's request to have its appeal withdrawn was granted.)

International Union of Operating Engineers, Loc. 39, AFL-CIO v. County of Placer, No. 1630-M/167:99

(IUOE's grievance which alleged that a specified group of employees had been performing out-of-class work was dismissed because it was not filed within the 60-day time frame required by the parties' MOU.)

Jeffers v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 616, No. 1675-M/169:85

(The charging party failed to demonstrate that the union had denied him representation in bad faith.)

Kimbrough v. Alameda County Medical Center, No. 1620-M/166:80

(The employer did not violate the MMBA by refusing to meet and confer with the charging party.)

Kimbrough v. Alameda County Medical Center, No. 1620a-M/168:110

(The request for reconsideration was denied because it did not state either of the appropriate grounds for the board to reconsider a case.)

Lopez v. City of Milpitas, No. 1641-M/168:106

(The charging party did not meet the burden of proving he suffered retaliation because of his protected activities.)

Lowery v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790, No. 1666-M/169:85

(No breach of the duty of fair representation was found where the union provided the charging party with a detailed explanation of why his grievance lacked merit.)

Montgomery v. City and County of San Francisco, No. 1643-M/168:109

(The unfair practice charge was dismissed because it was untimely and virtually identical to the charge in a prior case that already had been dismissed.)

Montgomery v. SEIU Loc. 790, No. 1644-M/168:115

(The charge was dismissed because it was untimely and virtually identical to a charge in a prior case that already had been dismissed.)

Operating Engineers, Loc. 3 v. Westlands Water Dist., No. 1622-M/166:80

(The dismissal was reversed. The district violated its own local rules by conducting an election on the unit modification petition.)

Oxnard Harbor Dist. v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 998, No. 1580-M/165:80

(A sympathy strike was not a "strike" or "work stoppage" as prohibited by the parties' agreement. The union

did not interfere with employee rights by threatening to fire members who failed to honor the strike.)

Sacramento County Aircraft Rescue Firefighters Assn. v. Sacramento Co., No. 1581-M/165:82

(The contract bar did not prohibit the county from accepting the association's petition for modification.)

San Francisco Firefighters Union, Loc. 798, IAFF, AFL-CIO v. City and County of San Francisco, No. 1611-M/166:79

(The charge failed to establish an unlawful unilateral change in discipline policy. The union could not rely on the settlements in two disciplinary cases to establish past practice.)

Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790 v. City and County of San Francisco, No. 1664-M/169:81

(The charging party failed to state a prima facie case of discrimination, interference, or unilateral change.)

Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790 v. County of Riverside, No. 1577-M/164:120

(The county unlawfully refused to process a bargaining unit member's grievance in violation of the MMBA.)

Service Employees International Union v. County of Riverside, No. 1577a-M/167:97

(The county's request for reconsideration was denied because the board's decision was not based on a prejudicial error of fact and because newly discovered evidence did not make the case moot.)

Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790 v. County of San Joaquin, No. 1570-M/164:119

(The board agent's decision was reversed. The county was found to have violated its local rules, and the case was remanded to allow the union a chance to establish the alleged impasse involved a subject within the scope of representation.)

Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790 v. County of San Joaquin, No. 1600-M/166:77

(The allegation that the county refused to adopt the recommended decision of a mediator did not state a prima facie case.)

Service Employees International Union, Loc. 817 v. County of Monterey, No. 1663-M/168:113

(The county's application of its rules regarding union recognition disparaged the incumbent exclusive representative and demonstrated unlawful support of one union over another.)

Service Employees International Union, Loc. 817 v. County of Monterey, No. Ad-331-M/166:78

(Good cause exists to sever the park ranger association's case from SEIU's case.)

Siroky v. International Union of Operating Engineers, Loc. 39, No. 1618-M/166:82

(The charging party failed to meet his burden to show how the union abused its discretion by failing to represent him in a wage dispute.)

Stewart (Mental Health Workers) v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 250, No. 1610-M/166:81

(Some bargaining unit members' dissatisfaction with an agreement is insufficient by itself to demonstrate a prima facie violation of the duty of fair representation.)

Union of American Physicians and Dentists v. County of San Joaquin (Health Care Services), No. 1649-M/168:110

(The charge was dismissed because evidence demonstrated that the county would have terminated the charging party even absent any protected activity.)

Waqia v. International Association of Firefighters, No. 1621-M/166:82

(The charge failed to show that the association's refusal to pursue the grievance to arbitration was arbitrary, discriminatory, or in bad faith.)

Section B: Key to Orders and Decisions by PERB Decision Number

| | | | |
|-------------|---|-------------|--|
| No. 1490a | Turlock Teachers Assn. v. Turlock Joint Elementary School Dist./166:70 | No. 1559a-S | Vickers v. State of California (Department of Corrections)/166:67 |
| No. 1540a-S | Vickers v. State of California (Department of Corrections)/166:67 | No. 1560 | Maurer v. Coast Community College Dist./164:109 |
| No. 1550 | Simpson v. California School Employees Assn., Chap. 130/164:113 | No. 1561 | Bellevue Educators Assn. v. Bellevue Union Elementary School Dist./164:109 |
| No. 1551-S | Barker and Osuna v. California State Employees Assn./164:101 | No. 1562-S | California Union of Safety Employees v. State of California (Department of Parks and Recreation)/164:103 |
| No. 1552 | Bailey v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist./164:107 | No. 1563-M | AFSCME Loc. 512 v. City of Pittsburg/164:118 |
| No. 1553-S | Sutton v. California State Employees Assn., Loc. 1000/164:106 | No. 1564 | Long Beach Council of Classified Employees v. Long Beach Community College Dist./164:110 |
| No. 1554 | Abrams v. Chula Vista Elementary Educators Assn./164:115 | No. 1565-M | Fresno Irrigation District Employees Assn. v. Fresno Irrigation Dist./164:118 |
| No. 1555 | American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Loc. 101 v. San Jose Unified School Dist./164:108 | No. 1566-S | California Union of Safety Employees v. State of California (Department of Parks and Recreation)/164:104 |
| No. 1556 | Ravenswood Teachers Assn. v. Ravenswood City Elementary School Dist./164:108 | No. 1567-S | California Union of Safety Employees v. State of California (Department of Mental Health)/164:104 |
| No. 1557 | Larkins v. Chula Vista Elementary School Dist./164:108 | No. 1568 | Long Beach Community College Dist. Police Officers Assn. v. Long Beach Community College Dist./164:110 |
| No. 1557a | Larkins v. Chula Vista Elementary School Dist./167:85 | No. 1569 | Rossmann et al. v. Orange Unified Education Assn. and California Teachers Assn./164:115 |
| No. 1558-S | California State Employees Assn. v. State of California (Department of Motor Vehicles)/164:102 | | |
| No. 1559-S | Vickers v. State of California (Department of Corrections)/164:103 | | |

- No. 1570-M Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790 v. San Joaquin County/164:119
- No. 1571 Kaiser v. Fremont USD/164:112
- No. 1572 Kaiser v. Fremont Unified Dist. Teachers Assn./164:116
- No. 1573-H O'Malley v. American Arbitration Assn./164:117
- No. 1574-S California Union of Safety Employees v. State of California Highway Patrol/164:105
- No. 1575 Larkins v. Chula Vista Elementary Educators Assn./164:116
- No. 1575a Larkins v. Chula Vista Elementary Educators Assn./167:93
- No. 1576 Lee v. Peralta Community College Dist./164:113
- No. 1577-M Service Employees International Union v. Riverside County/164:120
- No. 1577a-M Service Employees International Union v. County of Riverside/167:97
- No. 1578-H O'Malley v. California Nurses Assn./164:117
- No. 1579-S Zanchi v. State of California (Department of Corrections)/164:105
- No. 1580-M Oxnard Harbor Dist. v. SEIU Loc. 998/165:80
- No. 1581-M Sacramento County Aircraft Rescue Firefighters Assn. v. Sacramento Co./165:82
- No. 1582-H Trout v. University Professional and Technical Employees, CWA Loc. 9119/165:75
- No. 1583-S Hard, Hackett, and Perkins v. California State Employees Assn./165:73
- No. 1584-H California State Employees Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University (San Marcos)/165:76
- No. 1585-H Sarka v. Regents of the University of California/165:77
- No. 1585a-H Sarka v. Regents of the University of California/167:93
- No. 1586-H Professionals of California v. Trustees of the California State University/165:78
- No. 1589-E Andrus, Miller, Mettier, and Kerr v. Paso Robles Public Educators/165:73
- No. 1590-H American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees v. Regents of the University of California (Davis)/165:78
- No. 1591-H California Faculty Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University/165:79
- No. 1592-H Sarka and Malkes v. Regents of the University of California/165:79
- No. 1593-S Toran v. California State Employees Assn./165:73
- No. 1594 Kestin v. United Teachers of Los Angeles/165:75
- No. 1595 Newark Teachers Assn. v. Newark Unified School Dist./165:74
- No. 1596-H Regents of the University of California v. Association of Graduate Student Employees, United Auto Workers/165:80
- No. 1597-H California Faculty Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University/165:80
- No. 1598-M SEIU Loc. 1280, AFL-CIO v. Solano County (Human Resources Dept.)/166:76
- No. 1599-H California State Employees Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University/166:74

| | | | |
|-------------|---|-------------|---|
| No. 1600-M | SEIU, Loc. 790 v. San Joaquin County/ 166:77 | No. 1613 | DeLauer v. Sonoma Valley Unified School Dist./166:72 |
| No. 1601-S | State of California (Department of Per- sonnel Administration) v. California State Employees Assn., SEIU Loc. 1000/166:68 | No. 1614-S | California Union of Safety Employees v. State of California (Department of Devel- opmental Services)/166:69 |
| No. 1602 | San Bernardino Association of Substitute Teachers v. San Bernardino City Unified School Dist./166:71 | No. 1615-H | Security Police Officers Assn. v. Regents of the University of California (Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory)/166:76 |
| No. 1603 | Sloan v. Shasta College Faculty Assn./ 166:73 | No. 1616 | San Juan Teachers Assn., CTA/NEA v. San Juan Unified School Dist./166:72 |
| No. 1604 | Holford v. United Teachers of Richmond/ 166:73 | No. 1617-S | Kunkel v. State of California/166:70 |
| No. 1605 | Las Virgenes Educators Assn. v. Las Virgenes Unified School Dist./166:71 | No. 1618-M | Siroky v. International Union of Operat- ing Engineers, Loc. 39/166:82 |
| No. 1606 | Gutierrez v. California School Employ- ees Assn., Chap. 244/166:74 | No. 1619-S | Sarinana v. State of California (Department of Forestry and Fire Protection)/166:70 |
| No. 1607-H | O'Malley v. California Nurses Assn./ 166:74 | No. 1620-M | Kimbrough v. Alameda County Medical Center/166:80 |
| No. 1608-M | Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790, AFL-CIO v. City and County of San Francisco/166:78 | No. 1620a-M | Kimbrough v. Alameda County Medical Center/168:110 |
| No. 1609-H | Webb v. Trustees of the California State University (San Bernardino)/166:75 | No. 1621-M | Waqia v. International Association of Firefighters/166:82 |
| No. 1609a-H | Webb v. Trustees of the California State University San Bernardino/168:102 | No. 1621a-M | Waqia v. International Association of Firefighters, Loc. 55/168:116 |
| No. 1610-M | Stewart (Mental Health Workers) v. Ser- vice Employees International Union, Loc. 250/166:81 | No. 1622-M | Operating Engineers, Loc. 3 v. Westlands Water Dist./166:80 |
| No. 1611-M | San Francisco Firefighters Union, Loc. 798, IAFF, AFL-CIO v. City and County of San Francisco/166:79 | No. 1623 | Fontana Unified School Dist. and United Steelworkers of America/167:91 |
| No. 1612 | DeLauer v. Santa Rosa Junior College/ 166:72 | No. 1624 | Stryker v. Antelope Valley College Fed- eration of Teachers/167:85 |
| | | No. 1625-M | International Union of Operating Engi- neers, Loc. 3 v. McCloud Community Ser- vices Dist./167:98 |

| | | | |
|------------|---|------------|---|
| No. 1626-H | Sarca v. California State Employees Assn., CSU Div./167:96 | No. 1640 | California School Employees Assn. v. Lucia Mar Unified School Dist./167:89 |
| No. 1627 | San Joaquin County Office of Education and California School Employees Assn./167:92 | No. 1641-M | Lopez v. City of Milpitas/168:106 |
| No. 1628-M | Brady v. City of Santa Barbara/167:98 | No. 1642-H | Academic Professionals of California v. Trustees of the California State University/168:101 |
| No. 1629 | California School Employees Assn., Chap. 209 v. Yucaipa-Calimesa Joint Unified School Dist./167:86 | No. 1643-M | Montgomery v. City and County of San Francisco/168:109 |
| No. 1630-M | International Union of Operating Engineers, Loc. 39, AFL-CIO v. County of Placer/167:99 | No. 1644-M | Montgomery v. SEIU Loc. 790/168:115 |
| No. 1631 | Deglow v. Los Rios Community College Dist./167:86 | No. 1645 | Ferguson v. Oakland Unified School Dist./168:87 |
| No. 1632-M | Adza v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790/167:103 | No. 1646 | Ferguson v. Oakland Education Assn./168:99 |
| No. 1633 | California School Employees Assn., Chap. 82 v. Fullerton Joint Union School Dist./167:88 | No. 1646a | Ferguson v. Oakland Education Assn./169:75 |
| No. 1634-M | Bartlett-May et al. v. Otay Water Dist./167:100 | No. 1647 | Chula Vista Elementary Education Assn., CTA/NEA v. Chula Vista Elementary School Dist./168:88 |
| No. 1635-H | California State Employees Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University (San Marcos)/167:94 | No. 1648 | Lake Elsinore Teachers Assn., CTA/NEA v. Lake Elsinore Unified School Dist./168:89 |
| No. 1636-M | Banks and Molidpiree v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790, AFL-CIO/167:104 | No. 1649-M | Union of American Physicians and Dentists v. County of San Joaquin (Health Care Services)/168:110 |
| No. 1637-M | Engineers & Architects Assn. v. Public Transportation Services Corp./167:102 | No. 1650 | Empire Teachers Assn. v. Empire Union School Dist./168:92 |
| No. 1638-H | Regents of the University of California v. California Nurses Assn. No. 1638-H/167:95 | No. 1651-H | O'Malley v. California Nurses Assn./168:102 |
| No. 1639 | Salinas Valley Federation of Teachers, AFT Loc. 1020, AFL-CIO v. Salinas Union High School Dist./167:89 | No. 1652 | California School Employees Assn., Chap. 802 v. Lost Hills Union Elementary School Dist./168:95 |
| | | No. 1653 | Malik v. Compton Community College Dist./168:96 |

- | | | | |
|------------|--|------------|--|
| No. 1654-H | Academic Professionals of California v. Trustees of the California State University/168:102 | No. 1668 | Astrachan v. Los Angeles Community College Dist. No. 1668/169:73 |
| No. 1655-M | Geismar v. Marin County Law Library/168:112 | No. 1669-M | International Federation of Professional & Technical Engineers, Loc. 21, AFL-CIO v. Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation Dist./169:83 |
| No. 1656-H | Academic Professionals of California v. Trustees of the California State University/168:103 | No. 1670 | Rossmann v. Orange Unified School Dist. No. 1670/169:73 |
| No. 1657 | United Teachers of Los Angeles v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist./168:97 | No. 1671 | Perez v. Fullerton Elementary School Dist./169:74 |
| No. 1658-H | Academic Professionals of California v. Trustees of the California State University/168:104 | No. 1672-H | California Faculty Assn. v. Trustees of the California State University/169:80 |
| No. 1659-H | State Employees Trades Council United v. Trustees of the California State University (Stanislaus)/168:105 | No. 1673-H | O'Malley v. California Nurses Assn./169:80 |
| No. 1660 | Ravenswood Teachers Assn. v. Ravenswood City Elementary School Dist.; Ravenswood Teachers Assn. v. Edison Brentwood Academy/168:98 | No. 1674 | Fresno County Office Schools Educators Assn. v. Fresno County Office of Education/169:75 |
| No. 1661 | Ravenswood Teachers Assn., CTA/NEA v. Edison Schools, Inc./168:99 | No. 1675-M | Jeffers v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 616/169:85 |
| No. 1662 | Malik v. California Federation of Teachers/168:100 | No. 1676-M | Goddard v. Rainbow Municipal Water Dist./169:84 |
| No. 1663-M | Service Employees International Union, Loc. 817 v. County of Monterey/168:113 | No. 1677 | Hein v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790/169:79 |
| No. 1664-M | Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790 v. City and County of San Francisco/169:81 | No. 1678 | Delano Joint Union High School Dist., Association of Student Affairs Support Specialists, and California School Employees Assn., Chap. 79/169:78 |
| No. 1665 | Associated Administrators of Los Angeles v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist./169:77 | No. 1679 | Grosfield v. Oxnard Elementary School Dist./169:76 |
| No. 1666-M | Lowery v. Service Employees International Union, Loc. 790/169:85 | No. 1680-S | International Union of Operating Engineers v. State of California (State Personnel Board)/169:72 |
| No. 1667 | Mrvichin v. Los Angeles Community College Dist. No. 1667/169:73 | No. 1689-H | University Council American Federation of Teachers v. Regents of the University of California/169:81 |

- No. Ad-331-M Service Employees International Union,
Loc. 817 v. Monterey County/166:78
- No. Ad-332 Santa Clarita Community College Dist. v.
Part-Time Faculty United, AFT/166:73
- No. Ad-333 Pleasant Valley Elementary School Dist.
and Group of Employees and SEIU Loc.
998/167:89
- No. Ad-334 Henderson v. Los Angeles Unified School
Dist./167:84
- No. Ad-335 Henderson v. Teamsters Loc. 572/167:93
- No. Ad-336-M Coachella Valley Mosquito & Vector
Control Dist. and California School Em-
ployees Assn. and its Chap. 2001/167:101
- No. Ad-337-H Sarka v. Regents of the University of Cali-
fornia/167:95
- No. Ad-337a-H Sarka v. Regents of the University of Cali-
fornia/169:81

PART IV

INDEX OF ARBITRATION

Grievance Actions

A-C

CONTRACT INTERPRETATION
164:92, 164:94, 164:95, 169:80, 169:81

CONTRACT INTERPRETATION — BENEFITS
164:86, 167:81

CONTRACT INTERPRETATION — EXPENSE PAY
165:67

CONTRACT INTERPRETATION — JOB CLASSIFICATION
167:79

CONTRACT INTERPRETATION — OFF-DUTY EMPLOYMENT
169:79

CONTRACT INTERPRETATION — NON-RE-ELECTION
166:60

CONTRACT INTERPRETATION — PROMOTION
167:74

CONTRACT INTERPRETATION — REIMBURSEMENT
165:71

CONTRACT INTERPRETATION — RETIREMENT BENEFITS
165:68, 166:63

CONTRACT INTERPRETATION — RETURN TO WORK
166:62

CONTRACT INTERPRETATION — SALARY
168:69

CONTRACT INTERPRETATION — SELECTION CRITERIA
165:71

CONTRACT INTERPRETATION — VACATION LEAVE
166:59

D

DISABILITY
168:62

DISCHARGE — DISPARATE TREATMENT
165:69

DISCHARGE — JUST CAUSE
165:64, 167:77, 167:78, 167:80, 168:68

DISCIPLINE
164:93, 168:65, 168:66, 168:67

DISCIPLINE — INSUBORDINATION
165:7

DISCIPLINE — JUST CAUSE
165:69, 169:76, 169:77

E-L

EXCLUSIVE REPRESENTATION

166:61

M-N

MAJORITY STATUS

166:61

MILEAGE REIMBURSEMENT

164:94

O

OUT-OF-CLASS CLAIM

167:79

P-Q

PAY CLAIM — OVERTIME

164:95

PROGRESSIVE DISCIPLINE

164:96

PROMOTION — WEIGHT CONTROL

167:74

R

REASSIGNMENT

164:93

REMEDY — ISSUANCE OF AWARD

166:62

S-T

SAFETY

158:72

SHIFT ASSIGNMENT

160:69

SUSPENSION — JUST CAUSE

164:96, 165:70

U

UNION ACCESS TO EMPLOYER'S FACILITIES

164:92

V-Z

VOLUNTARY TRANSFER

165:71

Neutrals

WOODFORD, JOSEPH J.

169:69

WORMUTH, JOHN

166:60

BOGUE, BONNIE G.

164:94, 165:67, 166:61, 167:74, 168:77, 169:66

BURDICK, CHRISTOPHER D.

169:67

ELLIS, ANNE ANDREWS

164:92

KAUFMAN, WALTER N.

165:64

NELSON, ELINOR S.

165:69

POOL, C. ALLEN

164:93, 166:55, 167:78, 168:79, 169:68

RIKER, WILLIAM E.

165:68, 167:80, 168:76, 169:62

RULE, WILLIAM

164:86

SILVER, FRANKLIN

166:59, 167:77

SILVER, MELVYN D.

168:73, 169:65

STAUDOHAR, PAUL D.

164:96, 165:71, 166:63, 168:80

TAMOUSH, PHILIP

164:95, 166:62

THOMSON, KATHERINE

165:70, 167:81

VENDRILLO, CAROL

167:79