NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 22202 Docket Number CL-22103

Joseph A. Sickles, Referee

(Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and
(Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers,
(Express and Station Employes
(Southern Pacific Transportation Company
((Pacific Lines)

PARTIES TO DISPUTE:

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood (GL-8367) that:

- (a) The Southern Pacific Transportation Company violated the current Clerks' Agreement when it failed to assign Clerk Florence Okafor to General Steno-Clerk Position No. 106 instead of junior clerk V. R. Carter; and,
- (b) The Southern Pacific Transportation Company shall now be required to compensate Clerk Okafor at the rate of Position No. 106 for May 16, 1974 and each date thereafter until she is placed thereon.

OPINION OF BOARD: On May 2, 1974, the Claimant applied for a General Clerk Steno position which was then vacant. She completed a shorthand-typing test for the position; however, when the position was assigned to a junior employe, she requested an investigation asserting that the test was unfairly and unjustly administered.

The Carrier has continued to insist that the Claimant was not qualified for the position.

The Carrier points out that when Claimant was interviewed, subsequent to submitting her bid, it became apparent that she had no prior general clerical experience and that her bid was eventually rejected based upon a lack of sufficient experience and qualifications to handle the work involved in the position, and because of her unsatisfactory performance in a dictation and typing test.

Rule 27 is pertinent to this dispute:

"Rule 27:

PROMOTIONS, ASSIGNMENTS, DISPLACEMENTS

Employes covered by these rules shall be in line for promotion. Promotions, assignments and displacements shall be based on seniority, fitness and ability; fitness and ability being sufficient, seniority shall prevail.

NOTE: The word 'sufficient' is intended to more clearly establish the right of the senior employe to bid in a new position or vacancy, or to displace a junior employe, where two or more employes have adequate fitness and ability. In such cases the senior employe will be awarded the position unless it is obvious he cannot qualify. Employes shall be given cooperation in their efforts to qualify."

We have considered all of the various assertions made by the Claimant concerning prejudice, prejudgment, etc.; however, in the final analysis, and after consideration of the entire record, this Board is of the view that the Claimant failed a test which was reasonably related to the qualifications for the position and which was reasonably administered.

Of course, each dispute such as this must be considered based upon its own individual merits, and in this case we are unable to establish that the Claimant has set forth any basis for a determination that the Carrier violated the Agreement.

FINDINGS: The Third Division of the Adjustment Board, upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds and holds:

That the parties waived oral hearing:

That the Carrier and the Employes involved in this dispute are respectively Carrier and Employes within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act, as approved June 21, 1934;

Award Number 22202 Docket Number CL-22103

That this Division of the Adjustment Board has jurisdiction over the dispute involved herein; and

That the Agreement was not violated.

AWARD

Claim denied.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD By Order of Third Division

ATTEST:

Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 13th day of October 1978.