

3-25-1966

# United States Steel Corporation Heavy Products Operations Gary Steel Works and United Steelworkers of America Local Union 2695

Sylvester Garrett

Follow this and additional works at: [http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett\\_series](http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett_series)

---

## Recommended Citation

Garrett, Sylvester, "United States Steel Corporation Heavy Products Operations Gary Steel Works and United Steelworkers of America Local Union 2695" (1966). *Arbitration Cases*. 220.  
[http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett\\_series/220](http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett_series/220)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Sylvester Garrett Labor Arbitration Collection at Knowledge Repository @ IUP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Arbitration Cases by an authorized administrator of Knowledge Repository @ IUP. For more information, please contact [cclouser@iup.edu](mailto:cclouser@iup.edu), [sara.parme@iup.edu](mailto:sara.parme@iup.edu).

BOARD OF ARBITRATION

Case No. USS-5293-H

March 25, 1966

ARBITRATION AWARD

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION  
HEAVY PRODUCTS OPERATIONS  
Gary Steel Works

and

Grievance No. S-63-66

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA  
Local Union No. 2695

Subject: Rates of Pay - Assignment to Appropriate Job

Statement of the Grievance: "I, Mary Ann Novicki, request the Company to abide by the terms of the Salaried Bargaining Agreement. I have been required to perform, and am still performing on my job, duties and work functions which are part and parcel of several other jobs which are classified at a higher bi-weekly salary rate than that which I am being currently paid thereon."

This grievance was filed in the First Step of the grievance procedure December 10, 1963.

Contract Provision Involved: Section 9 of the April 6, 1962 Salaried Agreement, as amended June 29, 1963.

Statement of the Award: The grievance is denied.

BACKGROUND

Case USS-5293-H

A salaried employee in the West Mills group of the Accounting Department, Gary Steel Works, grieves that she was improperly assigned to the job of Typist (Loading), Job Class 2, upon recall from layoff on February 25, 1963, in violation of Section 9 of the April 6, 1962 Salaried Agreement, as amended June 29, 1963.

1

On July 14, 1962, the incumbent of the job of Typist (Loading), Job Class 2, was laid off in the Loading Department of the West Mills group. Operations were reduced and Supervision assigned the remaining typing duties to the then incumbent of the job of Inventory Clerk (Finishing End), Job Class 4, who performed the typing duties as required and otherwise performed her regular duties. On July 28, 1962, due to a further force reduction, another employee bumped into the job of Inventory Clerk (Finishing End) who performed it in the same manner as her predecessor. This employee in turn went on an extended sick leave several months later and Mrs. Florence Phillips was assigned to the job of Inventory Clerk (Finishing End). She continued to fill both this job and the job of Typist (Loading) until February 25, 1963, when production increased and grievant was recalled from layoff and assigned to the job of Typist (Loading). From that day on, Mrs. Phillips filled only the job of Inventory Clerk (Finishing End) and maintained four inventory control ledgers out of eleven. At first, two other inventory control ledgers were assigned to grievant, a third one was added later on. The remaining ledgers were posted by other Job Class 4 jobs, such as Unit Backlog Clerk.

2

After grievant became familiar with the operations of the office and learned that other employees who maintained inventory control ledgers were coded and paid at Job Class 4, she took the matter up with her Union Representative

3

who filed a grievance on December 10, 1963. A written grievance was filed two days later which was held pending until September 10, 1964.

At the time the grievance was filed the Primary Function of the job Typist (Loading) was "Types daily rejection and delinquent processing reports from written reports. Types various reports and types stencils." In the first four factors the job was coded on the basis of "Operate typewriter to type reports and correspondence." After the grievance was filed, the Company issued a Form G on January 20, 1964 adding as a working procedure "Posts collected data such as material receipts, products produced, and other information to records and forms." The wording in Factors 1, 2 and 3 was changed to "Post collected data such as material receipts, products produced, and other information to records and forms where source of information is indicated by procedures or instructions and location of postings are clearly indicated by headings;" the total job class was increased from 1.6 to 2.3, but remained in Job Class 2. The classification as changed by Form G was also grieved; this issue is not before the Board in this case.

4

Grievant has filled subsequent vacancies in the job of Inventory Clerk (Finishing End) and is therefore familiar with the full range of its duties. It is undisputed that there has been a substantial erosion of its duties from those originally set forth in its working procedure as issued on February 18, 1954. Specifically, the grievant stated that the Inventory Clerk now performs only the following eight duties:

5

"Sorts all Mill Production and Merchant Mill Finishing and Shipping End Unit Reports received from Shear and Unit Production Recorders into three groups, retaining one group for office record and mailing other groups to Standard Cost and Production Planning.

"Deletes weight, size, length, etc., of material in Inventory Ledger as material is shipped to stock area.

"Maintains Inventory Ledger showing customer's name, heat number, inventory code, weight, pile number, pieces, size, length, etc., of all material produced in various mills from Mill Production Reports. Deletes from Ledger all material loaded daily from mills by stamping load number opposite weight as shown on Loader's recap.

"Deletes from Inventory Ledger all material rejected by circling weight and marking same 'rejected' in car number column when complete pile is rejected.

"Reduces the weight by subtracting amount rejected when only part of pile is rejected. Rejections are obtained from Final Inspection Report.

"Prepares monthly Inventory Report by tonnage, class, and inventory code of all material on hand in various mills as shown in Inventory Ledger.

"Sorts loader's recaps into groups of mill, and loadings which might require 'suspense' application.

"Removes completed ledger sheets and files."

Grievant claims that the language of these working procedures also cover the work of the Typist (Loading) on the three ledgers assigned to her. 6

The Union relies on the fact that, prior to grievant's recall, maintaining ledgers and typing was performed by an incumbent of the job of Inventory Clerk (Finishing End) in Job Class 4. Grievant was allegedly assigned the identical work but under the classification of Typist (Loading) in Job Class 2. Since she seemingly performed all the duties of an Inventory Clerk (Finishing End) on the three ledgers which had been assigned to her, she should have been paid the rate of the Inventory Clerk's job. The Union states that there was no change in existing job descriptions and classifications, and it was not until after grievant had filed her grievance that a Form G was issued for the job of Typist (Loading). 7

The Company explains that, in the first four factors, the job of Inventory Clerk (Finishing End) was coded 8

on the basis of "Prepare and maintain monthly recapitulation of inventory of all material on hand in various mills, material in cars, etc.", and that this is no longer accurate, although incumbents of the job of Inventory Clerk (Finishing End) are still properly in Job Class 4. While they no longer perform the full scope of the job as originally described, their job includes certain coding functions which in themselves justify a Job Class 4 classification. (It is not disputed that shear sheets for ledgers maintained by the job of Typist (Loading) are first routed to the Head Statistical Clerk who checks them for proper coding and then passes them onto the Typist (Loading) for posting.)

The Company also argues that the phrase "maintains inventory ledger" in the job description of the Inventory Clerk (Finishing End) refers to more than mere posting. "Maintenance" embraces the resolution of discrepancies. A Supervisor in the department testified that whenever a "wreck" occurs in any of the books assigned for posting to incumbents of jobs other than the Inventory Clerk, the incumbent of the latter job is assigned to ferret out any mistakes which have been made. The Company feels that the work performed by grievant on the ledgers is merely that of a Posting Clerk as described in the following Primary Function and Working Procedure:

9

"Primary Function

"Performs miscellaneous clerical duties such as typing, maintaining daily production data, shop and store order records, etc.

"Working Procedure

"Posts daily production by turn and section showing earned and actual

"hours, yield performance, and delays, from daily production records as furnished by Standard Cost Bureau.

"Maintains file of shop orders and posts detail of shop charges against these orders from daily listings furnished by the Tabulating Bureau.

"Maintains file of store orders and keeps record of operating supplies ordered.

"Writes minutes of supervisors' safety meetings, types and maintains safety file.

"Performs miscellaneous office duties as directed, such as maintaining files on correspondence and various reports, miscellaneous typing, etc.

"Answers telephone and refers to proper party."

(Underscoring added.)

In this job description, the Company argues, the term "Maintain" has a meaning different from that used to describe the duties of the Inventory Clerk.

10

As the job of Typist (Loading), that of Posting Clerk is also classified at a total job classification of 2.3 for Job Class 2 with the following Reason for Classification in the first four factors:

11



"Posts daily production from production records where identification of items to be posted and location of posting are clearly indicated."

### FINDINGS

There can be no doubt that, over the years, jobs in the Loading Department Office have undergone changes which have not been recognized in changed job descriptions and classifications. Under these circumstances, the proper rate for a specific bundle of duties assigned to a given job cannot be ascertained solely by reference to these tasks in a given job description. 12

Under the salaried job description and classification program, jobs in different job classes frequently perform similar duties, such as posting, and the reason for classification depends in many instances on the performance of certain well-defined tasks such as coding or resolving differences. Therefore, in the instant case, a claim for assignment to a Job Class 4 job is not substantiated merely by the fact that grievant posted data to three ledgers in a manner similar to the posting work of the Inventory Clerk on four ledgers. It is incumbent on grievant to substantiate such a claim by reference to principles of salaried job description and classification. A grievance, initiating such an inquiry, was filed when the Company issued the Form G and is not now before the Board. 13

Thus, the Board here must limit its inquiry solely to the claim that grievant was, in fact, assigned to an 14

existing job in Job Class 4. Before grievant was recalled from layoff there was only one incumbent of the job of Inventory Clerk (Finishing End) who had also filled in as Typist (Loading). After grievant's recall, the Inventory Clerk resumed to work on ledgers exclusively. In terms of departmental work distribution, grievant's assignment to the job of Typist (Loading) changed the picture, and the record, without more, does not support a finding that she filled the exact duties formerly performed by Mrs. Phillips; when Mrs. Phillips performed ledger work and typing, there was no additional Inventory Clerk for coding and resolving discrepancies. It should be noted that Mrs. Phillips did not participate in the grievance procedure although she did not retire until May of 1964.

The present decision, of course, passes no opinion on the merit of contention as to proper job classification raised by the later grievance protesting failure to assign a coding of more than 2.3, following issuance of a Form G.

15

AWARD


The grievance is denied.

16

9.

USS-5293-H


Findings and Award recommended  
pursuant to Section 7-J of the  
Agreement, by



---

Peter Florey  
Assistant to the Chairman

Approved by the Board of Arbitration



---

Sylvester Garrett, Chairman