

INLAND STEEL COMPANY)	
- and -)	Grievance No. 7-E-16
)	Docket No. IH-32-32-6/11/56
UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA))	Arbitration No. 220
Local Union No. 1010)	<u>Opinion and Award</u>

Appearances:

For the Company:

L. E. Davidson, Assistant Superintendent,
Labor Relations
R. L. Smith, Superintendent, Industrial Engineering
R. J. Stanton, Divisional Supervisor, Labor Relations
R. Ayres, Divisional Supervisor, Labor Relations

For the Union:

Cecil Clifton, International Staff Representative
Joseph Wolanin, Secretary, Grievance Committee
C. Krivickas, Grievance Committeeman

The grievance notice filed by Pit Clerks in the No. 2 Blooming Mill on November 23, 1955 is expressed as follows:

"The aggrieved employees, Pit Clerk - Index No. 61-0303, Dept. 40" Blooming Mill, Unit Heating allege that due to changed conditions, methods and equipment the Company has made changes in their existing job content, dated 9-14-45, so as to change the classification of such job under the provisions of the W.R. I.A.

"Some of the major changes are:

1. Four (4) batteries and or 8 new pits
2. Two (2) cover cranes
3. Hi lift tractor
4. One (1) new pit crane
5. New shears
6. Two (2) transfers
7. new roll stand

"violation of Article V, Section 6."

The relief sought is

"Aggrieved employees request that a job description and classification be developed and installed in accordance with the applicable provisions of the W.R.I.A. and C.B.A."

Some clarification and modification of the demand and relief requested was achieved at the third step hearing and at the arbitration step. The Union claims that the job description of Pit Clerk does not properly describe the job; that the job is improperly evaluated and classified; that the following changes in the evaluation of the factors set forth below should be made:

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Present Rating</u>		<u>Requested Rating</u>	<u>Number of Points Increased</u>
Judgment	5-B-1	to	5-C-2	1
Experience	2-B-4	to	2-C-6	2
Physical Exertion	2-C 1-A-3	to	2-D-4	1
Accident Exposure	3-B-4	to	2-D-6	2
Maintenance of Operation Pace	4-A-4	to	4-B-7	3

and that, accordingly, the job of Pit Clerk in the No. 2 Blooming Mill should be evaluated at the increased total of 50 points (nine above the present 41 points) and should be slotted into Job Class 7 (which is two job classes above the present Job Class 5).

An inspection of this operation was made in the company of representatives of the Union and of Management.

The Pit Clerk occupation under consideration was the subject of a job description dated August 23, 1945 and a classification and evaluation dated February, 1946. They were approved by the Union and were in effect at the conclusion of the Wage Rate Inequity Program on November 26, 1949. The 41 points assigned to the occupation placed it in Job Class 5 (41-44 points).

The grievance is based on the provisions of Article V, Section 6 of the 1954 Agreement. Marginal Paragraph 43, thereof provides

"The job description and classification for each job as agreed upon under the provisions of the Wage Rate Inequity Agreement of June 30, 1947 * * * shall continue in effect unless (1) the Company changes the job content (requirements of the job as to training, skill, responsibility, effort or working conditions) so as to change the classification of such job under the Standard Base Rate Wage Scale or (2) * * *"
(Underscoring supplied.)

The provisions following Marginal Paragraph 43 set forth procedures to be followed by the parties and Marginal Paragraph 50 provides that a grievance may be filed when the Company does not develop a new description and classification.

The Union claims that redescription and reclassification are called for by reason of changed job content (requirements of the job as to training, skill, responsibility, effort or working conditions) resulting from the addition of new facilities during the course of the expansion and modernization of the mill. It lists the new and modified facilities in its prehearing brief and alleges that by reason thereof and the changes in the work procedures they entailed, the Pit Clerk should be classified as an Assistant Pit Recorder, a job title in the No. 1 Blooming Mill which is in Job Class 6. It appears, however, that there are considerable variations in the equipment, operations, procedures, manning, occupational structure, organization and levels of compensation in the three blooming mills. The Union presented a list of occupations in the No. 2 Mill which were reclassified, presumably, to indicate that although many other job reclassifications were undertaken, nothing was done about the Pit Clerk. It then proceeded to undertake a showing why each of the factors referred to above should be entitled to higher point values than are presently assigned.

The Company's position is that the changes in facilities due to plant modernization did not affect the job content and the requirements of the job of Pit Clerk so as to warrant a change in the job description or classification. Its presentation seeks to refute the Union claims for a higher point value for the factors involved and argues that the work procedures the Union lists either had always been performed or constitute a restatement, in different words, of the long established duties of Pit Clerk. The Company states that the changes that took place in the Mill related to operational aspects of producing and handling steel rather than to the control and recording functions of Pit Clerk. The Pit Clerk was one of the occupations reviewed by the Company's Industrial Engineering Department upon conclusion of the modernization program, and it did not recommend any change in description or classification.

It is the function of the Arbitrator in a case of this kind to apply the provisions of Article V, Section 6 (Marginal Paragraph 43) quoted above. The existing job description and classification must remain in effect unless the job content, as defined, is changed by the Company.

The Union disputes the codings of five factors: Judgment; Experience; Physical Exertion; Accident Exposure; and Maintenance of Operation Pace.

- 1) Judgment: The Union requests an increase of one point from the present 5-B-1 to 5-C-2.

5-B-1 relates to "Simple inspection involving comparison with samples or standards within ordinary working tolerances." The requested 5-C-2 relates to "Action entailing judgment of distance, timing, size or mass and progress in chemical processes and reactions."

In support of its position that changes in job content have effected the Judgment element, the Union refers to the obligation of notifying the metalurgist, the scarfer operator and others of all changes affecting their operations and of maintaining the records of such changes. The Company answer is that these have always been duties of Pit Clerk, and that there has been no change in this regard. The General Heater Foreman stated that, whereas notification to the scarfing machine operator used to be rather "hazardous", the machine is now directly in the Pit Clerk's line of travel and the relocation presents no difficulties or added job content.

In its Post-Hearing Statement the Union refers to the contention in its prehearing brief that Pit Clerk "understands involved instructions" and complains that the Company credits Pit Clerk only with "simple inspection". The Union then points out that

"The Pit Clerk must now have the skill to coordinate duties and share duties with the Pit Clerk."

Reference was undoubtedly intended here, in the last two words of the quotation, to Pit Recorder who "directs" the Pit Clerk. The Pit Clerk normally performs a number of operations of the Pit Recorder in his absence from the office, but this office is also used by the General Heater Foreman and the Pit Clerk works under this General Foreman's immediate surveillance. It seems that the exercise of judgment by Pit Clerk when the Pit Recorder is not in the office is about the same in degree, quality and quantity as Pit Clerk has always exercised in the past. There is no showing that the Pit Clerk has assumed more of the Pit Recorder's exer-

cise of judgment than at the time the job descriptions and classifications were agreed upon.

The Union also speaks of "more section changes" resulting from the rolling of more wide flange steel in referring to Judgment. The Company claims that section changes and the charging and drawing of ingots are Pit Recorder's responsibility under his job description and not Pit Clerk's, and that this does not represent any change in procedures or responsibilities. The Union states that if the Heater lines up the wrong section and Pit Clerk does not observe the mistake, Pit Clerk would be held responsible; but the General Heater Foreman insisted that such an error would be attributable to Pit Recorder who has the responsibility, and not Pit Clerk. There was no testimony tending to show that the Company had or would take any other position. On the occasions when the 28" mill was down because of "mixed steel" the Pit Clerk was not held responsible. The Company's version is that Pit Recorder is responsible for all the charging and the drawing and the order in which they are scheduled; the Pit Clerk watches the drawing, brings data and information to others who are involved, in subsequent processing, but the "discernment and judgment" required by Pit Recorder are not his to exercise.

The Union claims that an upward evaluation of Judgment is justified because of the degree to which the Pit Clerk "works in cooperation" with the Pit Recorder "as stated on Pit Clerk's job description." Even if this were true, the evidence does not show a change in job content which demonstrates that the "requirements of the job as to training, skill, responsibility, effort or working conditions", as bearing on the Judgment factor, are any different than they were on the date that the job description and classification were agreed upon.

There are additional bases advanced by the Union for an increase in Judgment point values, but as to these, as in the discussion on other factors, I am restricting myself to the principal claims put forward, and directly to the matter of change; and on this ground the Union's position as to Judgment is not supported.

- 2) Experience: The Union requests an increase of 2 points from the present 2-B-4 to 2-C-6.

The principal points on which the Union bases its case, here, are that "it takes more time * * * to become proficient on this job than formerly"; that in the No. 1 Blooming Mill the Assistant Pit Recorder is coded at 2-C-6 although there are only 10 pits in No. 1; that more special steel is being rolled in No. 2 than heretofore; and that more experience is required in informing "central providing" when the blooming mill will roll out a heat. The evidence to support these contentions are sparse.

The Company answers that no significant changes have taken place to increase quantitatively the experience required for performing the job of Pit Clerk. It states specifically that although there are more pits at No. 2 Blooming Mill than at No. 1, the smaller number of facilities coupled with the larger number of size changes required impose greater burdens on those performing recording, reporting and clerical functions at the No. 1 Blooming Mill and entail greater experience for that reason. This explanation was not contested by the Union. There has been no significant change in the No. 2 Mill in the specifications of the steel rolled, and the Company urges that the addition of a few additional items does not materially affect the experience factor. The information given to "central providing", it is asserted, had to be given in the past to someone, and the establishment of that office has no effect on the experience factor.

Analysis of the briefs and the testimony does not reveal facts that would justify a finding favorable to the Union with respect to the factor of Experience. The Union's Post-Hearing Statement does not address itself to "Experience".

3. Physical Exertion: The Union requests an increase of one point from the present 2-C, 1-A-3, to 2-D-4.

According to the Wage Rate Inequity Agreement, this would require a change from "Up to and including 1/4 of total time" at "Little exertion; wait at attention" and "Up to and including 3/4 of total time" at "Below normal exertion, i.e., operate light controls, walk, handle light weight material at intervals", to a new coding which would evaluate the Physical Exertion of Pit Clerk as "exceeding 3/4 of total time" at "Below normal exertion * * *" as expressed above. The basis for the present coding on the classification sheet is "Walk, climb stairs; check etc. Perform clerical duties."

The Union expresses strong disbelief that the No. 2 Blooming Mill would produce if Pit Clerk spent one-quarter of his time at "wait at attention." Of course, as indicated above, "wait at attention" is coupled, in the 1-A coding with "little exertion". The Company counters that about one-quarter of Pit Clerk's time (and Pit Recorder's for that matter) calls for comparable clerical activities in some 2300 jobs evaluated and coded at 1-A, as are Pit Clerk's and Pit Recorder's. The Union states that "Intensity of work load created greater physical exertion", yet the Union in its request does not seek to change the level, which is the measure of the type of exertion. The Union merely asks for degree D, rather than C, which means that it contends the Pit Clerk works at "below normal exertion" more than three-quarters of the total time. Indeed, the clerical nature of his duties could not conceivably warrant a level above "below

normal exertion". Some of the equipment has been shifted in position, requiring that the Pit Clerk walk further and, perhaps, walk stairs where this may not have been required heretofore; but these features of changed physical exertion are counterbalanced by other improvements and organization of the work-place, as was pointed out during our inspection. There is no evidence supporting the Union's contention that this factor has been so changed as to merit an increase in point value.

4. Accident Exposure: The Union requests an increase of two points from the present 3-B-4 to 2-D-6.

The Union claims that although accidents are infrequent, if one should occur it could result in permanent incapacitation or death. It states that cooperation with the Pit Recorder frequently requires the Pit Clerk to perform work on the pit floor and exposes him to greater hazards.

It should be noted that the Union is here requesting Level 2 whereas this factor is now at Level 3, which means there is frequent exposure. On the other hand, the Union wants a change from Degree B to Degree D, which implies that instead of accidents "not calculated to cause incapacitation for more than short periods" these employees are subject to accidents which are "likely to cause permanent incapacitation or death."

The Company states that the Pit Clerk may be called upon infrequently to walk out on the platform to check the heat in the pit -- "but this duty does not require any great length of time and may not be in the area of crane activity. The Pit Clerk has always been subject to such hazards".

It is not enough to allege increased hazards as a basis for change in coding. The Union has presented no evidence in the form of facts on the basis of which one might find that since the original job description and classification were agreed upon there has been a change in job content, job requirements and working procedures, exposing Pit Clerk to greater hazards than those to which he was formerly exposed.

5. Responsibility for Maintenance of Operating Pace: The Union wishes a three point increase from the present 4-A-4 to 4-B-7.

The basis on which the job is classified 4-A-4 as expressed in the current Job Classification is "Insignificant effect on overall production of others." Level 4, however, which this factor already enjoys, is assigned to jobs, according to the Wage Rate Inequity Agreement, in which failure to perform responsibilities could influence the operating pace "significantly in overall productions of a department".

The Union alleges that the Pit Clerk has control over the pace of others and if he failed "to fulfill his responsibilities, operating pace would be seriously affected". It is also stated that he must maintain the pace set by the Heater and the Pit Recorder and must exercise control of his own pace in order to coordinate his work with the Pit Recorder.

The Company responds that the Pit Clerk's duties are of a clerical and liaison nature. He only assumes responsibilities during the infrequent absences of the Pit Recorder and has always been under the obligation of coordinating his pace with other occupations. It asserts that there has been no "change" in job content sufficient to justify the "B" degree of responsibility which is expressed as

"Responsibility of worker involves little control over operating pace but it is necessary for the worker to assume responsibility for maintaining pace set by machines or other workers. Exercise some control over own pace or part time control over pace of others."

The Company also refers to an "accepted differential" between Pit Clerk and Pit Recorder, the latter being coded at 4-B-7. This means that inasmuch as Pit Recorder has broader responsibilities for maintaining pace among various groups than Pit Clerk it would be improper to elevate Pit Clerk to the degree assigned the Pit Recorder.

There is nothing in the record to justify a finding of a change of job content on the basis of which an increased point value might be required for this factor.

With respect to the several factors mentioned above, the Union referred to descriptions and classifications of certain other jobs for purposes of comparison. Presumably those descriptions and classifications were presented to demonstrate that the Pit Clerk in the No. 2 Blooming Mill is not properly evaluated in relation to other jobs with which it bears some comparison. The evaluation of other jobs, however, is pertinent and material only in the classification and evaluation process, not in an inquiry, such as this, into the question whether, in fact, there has been such a change of job content on this job as to require redescription and reclassification. In the case of changed jobs, the most cogent comparison is with the same job as it was formerly constituted and accepted, as was pointed out on page 4 of Arbitration No. 212.

On all the evidence, I find no convincing showing of such a change in job content as to warrant reclassification and redescription of this job.

AWARD

The grievance is denied.

Peter Seitz,
Assistant Permanent Arbitrator

Approved:

David L. Cole,
Permanent Arbitrator

Dated: December 20, 1957