

Monsanto

Springfield, Massachusetts cc: File

DATE October 12, 1973

SUBJECT

REFERENCE

TO Mr. P. E. Bureau

In preparation for our upcoming meeting with our attorneys for the Department 80 staffing arbitration, I have prepared the following background of the Job Evaluation aspects of the case:

- JUNE 18, 1973 - The Union was informed of the staffing changes in Department 80 due to the closing of Building 92 and sale of the business to Borden. At this meeting the Union was told that details on the changes in specific classifications would be made at the next Job Evaluation Meeting.
- JUNE 19, 1973 - I attended a meeting previously scheduled by the Committee. Joe Bernardo was the only member of the Evaluation Committee present. Chet Kowalczyk was there filling in. When I told them of my desire to explain the specifics of the Department 80 staffing changes, the Committee refused to meet and left the room when I began giving details.
- JUNE 21, 1973 - Present at this meeting were Messrs. Harris, Starzyk, Topor, Bernardo, Kowalczyk and Soucy. The Union requested written notification of the changes in job assignments. When told that the Company was not prepared to do this the Committee called for a recess. When the meeting reconvened I gave the Committee a copy of A. V. Laakso's memo regarding the affected classifications. The Committee declared that this was unacceptable and that they must have detailed lists of duties. I informed them that I was prepared to give them the details verbally and they were welcome to take notes. Roger Soucy, Acting Chairman, declared that the Union would not proceed on this basis. I responded that I was willing to proceed on discussion of the Department 80 jobs; however, if it was

their wish to withhold discussion on these jobs, I would honor that wish. I told them that I considered my contractual obligation fulfilled. Roger Soucy charged that the Company was preventing discussion by its failure to give the Committee written details.

Note: At the recess, M. Starr told the Union that the Company was here to discuss these jobs and convey information and to discharge our contractual obligation.

JUNE 26, 1973 - The Company again attempted to discuss the Department 80 jobs with the Evaluating Committee. Present for the Union were Messrs. Natario, Bernardo, Verge, Kowalczyk and Topor.

At this meeting the Company submitted revised job descriptions for the affected jobs. The Union objected that they had not been given lists of duties, times and a detailed breakdown of the number of hours work remaining. I told them that revised evaluation sheets would be available at our next meeting. The Union requested that they be allowed to tape the meetings or that the Company sign their notes as an official transcript. Both requests were denied. The Committee discussed the descriptions alone. When the meeting reconvened I indicated that I was willing to review the descriptions in detail. Natario stated that all of the duties remained from the eliminated classifications and he specifically spoke on the Drier Operator, EPA and Warehouse Clerk. When I attempted to show justification, Natario heatedly stated that the Committee did not wish to hear the details or justifications and that the Committee would not discuss these jobs. The Committee called for a second recess. When the meeting reconvened, Harris and Starzyk were present and Natario presented a grievance on the combination of jobs in Department 80 without justification. I informed them that Job Evaluation was not the proper forum for a grievance and asked him to explain how the Union could take such a position when they had refused on three separate occasions to discuss these changes. The meeting adjourned and the grievance was later submitted for an Emergency Third Step Hearing.


J. P. Ryan

/lm