

Sarvodaya Structural



Brand: Mehta Solutions

Product Code: case208

Weight: 0.00kg

Price: Rs500

Short Description

Sarvodaya Structural

Description

Sarvodaya Structurals CAST STUDY solution

Read carefully the case and answer the questions given at the end :

Sarvodaya Structurals Limited was engaged in the fabrication of heavy structurals. The company had six shops besides engineering, accounts, personnel, sales and administrative departments. It employed 7000 men. The chief executive of the company was the General Manager. In one of the shops employing 1000 men, 900 tons of structurals were fabricated every month. The day-to-day management of the shop was entrusted to the Manager, who was assisted by the Senior Foreman. The three main sections of the shop were Preparation, Marking, and Finishing. In the Marking and Finishing Sections, the work was supervised by two Foremen each. The Preparation Section was under the direct supervision of the Senior Foreman, who, in addition, planned and coordinated the work of all the three sections. The Preparation Section was responsible for the collection and classification of works orders, for reading intricate machine and structural drawings, determination of priorities of execution orders, checking bills of materials and processing raw materials for fabrication. This section had 200 men on the rolls. In 1981, the shop started receiving heavy orders, and as the work-load increased considerably, the Senior Foreman was unable to cope with it. On the Manager's recommendation, the General Manager sanctioned two new posts of Foremen for the Preparation Section. Two Progress Incharges attached to the Senior Foreman were thus rendered surplus and their principal work, namely reporting progress of work in the shop, was transferred to the Production Planning Department. This action of the General Manager had the concurrence of the Manager. The Incharges themselves were not transferred to the Production Planning Department, as this had its own departmental men to take care of this work. They continued on the rolls of the shop, awaiting orders for transfer to vacancies of equivalent grade in other shops. The minimum qualifications for the recently created posts of Foremen, prescribed by a Joint Committee, were a diploma in engineering and five years' experience in structural shop. The posts were advertised for in the organisation but none of the applicants was found suitable for appointment. The Incharges concerned who were non-matriculants, did not apply, as they did not possess the prescribed qualifications. The posts were therefore advertised in the press. Three outside candidates applied. Only one appeared for the interview and he was not considered suitable for appointment. MS-1 The case of the two surplus Incharges did not come within the purview of the grievance procedure in operation, in the company, as it involved a change in the minimum qualifications prescribed for the post of Foreman. As, however, they were powerful members of the Union executive, the Secretary of the recognized trade union took up their case for appointment as foreman with the General Manager. The Union Secretary argued that they had been doing part of the foreman's job before the posts were created and in the absence of suitable candidates they should be preferred for promotion. The

General Manager maintained that the men concerned were not qualified for the posts and did not possess the technical background required to perform the Foreman's duties. The written job - descriptions of the posts of Progress Incharge and Foreman prepared by the Joint Committee indicated that the job content of the former was only about 25% of that of a Foreman, and only, on the administrative side. They did not supervise the work of the Preparation Section in any way, where there were mistries in line for promotion. The latter, though good in their own area, could not be promoted as they were not technically qualified to hold the higher position. After prolonged discussion, the General Manager conceded that in the circumstances, the Incharges would be given an opportunity to prove their fitness for the job. It was also agreed that in the first place, test specifications for the posts of Foreman would be worked out by a Joint Committee and given to the men concerned. If they wished, they would also be given guidance for a period of three months, to learn the job. They would then be subjected to a test by the Training Officer, and if they passed the test, they would be promoted to Foremen. The Manager communicated this decision to the Senior Foreman in the presence of the two men. He readily agreed to give them the necessary guidance whenever they requested it. However, they maintained that the decision was not only to give them guidance when asked for, but full- time training and guidance in order to enable them to pass the test. On hearing this, the Senior Foreman remarked : 'I have no one to spare primarily for the purpose of training them to pass the test'.

Questions :

1. What is the main problem in the case ?
2. Identify and discuss the stage and action required to tackle the problem before it became a grievance. Comment on the role of the management .
3. Critically evaluate the grievance and the follow - up action.
4. If you were the manager of the 'shop', how would you handle the problem, after the Senior Foreman's remark about sparing the 'Incharges' for three months ?

Details

1. Case study solved answers

2. pdf/word in 24-48 hrs

3. Fully Solved with answers