

W
by W S

Submission date: 20-Oct-2020 04:13AM (UTC+0800)

Submission ID: 1420177977

File name: Case_Study.edited.docx (18.35K)

Word count: 563

Character count: 2881

Case Study: Sleeping On the Job

Name

Institution

Course

Instructor

Due date

Case Study: Sleeping On the Job

Question One

The two occurrences of sleeping on the job are unquestionably significant besides ought to have an effect on the outcomes in the disciplinary or potentially discharge case. However, the union has a decent contention concerning the primary occurrence. The overseer who at first spotted him dozing at work ought to have documented the occurrence and set the composed admonition in the grievant staff file as opposed to swaying his finger and shaking his head to indicate that slumbering at work was unacceptable. On the off chance that there is an issue with performance or unbecoming conduct, management ought to consistently archive regardless of whether a verbal admonition is given. Additionally, suppose the issue is progressing and there is no underlying documentation of the conduct the executives will most likely be unable to reference if case goes to an assertion. The leadership documented the subsequent incident under the appellation "Employee was sleeping" as a note. A composed admonition was given to the grievant and to address violation of safety a union representative equally offered counseling. Although this occurrence was reported in the worker's faculty file and cautioned by the organization of glaring at an imminent termination in future, he was allowed the chance to uncover any ailment that could be causing his tiredness and lack of enthusiasm. The fact that the aforementioned occurrence was not documented as conduct representing safety risk it reinforces the case of the employer.

Question Two

Even though the truck was not in gear and had the safety brake on, a safety infringement still prevails as the grievant was dozing in the vehicle in a profound traffic workplace which represented a safety peril not just to the worker but also to subsequent workers within the loading

zone. Given the idea of his obligations, if he could nod off while parked in this area there is a likelihood he could nod off while handling the truck. That is the reason the grievant was allowed the chance to uncover any ailments that could be causing his drowsiness. Likewise, since the issue was a well-being infringement I accept the grievant having his union steward in the therapy meeting with him. At the same time exhorting that termination was attainable if conduct not amended was the organization and union's method of emphasizing how critical the issue is.

Question Three

Not at all, since the incidents of "sleeping on the job" were three in total. Although the first occurrence was not filed the leadership addressed the conduct and even though the backhoe driver was not brought on board to testify on what he observed, he still witnessed the incident. The notion that he "seems to be sleeping" regardless of whether he was simply resting his eyes as opposed to "sleeping" fails to invalidate the fact that the grievant was portraying a conduct associated with safety infringement as a truck driver. The union did not repudiate he was not slumbering while parked which was part of his obligations as the rest of supplementary workers, counting other members of the union, parked his lorry. Accordingly, I conclude the grievant was very much conscious that his "sleeping on the job" was a performance problem besides failed to consent to safety guidelines as a worthy motivation for his termination.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

0%

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches Off