

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL CANADA (NRC)
MINUTES OF THE 89th MEETING
OF THE
NRC – JOINT CONSULTATION COMMITTEE (JCC)

DATE: September 15, 2016
TIME: 9:00 AM
LOCATION: Room S-303, Building M-58

IN ATTENDANCE

Chairperson:

Roman Szumski, Vice-President, Life Sciences, NRC

Representing NRC:

Roman Szumski, Vice-President, Life Sciences
Isabelle Gingras, Vice-President, HRB
Joe Grebenc, Acting Manager, Labour Relations and Pay and Benefits, HRB
Meredith Marchand, Senior Labour Relations Officer, HRB

Representing Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada (PIPSC):

Sara Boulé-Perroni, Employment Relations Officer
Susan O'Donnell, President, NRC RO/RCO Group

Representing Research Council Employees' Association (RCEA):

Cathie Fraser, President
Joan Van Den Bergh, Negotiator
Marvin Zaluski, 1st Vice-President

Guests:

Noreen LeBlanc, Senior Advisor, Official Languages/Diversity, HRB

ITEM	89 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
89.1	<p>Approval of Agenda</p> <p>The agenda was approved with the addition of 89.10 - Update on the New President.</p> <p>All members also expressed their deepest sympathy to Patricia Loder, the President of the PIPSC Consultation Team, regarding the sudden loss of her son.</p>	

ITEM	89 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
89.2	<p>Minutes of the 88th Meeting of the JCC</p> <p>The minutes were amended to reflect the following and subsequently approved by the parties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 84.5 – Phoenix <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ That in the last paragraph on page 3, be changed to reflect that it was NRC representatives and not the RCEA who provided some rational as to the delay in final payments for departing employees. • 88.8 – Accommodation of Nursing Employees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ That “if at all possible” is to be removed from the sentence regarding accommodation. • 88.9 – Performance Improvement Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Verification that it was RCEA representatives that posed the questions noted. 	<p>M.Marchand</p> <p>M.Marchand</p> <p>M.Marchand</p>
89.10	<p>Update on the New NRC President</p> <p>Dr. Szumski, Vice President of Life Sciences commented that the appointment of Iain Stewart, as President, on August 24th was a significant development for NRC. The President was the Assistant Deputy Minister of Industry Canada and Dr. Szumski knew him in that role. The President was also actively involved in the Science and Technology Strategy and was Secretariat for the Jenkins Panel. As Assistant Vice-President of Research at Dalhousie University he became more familiar with NRC via IMB and he also spent time on NRC’s Council, all of which provided him with a positive view of NRC and its unique role in Canada.</p> <p>The President has been given a two year mandate, which is available on MyZone, to assess the current state of NRC and determine how it can best support the Government’s Innovation Agenda. In support of this, an “NRC Dialogue” will be launched at the end of September to evaluate NRC in relation to areas of business growth and innovation support, engagement of stakeholders and technology clusters, as well as governance and management. The NRC Dialogue is anticipated to take six to seven months to complete, will involve seeking the input from staff across NRC, and result in a Report to Minister Bains (Innovation, Science and Economic Development) as well Minister Duncan (Science).</p> <p>The enormous policy experience that the President has will lend itself to this mandate. As well, he is very close to and well respected by the decision makers at the top of Treasury Board and in government and so he is well positioned to understand and meet their needs.</p> <p>PIPSC welcomes the open attitude and consultative nature of the President and provided feedback that he is having a strong</p>	

ITEM	89 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>positive impression on staff. RCEA President also had an opportunity to meet with the President and is excited about the level engagement. Both Bargaining Agents expressed the importance of getting input via the NRC Dialogue from staff at all levels, not just the GMs, scientific staff or the managers and supervisors. RCEA also noted the importance of receiving feedback from staff involved with internal processes. NRC recognized the necessity being conveyed related to true engagement of the front line staff in this exercise. Dr. Szumski indicated that platforms and processes will be developed in support of the NRC Dialogue in addition to the electronic tools that are currently available. There will also be Tiger Teams, each led by a VP and composed of selected staff members drawn from across NRC along with external advisors. The President also wants to be open, engaging and listening with all staff throughout this whole process. RCEA indicated that this is a big turnaround as employees now feel they will be heard as well they further commented that this President believes in real research and that there is a place for blue sky thinking.</p>	
89.3	Follow-up Action Items of the 88th Meeting	
81.8	<p>Implementation of Local Labour Management Consultation Committees (LLMCC)</p> <p>ICT had their second LLMCC meeting on September 13, 2016 for which the metrics of success as well localized challenges and issues were discussed such as training, mentoring, and migration of staff. PIPSC reported that the meeting was very positive and the GM is following up on items such as a pilot mentoring program for ICT.</p> <p>PIPSC reiterated the importance establishing metrics of success for the LLMCC pilots to which RCEA responded that for the ICT pilot there are two representatives from the JCC who are also present and as such would be in a great position to help.</p> <p>The Royalmount LLMCC is starting preparations for their first meeting as it is a geographically based pilot that represents six different portfolios. RCEA indicated that there is interest from their members to start LLMCCs in London, Vancouver, AERO and AST as well as possibly others.</p>	
84.5	<p>Phoenix</p> <p>RCEA communicated their concern about not receiving their union dues for a good number of employees since May; however, they do recognize the priority is to get employees paid. NRC responded that they were looking into the issue of outstanding union dues as they are having similar issues for both bargaining agents. Accordingly NRC committed to providing the RCEA with updates.</p> <p>PIPSC conveyed their appreciation for the regular Phoenix pay</p>	<p>J. Grebenc (L.LebLANC)</p>

ITEM	89 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>84.5 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>updates that NRC has been sending to both bargaining agents. NRC also recognized the excellent level of service that the Pay and Benefits (P&B) Team has provided in light of the difficult times and great pressure brought on by Phoenix through awarding them the President's Commendation Award which was announced to the Human Resources Branch via an adobe update session. As well, praise was given to the Team Leader, P&B for successfully sourcing and hiring two more P&B Advisors.</p> <p>RCEA commented that NRC is coping better than other government departments due to having retained a P&B team. NRC replied that they have not heard more since the implementation of Phoenix concerning the anticipated move to Miramichi, New Brunswick in 2019 or 2020. However, given the current problems Miramichi is experiencing it is expected that the move will be pushed further out. There is still concern about renewing the P&B resources with pending future retirements and while internal training is possible efforts would be hampered in light of the future move to Miramichi.</p> <p>NRC was pleased to report that they have just identified a contact with Finance for the pending Government of Canada-wide claims process for out-of-pocket expenses related to the implementation of Phoenix. When RCEA inquired as to whether the approvals for incurred costs resided with NRC or Treasury Board (TB), NRC responded that while it is too early to know the exact process, it is believed that TB would supply a list of approved expenses which would then be used by NRC Finance to review individual cases. It was noted by RCEA that there have been a lot of discussions between TB and the bargaining agents concerning this and they reiterated the importance of NRC consulting with their own bargaining agents to prevent further hardship on employees, who already incurred these expenses, including any impact to their security clearances due to requirement for a credit check. NRC agreed to consult with RCEA and PIPSC when they know more.</p>	<p>J.Grebenc</p>
<p>85.8</p>	<p>List of Grievance Officers</p> <p>NRC reported that the grievance process is listed on MyZone (green) as well as detailed in the Collective Agreements which are available on MyZone (green) as well as on Zone (black) through links to the RCEA and PIPSC websites. The parties confirmed there is nothing outstanding remaining on this item.</p>	
<p>87.5</p>	<p>Probation</p> <p>NRC reported that the briefing note on Probation was not yet able to make it onto the SEC agenda; however, the hope is that it would be tabled prior to the next JCC, ideally later in October. RCEA subsequently inquired as to what was contained in the briefing. To which NRC responded that it reflected the issues raised by the Bargaining Agents such as their concerns regarding it being an old policy wherein the length of probation is too long and not in line</p>	

ITEM	89 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
87.5 (cont.)	with the Core Public Service as well as their belief that the probation period was not being managed well. PIPSC reiterated their concern that a longer probation period impacts women scientists in particular who may delay starting a family due to the uncertainty of their employment. The briefing also contains NRC's experiences with probation. To make sure NRC is correctly capturing the probation issues raised by RCEA and PIPSC, NRC committed to sending them an e-mail which would detail their expressed concerns.	I.Gingras (M.Marchand)
87.15	New Members – Bargaining Agent Notifications Both Bargaining Agents confirmed the solution proposed by NRC to forward to PIPSC and RCEA applicable New Hire notifications would be acceptable. PIPSC will provide NRC with their appropriate contact e-mail.	S.Boulé-Perroni
87.16	Call For Action (CFA) – Presentation on Research at NRC Susan O'Donnell, President of the NRC RO/RCO Group provided an update on the CFA working group. There are 16 additional RO/RCOs as well as Management representatives involved in these open discussions on a number of issues ranging from how to support researchers moving through transition, research capacity outside of the NCR, to the RO/RCO promotion criteria. The President has also been invited to a meeting as it looks like this working group could be complimentary to the President's mandate in relation to the NRC Dialogue. Although NRC indicated it was too early to confirm this, as the processes for the Dialogue were still being developed. There were informal minutes taken at the first three monthly meetings, in which gaps in the organization were identified such as the increase in bureaucracy and lack of shared vision. Multidisciplinary teams to address complex problems were also identified as a strength of the NRC. The next meetings will be focused on how to address the identified gaps. NRC will be sending an update to all NRC staff regarding the CFA working group. PIPSC reported that the most important outcome of this group is that the researchers now feel they are being heard. RCEA also noted that the practical applications to be developed through this group could be in turn applied to their membership.	I.Gingras
87th Meeting Roundtable	Personal and Volunteer Leave NRC confirmed that given the nature of the Personal and Volunteer leaves, it is not possible for them to appear in the Time Accounts table; therefore the issue is considered complete .	
	Quarterly Report NRC made the requested changes to the reports, confirming the	

ITEM	89 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	issue is resolved .	
88.4	<p>Security at NRC</p> <p>NRC reported that the individual responsible for the preparing the Video Surveillance and the Administrative Investigations Security Standards had left the Council and in the transition the Bargaining Agents were not consulted again on these standards. However, both standards were approved by SMC and did not require subsequent authorization from SEC prior to their implementation. Accordingly the Standard for Security Video Surveillance in the NCR is available on MyZone and the Standard on Security Administrative Investigations should be forthcoming.</p> <p>Concern was expressed by RCEA as to why these standards did not require SEC approval. NRC responded they would look into the matter in addition to forwarding the Bargaining Agents copies of the posted standards.</p>	I.Gingras (M.Marchand)
88.5	<p>Hiring Foreign Workers – Immigration Issues</p> <p>PIPSC stated that two of the researcher immigration cases were finalized with positive outcomes and that the third is in progress with an anticipated successful resolution. Furthermore, PIPSC conveyed appreciation of the expertise now available to NRC from KPMG to help with future immigration issues.</p>	
88.6	<p>On-Boarding Project</p> <p>As requested, NRC had directed RCEA to the information available to supervisors and employees via MyZone. As well, NRC is investigating how many new employees missed the cut-off to attend the quarterly on-boarding event and whether their PBI could cover the cost in those circumstances. PIPSC also confirmed that their involvement in employer on-boarding events has ranged from full presentations to providing pamphlets. Both Bargaining Agents expressed their interest in participating in the on-boarding events.</p>	M-E.Roy
88.7	<p>Staffing Concerns – Staffing Without Competition</p> <p>PIPSC reported that NRC had sent them the data requested concerning the number of MGT positions staffed by PIPSC members within the last 6 years, although it was hard to interpret. RCEA subsequently also asked for a copy of the data.</p>	M.Marchand
88.8	<p>Accommodation of Nursing Employees</p> <p>With the fore mentioned amendment of the 88th JCC minutes this issue is now considered resolved.</p>	
88.9	<p>Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)</p> <p>RCEA inquired as to the number of PIPs, how they are tracked, and how many resulted in terminations because as to their</p>	

<p>88.9 (cont.)</p>	<p>knowledge only one did not. Therefore they see a connection and are further concerned that a PIP is put in place for the purpose of supporting a pre-determined termination. PIPSC also expressed their worry that a PIP is used as a form of intimidation by management. RCEA reiterated that in the past they saw CTEs used as a form of intimidation and retribution but that today they are more in line with NRC policy. However they explained that notation on the bottom of the PIP form indicating that failure to meet the required performance standards may result in removal from their current position or termination is inherently intimidating. As well, RCEA indicated that in their view they have not seen a good PIP, which details performance gaps, how to improve, how the employee will be supported, etc. Just telling the employee that they are bad at a particular area and that they need to improve by a certain date is not adequate in providing the employee with what they need to improve.</p> <p>NRC responded that there is no system in place to capture data on the usage of PIPs; however, it would be possible in the future to gather this information within the new Success Factors. As for the PIPs themselves, NRC Human Resources is usually made aware of them on a case-by-case basis but often do not hear about those that achieve a successful outcome. However the intent of a PIP is a tool to aid the supervisor in identifying specific weaknesses in performance and for the employee to understand specifically how they can improve. Performance improvement in general is inclusive of all discussions between a supervisor and their employee. PIPs are often put in place when the CTE has a “Met Some” or “Does Not Meet” rating as there is clearly a need to salvage the employee’s performance. However, NRC can understand how it could be upsetting to an employee receiving a PIP, even though it is intended for the good of helping them succeed.</p> <p>RCEA reiterated that if the PIP is done correctly then there is no issue but performance levels need to be valid and not just a document to support a decision management has already made. Certainly a history of poor performance needs to be addressed but the CTE ratings of “Meet”, “Met Some” and “Does Not Meet” are limited and a PIP to address only one area of “Met Some” is not the most productive.</p> <p>PIPSC is worried that there are CTEs containing revenue targets tied to approved business cases wherein the researcher is not able to meet them because the targets are unrealistic given the limited regional resources and so lead to a PIP being established for something that is outside of the researcher’s control and for which success is unattainable.</p> <p>When the obligation is put on an employee to improve via a PIP, RCEA further inquired as to management’s commitment then to help the employee. NRC confirmed that an employee on a PIP is supposed to be given appropriate management supports to</p>	
---------------------------------------	---	--

ITEM	89 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>88.9 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>provide them with ample opportunity to improve.</p> <p>Given the issues brought forward by the Bargaining Agents, NRC agreed to look into the usage of PIPs within the Council and requested that the unions raise any specific PIP cases for which they have concerns.</p> <p>PIPSC inquired whether there was an obligation for Management to consult Human Resources prior to implementing a PIP for which NRC confirmed that there is no such requirement although normally it does occur. RCEA also asked about the option for their members to have union representation present at PIP meetings.</p>	<p>I.Gingras (M.Marchand) C.Fraser S.Boulé-Perroni</p>
<p>88.10</p>	<p>Professional Development Time Coding (IRAP)</p> <p>The parties confirmed that at this point this issue has been addressed.</p>	
<p>88.11</p>	<p>Degree of Migration of Regional Staff to the National Capital Region (NCR)</p> <p>PIPSC commented that this issue is also important to the CFA working group as they are also examining the research capacity within the regions. They further reported that the requested data NRC provided, detailed the loss of 192 members since 2011 who were mostly researchers outside the NCR. NRC indicated that the data will be further filtered by location for the CFA group. In addition, NRC affirmed that it is the President's desire to keep regional cluster partnerships although the Deficit Action Reduction Plan played a key role in their decline. PIPSC reiterated their concern that within cluster funding there is no longer the requirement for regional funding.</p> <p>RCEA indicated that this is not as much of an issue for their AS, AD and CS membership. Although they did inquire as to how far back the data went since they recall cluster funding was started around 2000 to 2002.</p> <p>NRC also commented that there has recently been an increase in research funding such as the investment, in collaboration with Xerox Research Centre of Canada, in a state-of-the-art advanced materials research facility in Mississauga, Ontario as well as additional funding for building a new facility in Winnipeg, Manitoba as part of the Factory of the Future program.</p> <p>It was decided by the parties that this item would be more appropriately discussed within the CFA working group.</p>	<p>I.Gingras</p>
<p>88.13</p>	<p>Mississippi Mills Update</p> <p>NRC reported that drinking water had been supplied to employees at the National Fire Laboratory (NFL) since 2014 and as covered in the media they have been working with mayor, Health Canada and a provincial partner in an effort to address the trace amounts of Perfluoroalkylated Substances (PFAS) that have been found in the ground water. In addition, NRC has installed filtration systems for</p>	

ITEM	89 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>88.13 (cont.)</p>	<p>local affected residents who wanted it along with supplying them bottled water. Health Canada has confirmed that the levels of PFAS onsite and offsite do not pose a risk. However, NRC has commenced the removal of the affected soil at the NFL site.</p> <p>Even though the operations at the NFL have been suspended, the eight employees have been redirected to assist with the clean-up, wrapping up any necessary outstanding activities as well as working with other portfolios such as AERO in addition to performing testing activities in the USA.</p> <p>NRC can understand how employees would be concerned about the future of their jobs or if any relocation was required to move them to the Montreal Road location. NRC is currently considering options with recommendations to be tabled before Minister Duncan in the next several months. However, there is certainly a need from the Fire Chiefs for this work to continue as it is viewed as vital in evaluating the environmental impact and safety of firefighting foams.</p> <p>RCEA also expressed concern about the active staffing action for a TO Supervisor with the NFL on a continuing basis given the current circumstances. NRC committed to following up and responding offline.</p>	<p>M.Marchand</p>
<p>Business Arising from Minutes</p>		
<p>85.4</p>	<p>Changes in National Institute for Nanotechnology (NINT)</p> <p>It was reported by NRC that there is currently no set direction for NINT, which resulted from complications in operationalizing the specific vision of former NRC President, John McDougall and Vice-President Emerging Technologies, Dan Wayner after their departures. Discussions are currently underway with SEC, the University of Alberta and the Province of Alberta as to what would be the best use of NINT moving forward given that there is still a need for an NRC presence.</p> <p>The NINT report unfortunately cannot be forgotten, according to PIPSC, necessitating the focus to be on lessons learned such as how to effectively work with universities and innovation clusters within a regional environment. PIPSC further noted that even though the NINT model did not work operationally, it made sense so a path forward needs to be found and any discussions should engage the research community within universities and consider insights from the Jenkins report. It was also agreed by the RCEA that NINT was a great idea that was hard to implement effectively.</p> <p>It was acknowledged by NRC that cross appointments, while also a good idea in principle, did not have the desired effect. It was noted that the Vice President of Emerging Technologies, Geneviève Tanguay, had confirmed that NINT staff are finding the current situation stressful as they want to know what will happen to NINT but as of yet there are no answers. Dr. Tanguay is running with the NINT project during her one year term and she is receiving</p>	

ITEM	89 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	direct support Jennifer Decker and Kjersti Powell on the transition initiative, as well as from Alan Steele. NRC committed to keeping the Bargaining Agents up-to-date on NINT.	I.Gingras
	New Business	
89.5	<p>Directive on Official Languages (OL) for Management</p> <p>Noreen LeBlanc, Senior Advisor on OL and Diversity provided clarification on this Directive which has actually been in effect since 2012. The confusion stems from the Commissionaire of OL's desire that the language levels of management positions should be changed from BBB to CBC and accordingly had recently stated that any complaint received regarding a management/supervisory position with a BBB level will be deemed as founded. However, all government departments and agencies are still only bound section 91 of the Official Languages Act in determining the language requirement and appropriate level when staffing each position, including supervisory and management positions, for which BBB is an option.</p> <p>Concern was expressed by PIPSC as they had heard that discussions were underway at core government departments regarding considerations for changing the language profile on supervisory positions to CBC. More specifically should NRC consider doing the same, it would have a profound impact on supervisors. NRC responded that it is maintaining the status quo concerning language levels for supervisors but would consult with the Bargaining Agents should this change.</p>	
89.4	<p>37.5 vs 1950 Hours Requirements for RO/RCOs</p> <p>NRC was thanked by PIPSC for providing the report they requested on the work schedules for ROs and RCOs overall and by portfolio. NRC confirmed that the 1950 schedule is the standard; however, if this is not the case it is due to operational requirements such as it is for four portfolios. Although NRC does not have these specific operational rationales for these cases as they have been historical decisions related to meeting their specific client needs, they do see the value in discussing the matter with the applicable current General Managers as it has not been looked at in a number of years.</p> <p>PIPSC noted that IRAP, which works very closely with industry, is almost exclusively under the 1950. They further commented that industry does not always operate under core hours. NRC recognizes that for IRAP meeting with clients tends to occur between the hours of 9 and 5 but there is also a lot of travel required around those meetings. It was further noted that there are no overtime provisions afforded under the 1950 work schedule.</p> <p>The question was posed to PIPSC whether they had heard of any issues or concerns raised from their membership? PIPSC responded that while they are not aware of any specific cases,</p>	

ITEM	89 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
89.4 (cont.)	they see links between problem areas with the organization and hours of work. Therefore, they would find the specific operational rationales helpful to better understand the situation. NRC agreed to follow-up on the matter.	I.Gingras (M.Marchand)
89.6	<p>New Computer Zones</p> <p>NRC confirmed that there are no new computer zones. On ultra-secure Green computer devices there is a “blue” zone for business and corporate functions and an “orange” zone for research functions within which there are five difference classification levels. Both the “blue” and the “orange” have specific rules governing the data on those zones. Black devices, which utilize the old networks that are not as secure as the “green” devices. The “gray” is an isolated physical computer environment for getting access to critical documents not accessible due to cyber intrusion. Although this area is currently not being used due to network storage having become available for Black devices. RCEA noted that there was a recent related briefing for the CS employees and NRC will follow-up.</p> <p>The question was posed from PIPSC as to whether there was any oversight to ensure NRC was following the best practices used by other research organizations? NRC responded that the modelling was based upon NIST (USA) but our old system was not properly secured so efforts are now underway to correct that but NRC still remains open to collaborative activities. RCEA reiterated the importance of not only being able to get and use data from an outside organization but that it be easy to do so. Furthermore, RCEA commented on the importance of conveying security and IT protocols to all employees in a manner such that they are easily understood for proper adherence.</p> <p>PIPSC further remarked that the Green computers are mostly used for only accessing SIGMA but that they are looking forward to the day when there is seamless computer access with e-mail on the green. It was agreed by NRC that the current state is still challenging even though it has been two and a half years since cyber intrusion and the new President has been briefed.</p>	M.Marchand
89.7	<p>Signage for NRC</p> <p>RCEA reported they have been receiving inquiries from their members regarding the return of the NRC signs for M-58 and the Uplands wind tunnel. NRC responded that the signs for M58 have been purchased but are awaiting electrical, structural and architectural design information before ASPM can proceed with their installation. ASPM is looking into the status of the approval of the signage on the U70 wind tunnel. NRC will look into the matter further and update RCEA directly.</p>	M.Marchand
89.8	<p>NRC Draft Three Year Program Review Report</p> <p>PIPSC is seeking more information about the three year program</p>	

ITEM	89 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>89.8 (cont.)</p>	<p>review report that was mentioned in a recent article about NRC in RESEARCH MONEY. NRC confirmed that unfortunately this was an erroneously combined statement as there is no single report which captures each of the program reviews. Communications is making arrangements with RESEARCH MONEY regarding a follow-up interview with the President which would provide an opportunity to clarify the matter.</p> <p>While PIPSC understood there was no central report they still expressed concern regarding the program changes that result from individual reviews and the timing of communication concerning those changes. NRC provided a recent example of when a program was cancelled based upon the review, the GM then focused on an exit strategy which included how to reallocate those resources such as redirecting those employees to other programs. Furthermore, NRC noted that there are monthly and quarterly reviews along with recalibrations to modify, expand or end the program. In the case of the later, the contracts with industry would be honoured and the resources redeployed as much as possible. There are also 3 year evaluations which are posted, such as with NINT. NRC is currently focusing on what is important to the Canadian government such as how NRC can link into the innovation clusters for Canada that Minister Baines is developing.</p> <p>There is further worry as to how program success is measured and at what cost. PIPSC believes the key measure for NRC management is revenue from industry whereas they see a range of important metrics such as publications and patents which showcase NRC as an international player. NRC acknowledged that what constitutes appropriate metrics are important questions to be pursued within NRC's Dialogue and they are looking forward to working with PIPSC's members as part of this process. They also reported that NRC did not meet its revenue targets for last year and that two of its flagships actually have zero revenue targets.</p>	
<p>89.9</p>	<p>Revised Promotion Criteria and Career Paths for RO/RCOs</p> <p>PIPSC reported that while the RO and RCOs are distributed between IRAP, Corporate, BMS and Research, the bulk fall within research and as such the focus of was placed here when considering how to best revise the promotion criteria. From a data report, principals and guidelines were developed in preparation for drafting new promotion criteria. The project champion is Isabelle Gingras, Vice-President Human Resources, who made the recommendation to have the draft criteria reviewed by the CFA working group due to the high level of PRO engagement within that group. They are hoping to finalize the promotion criteria for the July 2017 promotion round and timing is ideal to incorporate within the NRC Dialogue related to determining what is important to NRC. It was also confirmed by NRC that the review of the promotion criteria should be driven by how success is defined within NRC going forward and not the past. PIPSC also tabled the notion that one size does not fit all and this will be reflected in the revised</p>	

ITEM	89 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>89.9 (cont.)</p>	<p>promotion criteria. NRC further clarified that while there is one RO generic job description, the individuality of the job will be captured within the hiring process as well as the promotion criteria.</p> <p>RCEA raised the issue of generic one size fits all job descriptions within their groups, especially the ADs. NRC noted that the job description in essence is an overall description of the level of duties for the purpose of determining the appropriate level of compensation whereas the CTEs detail the specifics for that individual employee. Currently there are about 14,000 job descriptions for 4000 employees within NRC and Classification is a dying function wherein it is becoming exceedingly more difficult to find Officers. It is a balancing act between the need for a very specific job description verses what can be reasonably incorporated in a general set of overarching duties. The problem for the RCEA is that the CTEs do not always address the specifics and if there are questions the job description is consulted for clarity. NRC acknowledged the need to continue the conversation as it relates to the AD and TO generic job descriptions. While the RCEA is glad there is are promotion criteria for the RO/RCO community, they are very concerned that their own AD members are being treated like robots. NRC suggested that it may be appropriate for the JCC to receive an overall summary from the bargaining agents on of how each of their groups are doing without going into collective bargaining matters.</p>	
	<p>Roundtable</p>	
	<p>Harassment Policy</p> <p>PIPSC would like to receive an update on the status of the new Harassment Policy including what type of training is available concerning inappropriate bullying behavior in the workplace. NRC responded that while they did look at in-house training, the Canada School of Public Service has good coverage of appropriate harassment prevention courses but they have not been promoted. As well NRC confirmed that at the next JCC, there will be a presentation on the state of mental health within NRC.</p>	
	<p>Next Meeting</p> <p>The next JCC meeting is scheduled for 1 December 2016 with a start time of 9:00 a.m. The meeting will be chaired by the PIPSC.</p>	
	<p>Meeting adjourned at: 11:45 pm</p>	