

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL CANADA (NRC)

MINUTES OF THE 90th MEETING

OF THE

NRC – JOINT CONSULTATION COMMITTEE (JCC)

DATE: December 1, 2016
TIME: 9:00 AM
LOCATION: Room S-303, Building M-58

IN ATTENDANCE

Chairperson:

Susan O'Donnell, President, PIPSC NRC RO/RCO Group

Representing NRC:

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
Ronda Gosselin, Consultation Team
Susan O'Donnell, President, NRC RO/RCO Group

Representing Research Council Employees' Association (RCEA):

Cathie Fraser, President
Joan Van Den Bergh, Negotiator

Guests:

Marie-Eve Roy, Manager, Talent Acquisition/Classification, Workplace Effectiveness, HRB
David Shane, Director, Health and Safety, Occupational Safety and Health, HRB

ITEM	90 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
90.1	<p>Approval of Agenda</p> <p>The agenda was approved with agreement to move item 90.7 – NRC IT Systems and Impact on Employees to the 91st meeting and item 90.12 – D1 RO/RCO Promotion Documentation to the beginning of the New Business discussion for this meeting.</p> <p>All members also expressed their sincere appreciation to Susan O'Donnell, President of the NRC RO/RCO Group, for her contributions to the JCC over the years and wished her well in her</p>	

ITEM	90 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>90.1 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>upcoming retirement. More specifically NRC highlighted her commitment to improving employer-employee relationships and the collaborative nature of her involvement in the recent Call for Action initiative. The RCEA President, Cathie Fraser, also thanked Dr. O'Donnell for her commitment and passion for the issues of importance to her members and personally for her friendship.</p> <p>Congratulations were also extended to Dr. O'Donnell on her recent receipt of the PIPSC President's Achievement Award which recognizes members who have promoted professionalism by demonstrating innovative initiative and who have made an exceptional contribution under extraordinary circumstances.</p> <p>Dr. O'Donnell thanked everyone for their kind words and expressed how much she has enjoyed being a part of the JCC and the great work it has achieved through dealing productively with difficult issues. She also indicated her plans to remain as RO/RCO President until the collective agreement is signed. However, she will continue to remain active in the PIPSC Science Advisory Committee and the Women in Science initiative, which is of particular importance to her.</p>	
<p>90.2</p>	<p>Minutes of the 89th 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"> • 88.6 – On-Boarding Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ That the addition of “both Bargaining Agents expressed their interest in participating in the on-boarding events” be included. • 88.10 – Professional Development Time Coding (IRAP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ That the sentence be revised to “The parties confirmed that <u>at this point</u> this issue has been addressed.” • 89.6 – New Computer Zones <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ That the third paragraph be amended to replace “MyZone” with “SIGMA” and seamless computer access be further clarified to “with e-mail on the green”. • 89.9 – Revised Promotion Criteria and Career Paths for RO/RCOs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ That clarification be made to indicate that the draft criteria was being reviewed “by the” CFA working group instead of “as part of” of the working group. 	<p>M.Marchand</p> <p>M.Marchand</p> <p>M.Marchand</p> <p>M.Marchand</p>
<p>90.3</p>	<p>Follow-up Action Items of the 89th Meeting</p>	
<p>81.8</p>	<p>Implementation of Local Labour Management Consultation Committees (LLMCC)</p> <p>The third LLMCC for ICT is scheduled for December 12, 2016 and</p>	

ITEM	90 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>81.8 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>the first LLMCC meeting for Royalmount took place in late October with two future PIPSC stewards in attendance. Given that the Royalmount LLMCC is a geographically based pilot with representatives from three different portfolios present in the meeting, they face some unique challenges such as agenda items being raised that would be better addressed at the JCC. Accordingly an assessment of the effectiveness of this pilot should be conducted after several LLMCC meetings have taken place.</p>	
<p>84.5</p>	<p>Phoenix (including impact on Pay Office)</p> <p>RCEA inquired as to how the Pay and Benefits Advisors (PBAs) were affected with the implementation of the new Phoenix pay system. More specifically they were concerned about how many employees were on leave and if any had left the NRC as a result of Phoenix as they had heard that some staff were on leave and others had left the organization resulting from the heavy burden the PBAs are carrying.</p> <p>NRC representatives confirmed that there was one scheduled retirement that had occurred recently; however, another PBA is acting in that position. A second PBA left due to a lengthy commute and a replacement is in place. One PBA was on sick leave but would be returning shortly. It was also noted that a new PBA had begun work this week and that another term PBA was scheduled to start in January. With the hiring of the two additional term employees shortly (as approved by SEC), the PBA team will be at full strength.</p> <p>NRC representatives reiterated that they are very sensitive to the workload the PBAs are facing with the introduction of the Phoenix pay system and as a result are trying to manage the workload as best as possible. They recognize the PBAs maintain high standards as evidenced by their continued excellent results and place a lot of pressure on themselves. RCEA agreed in that the PBAs focus on the one wrong action instead of the 3500 right actions and suggested that employee complaints be directed to the Manager of Labour Relations instead of the PBAs. NRC responded that this suggestion was already extended and that the Human Resources Generalists (HRGs) are also trying to handle as much as possible on the front end before employees go to their PBA.</p> <p>An additional enquiry was made by RCEA as to whether it was anticipated that NRC would continue to maintain their own Pay and Benefits (P&B) group as they see the value this group brings to the Council. For example PBAs did an amazing job with a case that went back 14 years and required an incredible amount of work to prepare. Given the current issues Phoenix is having, NRC expects to retain its P&B group for some time, although the Government objective of consolidating pay offices in Miramichi at some future date remains in place. It was noted that the President, NRC is also aware of the great benefits NRC receives from retaining our own P&B group and as such recognized their excellent work with the recent awarding of the President's Commendation Award to the</p>	

ITEM	90 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	Pay and Benefits team.	
87.5	<p>Probation</p> <p>NRC reported that a briefing on probation is being made to SEC on January 23, 2017 and that the concerns expressed by the Bargaining Agents have been incorporated in the briefing. In response to a question from the Bargaining Agents NRC responded that the briefing did not contain a recommendation and was instead intended to create a productive discussion about probation. It was also noted that the current policy is not creating issues for NRC management as they have received no feedback that candidates are declining offers as a result of the period being too long. However, recognizing the issues raised by union representatives, the matter is being forwarded to NRC senior management for consideration.</p> <p>RCEA representatives indicated that their concerns related to the inconsistency with the core public service, and the expectation that a probationary employee's suitability should be possible to establish within a more reasonable timeframe. For example, NRC does not need two years to assess an AD employee. Furthermore, there have been instances of supervisors waiting to make an assessment when probation is about to end and extending probation periods when deficiencies have not been addressed.</p> <p>PIPSC representatives raised the issue of the impact of the lengthy probation periods on female probationary scientists in considering when to start a family. It was noted that Minister Duncan also has an interest in the issues impacting women in science. NRC representatives confirmed that this area of concern was reflected in the briefing to SEC.</p> <p>PIPSC representatives further expressed concern that probationary employees who were otherwise successful until something happened close to the end of the three year probation period were then having their probation extended. NRC representatives responded that they would reflect the number of probationary extensions in the SEC briefing. RCEA representatives also reiterated that last minute extensions are an important area of concern and that they hoped this briefing would lead to a meaningful discussion at SEC concerning probation periods at NRC.</p>	I.Gingras (M.Marchand)
87.15	<p>New Members – Bargaining Agent Notifications</p> <p>RCEA representatives expressed concern about the lengthy delays being experienced recently in getting regular membership listing updates from Labour Relations acknowledging that there have been some extenuating circumstances that may have impacted the timeliness of the reports. NRC representatives advised that they would pursue this matter and work to improve the timeliness of the notifications.</p>	J.Grebenc C.Fraser

ITEM	90 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
87.16	<p>Call For Action (CFA) – Presentation on Research at NRC</p> <p>NRC staff were informed, via e-mail on October 20, 2016, about the CFA Working Group having been formed to explore issues raised and to look for long-term solutions. A membership list was also provided. PIPSC representative expressed appreciation that the President was in attendance at the last meeting and requested that the CFA remain as a standing item on the JCC agenda.</p>	
88.4	<p>Security at NRC</p> <p>It was confirmed by NRC representatives that the Standard for Security Video Surveillance in the NCR has been posted on MyZone. A copy was also distributed to the Bargaining Agents but at that time the Standard on Security Administrative Investigations was not available. RCEA representatives subsequently reported they are having problems accessing MyZone.</p>	
88.6	<p>On-Boarding Project</p> <p>NRC representatives reported that IRAP had agreed to cover the cost of their new employees attending the quarterly On-Boarding event allowing all new NRC employees to attend the event. There were 70 employees in attendance at the last On-Boarding event with the next ones scheduled for February and May 2017.</p>	
88.7	<p>Staffing Concerns – Staffing Without Competition</p> <p>NRC confirmed that the data requested by RCEA was provided as requested.</p>	
88.9	<p>Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)</p> <p>PIPSC representatives acknowledged the NRC data that was provided on PIPs over the last two years and requested some additional information to better understand the data. Both Bargaining Agents requested that the data be further broken out by fiscal year and by portfolio and identifying whether the CTE rating was Does Not Meet or Met Some. If possible, information relating to missed revenue targets was also requested. RCEA representatives also inquired as to how PIP data could be captured on an on-going basis.</p> <p>NRC representatives suggested that the new Success Factors initiative which was being implemented shortly might have the potential to manage and report on PIPs.</p> <p>While the Bargaining Agents are pleased that no Workforce Adjustments (WFAs) had taken place over the past year, they are concerned that managers who are under great pressure to meet revenue targets are now using PIPs to replace WFAs. Furthermore managers are being rated on revenue in relation to the cost of their staff along with the added stress of sunset funding. Additionally the Bargaining Agents believe that employee favouritism is affecting how the CTEs are rated and the assignment of the higher valued A</p>	

ITEM	90 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>88.9 (cont.)</p>	<p>revenue project codes. PIPSC representatives expressed the view that they would rather see an employee go through a WFA than have their career destroyed by being performance managed.</p> <p>NRC representatives indicated that some additional break down of the data might be possible. They also requested information as to the specific concerns with PIPs.</p> <p>RCEA representatives indicated that they recognize the need to manage performance but they are of the opinion that the current PIP form is problematic in that it is poorly designed. However, for the RCEA, the issues are more than the form itself as they feel managers are providing limited tools and supports to help employees improve. RCEA representatives indicated that their concern is that the employer obligation goes beyond telling an employee their performance is deficient via the PIP form and that the burden of improved performance rests with both the employer and the employee. RCEA representatives suggested that PIPs should reflect factual performance data and should not be based on the manager not liking an employee.</p> <p>PIPSC representatives added that in their view, managers and supervisors need additional training on CTEs especially as to the development of objectives that are specific, measurable, aligned, realistic and time-bound (SMART). Furthermore, PIPSC representatives believed that CTEs can be used as a disciplinary tool that does not enhance the growth of their members and does not really help the employee improve. However they suggested that if the CTE and PIP processes were used properly it would be to the benefit of all parties.</p> <p>In response to the concerns expressed, it was agreed that a separate meeting would be arranged with the Bargaining Agents and NRC to discuss the expanded data and the PIP process mapping.</p>	<p>I.Gingras J.Grebenc (M.Marchand) P.Loder C.Fraser</p>
<p>88.13</p>	<p>Mississippi Mills Update</p> <p>RCEA representatives requested an update on the Mississippi Mills situation and inquired as to whether the Mississippi lab will be closed and the staff relocated.</p> <p>NRC representatives acknowledged the growing stress being felt by staff and that management was looking at ways to support staff now in advance of any formal transition that may be required. It was indicated that input from the RCEA was welcome to address issues that arise.</p>	<p>I.Gingras C.Fraser</p>
<p>89.4</p>	<p>37.5 vs 1950 Hours Requirements for RO/RCOs</p> <p>In response to questions raised, NRC representatives confirmed that the default work schedule for RO/RCOs is 1950 hours except for when operational requirements support a 37.5 work schedule such as clients requiring technical services. The differences between the needs of Engineering portfolios and those of the</p>	

ITEM	90 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>89.4 (cont.)</p>	<p>Research driven portfolios were also recognized.</p> <p>PIPSC representatives indicated that the language of the RO/RCO collective agreement supports their request for a written explanation for those portfolios that require all their RO/RCO staff to be on a 37.5 work schedule. They expressed the view that these managers were using the 37.5 work schedule as a substitute for the appropriate management of staff as they believe there are other areas of NRC whose employees have similar responsibilities and are able to work effectively under a 1950 work schedule. For example IRAP, which is entirely client driven, are able to operate under a 1950 work schedule.</p> <p>RCEA representatives also expressed concerns with respect to hours of work for their members and suggested that they face similar challenges related to hours of work in the context of childcare, family issues, or illness, etc., while needing to account for every minute of their time.</p> <p>NRC representatives committed to obtaining additional information relating to the operational requirements rationale in support of 37.5 hour work schedule for RO/RCOs. However, as 1950 is the predominant work schedule, PIPSC representatives were asked to articulate what they hope to achieve or solve in raising the issue of the few 37.5 exceptions, so that there can be more fruitful discussions on the matter if necessary.</p>	<p>I.Gingras P.Loder</p>
<p>89.6</p>	<p>New Computer Zones</p> <p>Concern was expressed by RCEA representatives concerning the increasing degree of difficulty in navigating the IT systems at NRC. In particular they are troubled by the level of employee responsibility and the consequences of non-compliance given the limited education, training and awareness of Treasury Board's Policy on Acceptable Network and Device Use (PANDU) as well as other NRC policies, standards and guidelines.</p> <p>PIPSC representatives suggested that the increasing IT security requirements were adding difficulty to the work of their members using NRC IT systems.</p> <p>It was agreed that a representative from KITS would be invited to attend the next JCC to hear the Bargaining Agents' concerns.</p>	<p>M.Marchand</p>
<p>89.7</p>	<p>Signage for NRC</p> <p>An NRC representative reported that they had initially been informed by AERO that there are concerns over the cost of the specialized paint required to the return the NRC signage on the U-70 wind tunnel at the Uplands airport. NRC representatives agreed to continue looking into the matter.</p>	<p>M.Marchand</p>

ITEM	90 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
89.9	<p>Revised Promotion Criteria and Career Paths for RO/RCOs</p> <p>Isabelle Gingras advised that she had provided an update to all employees on these initiatives in her role as Project Champion. The project remains on track for implementation in July 2017, although it will depend on the NRC Dialogue.</p> <p>PIPSC representatives indicated that they were very pleased with the progress made on these initiatives to date.</p>	
	<p>Business Arising from Minutes</p>	
85.4	<p>Changes in National Institute for Nanotechnology (NINT)</p> <p>NRC representatives advised that ongoing discussions with the University of Alberta (UofA) were continuing on this initiative and committed to convening an off-line meeting to provide an update, should anything new arise.</p> <p>PIPSC representatives noted that there is an important role for NINT in continuing to work with universities and that there needs to be an evaluation of what improvements are required to obtain better results. Learning from the NINT experience is particularly important as the NRC President has indicated that more collaborations with universities will be part of the future direction for NRC.</p> <p>RCEA representatives indicated that the situation is creating a lot of uncertainty for their members.</p> <p>NRC representatives confirmed that both NINT and the universities benefit from working together and so agreed on the importance of finding solutions to make it work.</p>	
	<p>New Business</p>	
90.12	<p>D1 RO/RCO Promotion Documentation</p> <p>Concern was expressed by PIPSC representatives regarding the level of detail required in support of a D1 promotion increase for the RO/RCO Group as there does not seem to be consistency amongst the portfolios. They advised that one portfolio even required a complete rewrite of the D1 cases to support the increase.</p> <p>Marie-Eve Roy, Manager of Talent Acquisition and Classification referred to the 2013/14 policy review that was conducted in response to concerns raised by PIPSC representatives concerning the lack of consistency in how the RO/RCO salary reviews were managed given that the supporting documentation ranged from nothing or very little to three pages. In response, a standardized short salary justification form was developed for all D1s to ensure that the process was consistent and that the salary decisions were sound in addressing the required promotion criteria. While the intention was that hours would not be spent on completing this</p>	

ITEM	90 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>90.12 (cont.)</p>	<p>documentation, current practices range from one to several pages depending on who completes the form and the level of details required by local management.</p> <p>Further apprehension was expressed by PIPSC representatives concerning the current climate and the emphasis placed on revenue generation relative to administrative overhead with some of their members feeling compelled to charge the administrative time for the D1 documentation to project codes, especially if extensive D1 rewrites were required.</p> <p>NRC representatives indicated that it would follow-up with the GMs concerning this matter and reiterate the original intent to create a standardized and transparent process that was not burdensome for DI processes.</p>	<p>M-E.Roy I.Gingras</p>
<p>90.4</p>	<p>State of Mental Health at NRC</p> <p>David Shane, Director of Health and Safety presented an overview of the strategic plan for addressing Psychological Health and Safety (PHS) in the Workplace at NRC. This initiative was in response to the larger Federal Government Mental Health initiative to address the CSA PHS Standard and the Consortium of Organizational Mental Health's 13 risk factors. As this presentation was in advance of the discussion at SEC, a copy of the presentation would be sent to the Bargaining Agents to obtain their comments by December 12th for any suggested presentation changes.</p> <p>Mr. Shane noted that depression, substance abuse, and generalized anxiety have a costly impact on employees as well as employers. Accordingly the Federal Government's Joint Task Force has developed 11 key recommendations to address the CSA PHS standard. These recommendations related to changing culture, building capacity, as well as measuring, reporting and striving to continuously improve at both the enterprise-wide and local level. He indicated that following discussion and decision by SEC priorities will need to be set and the needs mapped out given the potential transformational nature of this project. There is also a need to determine the current state of PHS for employees at NRC; however, there are a number of ways to do so from extrapolating relevant data from the Public Service Employee Survey scheduled in 2017 to other tools available from Mental Health Commission.</p> <p>RCEA representatives cautioned that posing questions over Zone would be problematic. They suggested that a joint union-management approach to the Mental Health Initiative is critical for reaching employees. Accordingly it is also important to discuss the role the Bargaining Agents can play in supporting this initiative. NRC representatives agreed on this point.</p> <p>RCEA representatives also questioned how other departments were responding to this initiative as well what role the COSH committees were playing, although both Bargaining Agents cautioned that it would be necessary to educate COSH members</p>	<p>M.Marchand C.Fraser S.O'Donnell</p>

ITEM	90 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>90.4 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>on this initiative particularly with respect to privacy issues.</p> <p>PIPSC representatives expressed gratitude for the efforts in this area as in the past the “health” portion of COSH did not address mental health and the important connection with workplace stress. They also suggested that given the President’s interest in the views of employees, this initiative could be relevant to the bigger NRC Dialogue undertaking and the need to balance meeting revenue targets and overall organizational health. PIPSC representatives also expressed the importance of utilizing an internal NRC resource to lead this initiative as they would already understand NRC’s culture.</p> <p>Regarding the use of a survey of employees, PIPSC representatives noted that employees would be highly concerned that the information could be tracked back to the individual and as a result NRC would need to be upfront about how this data would be used. They recommended using the national survey to avoid these privacy concerns. RCEA representatives also suggested using the Public Service annual employee survey to have access to data more quickly. NRC representatives noted that the NRC Dialogue had just launched an internal survey and that depending on the response rate that may also be an option for further employee consultation.</p> <p>A number of questions were raised concerning the assessment of PHS at NRC. RCEA representatives suggested that NCOSH already had enough responsibilities, although NRC representatives noted that NCOSH would need to be involved as it is mandated to support mental health in the workplace. RCEA representatives suggested that a working or steering committee which could also provide updates to JCC. Additionally RCEA representatives indicated that they were pleased to see the work being undertaken on mental health as opportunities to meet with individuals concerning assisting employees living with mental health illnesses, were not always accepted in the past. They advised that they would also be attending a two day course through the Joint Learning Project to further increase their knowledge in the area of mental health.</p>	
<p>90.5</p>	<p>Electronic Hazardous Occurrence Investigation Reporting (eHOIR) Process</p> <p>RCEA representatives advised that the eHOIR form required to report incidents specifies that only the supervisor is able to fill in the form. This has created some apprehension with RCEA members who have indicated that some supervisors find that the eHOIR requires too much time and effort to complete. This is particularly disconcerting in light of NCOSH’s new Directive on Violence in the Workplace. The current process, according to RCEA representatives also provides employees with no control over what is reported or how it is reflected in the report as there is no first person account. If supervisors view this requirement as a burden there is the potential for incidents to go unreported. It was</p>	

ITEM	90 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>90.5 (cont.)</p>	<p>indicated that in the past, the HOIR could be completed by the employee themselves and forwarded to their supervisor for review and approval. In the RCEA representative's opinion, anyone should be able to complete an eHOIR particularly in view of some supervisors' negative reactions. They also inquired as to whether it was possible for the employee to fill in the report following which it could be provided to the supervisor for investigation.</p> <p>PIPSC representatives also had similar issues with the eHOIR, particularly with respect to the lack of first-hand account.</p> <p>While NRC representatives believed that supervisors, through conversations with their employees, could capture incidents appropriately, they agreed to look into the eHOIR process including who is required to complete the form and why. RCEA representatives will provide NRC Labour Relations with additional information for follow-up.</p>	<p>J.Grebenc (M.Marchand) C.Fraser</p>
<p>90.6</p>	<p>Harassment Policy and Training</p> <p>Bargaining Agent representatives inquired as to whether managers were properly trained concerning harassment and bullying in light of the update to the NRC Harassment Policy.</p> <p>NRC representatives confirmed that the Policy on Harassment Prevention and Resolution and the Directive on the Harassment Complaint Process, which were approved by SEC on November 24th with the President's full support, are virtually the same as those the Bargaining Agents reviewed earlier. The intention of this update was to align NRC's policy and definitions with the TBS Policy and thus make its tools accessible and relevant. Once the translation is finalized, the policy and directive will be posted along with the TBS links. Also, a message to employees will be sent out in the new year. The Secretary General will be meeting with management teams across the Council in support of the new policy and directive and related courses from Canada School of Public Service will be added to NRC's catalogue of learning and development offerings.</p>	<p>M.Marchand</p>
<p>90.8</p>	<p>Multi-Zone USB Key – Terms and Conditions of Use</p> <p>Bargaining agent representatives noted that employees are instructed to safeguard the multi-zone USB key at all times in the terms and conditions of use and that a loss may trigger an investigation or disciplinary action. RCEA representatives observed that employees need to use this USB key as part of their work and yet appear to be threatened with discipline up front for the innocent loss or misplacement of their USB key. There was also no consultation with the Bargaining Agents on this policy. They also suggested that employees are just agreeing to the terms of use without fully paying attention to the details as having the USB key is a requirement to perform their jobs. They expressed the view that increasingly employees are being asked to sign off on obligations as part of performing their jobs such as using NRC</p>	

ITEM	90 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>90.8 (cont.)</p>	<p>vehicles or in the context of Safety and Health. RCEA representatives see this as setting employees up for failure by asking them to confirm an understanding of their obligations in numerous areas so that NRC can avoid liability but at potential cost to the employee. They expressed concern as to how employees would be able to remember all the various obligations required on their signed off.</p> <p>PIPSC representatives indicated that the loss of IT equipment, such as a multi-zone USB key, leading to a disciplinary investigation is a huge stress on an employee that is costly and non-productive. If NRC is looking at promoting mental health in the workplace an excellent place to start is by sitting down and having conversations with employees instead of using administrative or disciplinary meetings in increasing frequency. In support of this, RCEA representatives inquired as to the possibility of HR Generalists recommending that their client managers pursue informal and less stressful methods of communicating with employees, although they do recognize some cases warrant the formal disciplinary route. PIPSC representatives suggested that a balance needs to be found between the needs of security, openness, freedom and trust to support the success of NRC as an organization.</p> <p>NRC representatives acknowledged that there are some complexities to its IT system as well as some significant obligations. NRC will bring the concerns to the attention of those responsible for these policies and procedures and pursue the possibility of having a management representative attend a forthcoming JCC meeting.</p>	<p>I.Gingras (M.Marchand)</p>
<p>90.9</p>	<p>New GOC Communication Policy</p> <p>PIPSC representatives raised the Government's announcement on the new Communications and Federal Identity Policy had not been communicated to employees. An example of a message sent to employees of Environment and Climate Change Canada was presented as something they would like to see issued at NRC.</p> <p>NRC representatives agreed to follow up with NRC's Communications Branch.</p>	<p>I.Gingras (M.Marchand)</p>
<p>90.10</p>	<p>NRC Dialogue – Tiger Teams</p> <p>PIPSC representatives expressed their appreciation for the many opportunities its members have to contribute to the NRC Dialogue. At the same time, they requested an opportunity for PIPSC, as an organization, to respond officially with a written submission.</p> <p>NRC representatives agreed to inquire of the Vice-President who is managing the NRC Dialogue to determine where the Bargaining Agents might have opportunity to provide feedback directly.</p>	<p>I.Gingras</p>

ITEM	90 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
90.11	<p>Staff Utilization Rates and Assignment of SIGMA A&B Codes Across P/B/Is</p> <p>PIPSC representatives expressed some apprehension about the manner in which work is being assigned to employees. They suggested that there appears to be some disparity in the assignment of the more valuable SIGMA A revenue work and the lesser SIGMA B work. They suggested that this causes employees stress and could then have an impact on their performance related to revenue targets and possibly even lead to Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) or WFAs.</p> <p>RCEA representatives noted the same issue is faced by their TO members and suggested that favouritism plays a role in the assignment of the SIGMA A and B codes.</p> <p>NRC representatives noted that this is part of the issues being raised by employees through the NRC Dialogue. It was also noted that while the tracking of time is important, the level of complexity of coding is an issue.</p>	
	Roundtable	
	<p>Public Service Employee Annual Survey (PSEAS)</p> <p>RCEA representatives indicated they would provide the Vice-President, HRB information received on the PSEAS that is scheduled for early 2017.</p>	C.Fraser
	<p>IRAP</p> <p>PIPSC representatives agreed to defer their IRAP issues until the next JCC meeting, in the hopes that they can be addressed off-line directly with the new Vice-President of IRAP.</p>	
	<p>Preparation Time for JCC</p> <p>PIPSC representative expressed their view that leave with pay should be provided to employees to prepare for the JCC meetings.</p> <p>NRC representatives responded that their interpretation of the collective agreement provisions is that attendance at the meeting is considered leave with pay but that the preparation time is leave without pay. Given the difference in views, NRC will address this matter with union representatives off-line.</p>	J.Grebenc (M.Marchand)
	<p>2017 Meeting Dates</p> <p>The JCC meetings for 2017 are scheduled for March 8th, June 14th, September 6th, and December 13th with start times of 9:00 a.m. The next meeting will be chaired by the NRC.</p>	
	Meeting adjourned at: 12:35 pm	