

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL CANADA (NRC)

MINUTES OF THE 93rd MEETING

OF THE

NRC – JOINT CONSULTATION COMMITTEE (JCC)

DATE: September 6, 2017
TIME: 9:00 AM
LOCATION: Room S-303, Building M-58

IN ATTENDANCE

Chairperson:

Roman Szumski, NRC, Vice-President, Life Sciences

Representing NRC:

Roman Szumski, NRC, Vice-President, Life Sciences
Isabelle Gingras, Vice-President, Human Resources Branch (HRB)
Joe Grebenc, 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):

Patricia Loder, President, Consultation Team (*via teleconference*)
Sara Boulé-Perroni, Employment Relations Officer (*via teleconference*)
Stephan Grosse, RO/RCO Group Executive

Representing Research Council Employees' Association (RCEA):

Cathie Fraser, President
Joan Van Den Bergh, Negotiator
Marvin Zaluski, 1st Vice-President
Michelle Lévesque, 2nd Vice-President

Guests:

None

ITEM	93 rd JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
93.1	Approval of Agenda The agenda was approved by the members with the addition of Pay Stubs to New Business.	

ITEM	93 rd JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
93.2	<p>Minutes of the 92nd 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"> • 87.15 – New Members – Bargaining Agent Notifications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Adding “because of Phoenix issues” to the end of the first sentence. 	M.Marchand
93.3	Follow-up Action Items of the 92nd Meeting	
87.5	<p>Probation</p> <p>A management representative reported that the manner in which probation is being entered in SIGMA is being changed to ensure that any extensions are captured along with whether they are due to leave without pay or other reasons such as performance or conduct.</p> <p>The Human Resources Generalists (HRGs) were also briefed on the probation areas of concern as expressed by the bargaining agents, the changes to SIGMA tracking of probation as well as the importance of due consideration being given to waiving the probation for long-standing terms converting into continuing positions.</p> <p>It was also noted by management representatives that the subject of probation is often raised in conjunction with the three and five year Workforce Composition reviews when planning considerations are being given to the viability of integrating long-standing terms into continuing positions. The planning group within HRB will be tasked with the management of the Workforce Composition policy.</p> <p>Representatives of the RCEA inquired if statistics were available on when probation was applied for terms with greater than three and five years of service who were converted to continuing positions. Management representatives responded that they would inquire as whether the statistics requested were available.</p> <p>An individual probation case of great concern to PIPSC was raised by one of their representatives. A management representative indicated they were aware of the case and that Labour Relations (LR) was involved.</p>	I.Gingras (M.Marchand)
88.9	<p>Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)</p> <p>It was confirmed by management representatives that the PIP form in SuccessFactors will detail a rationale in support of the status of the PIP. Training, when launched, will include best practices as well as how to use the PIP within SuccessFactors. As there currently are issues with printing the performance gap, there is no launch date as of yet but the bargaining agents will be notified in</p>	

<p>88.9 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>advance and if possible provided with sample SuccessFactors-PIP printout.</p> <p>It was noted that management had provided statistics to the bargaining agents in June on performance management cases from FY14/15 and FY15/16. According to the statistics only 41 out of the 184 performance improvement cases had a formal PIP in place, which represented about 1% of the entire employee population. There was a slight decline in PIPs from 26 to 23 over the two year span. Most PIPs were ongoing; however, for those with outcomes, there were slightly more successful PIPs than unsuccessful ones.</p> <p>Representatives from both bargaining agents noted that they recognize the need for PIPs that are implemented for the purpose of helping an employee improve their performance but not as a tool for termination. PIPs should not be a surprise to the employee or a situational over-reaction to an issue with an employee. Any training needs to reflect this. They are educating their members on the importance of reaching out early on to their bargaining agent representatives for support and help when they are facing a PIP but many are uncomfortable in doing so. From those members that do reach out, they are receiving increasing numbers of negative and frustrating reports detailing that the PIP is based upon the full scope of the job duties and not focused on the specifics of performance gap; that employees are not receiving supporting resources and are bearing the burden of improvement alone as management is not making it a priority; and that the standard bar is constantly being raised keeping success out of grasp. They expressed that this is resulting in NRC getting a negative reputation when these employees leave and tell others not to work here.</p> <p>The appropriate length for a PIP was inquired of by representatives of the bargaining agents. A management representative responded that is dependent upon what is warranted in each individual case. It was also reported by management representatives that the PIP is a tool of last resort as supervisors would have initially engaged in discussions with their employee on the performance deficiencies, followed by additional coaching and interventions if required. If the employee's performance failed to improve despite these other efforts then a formal PIP would be implemented. Representatives of the bargaining agents replied that this is not what they are seeing.</p> <p>Representatives of both bargaining agents further questioned if supervisors were required to ensure completion of these other preliminary efforts through documentation or if consideration is given as to whether there is a new supervisor or there are changes in the personal life of the employee before a PIP could be implemented? They were searching for reasons why an employee who has had meets or exceeds Commitment to Excellence (CTE) ratings would then have a met some or does not meet rating. Representatives of the RCEA expressed, that in their view, it was</p>	
---------------------------------------	---	--

<p>88.9 (cont.)</p>	<p>critical that the supervisor be in place for at least six months before conducting a review of an employee's performance, similar to the provision currently in place in the core public service.</p> <p>Management representatives reported that these are the types of questions posed and background information solicited in an effort to obtain a complete picture when a new performance improvement case is brought forward. Any performance gaps would be included in CTEs unless the gap is a very recent issue, although details of efforts to close the gap would not be referenced.</p> <p>A PIPSC representative indicated that they were informing their members that if the negative CTE rating was a surprise, then they should not sign the CTE and instead use the comments to explain the situation as documentation in support of any future grievance. They further detailed a supporting example.</p> <p>Representatives of both bargaining agents requested some manner of third party review of a percentage of the PIPs for quality assurance and control purposes of appropriate intent, content, progress, and outcome. They suggested this review could be a quarterly review conducted by management and the bargaining agents together. They noted that they are well acquainted with unsuccessful PIPs but not with the successful ones and so requested a copy of a successful PIP. They had seen some unusual PIPs coming out of certain portfolios.</p> <p>A management representative acknowledged the importance of quality control and supporting tools but was unclear as to what would constitute an appropriate critical review in light of the request from the bargaining agents. Currently there is alignment between the HRGs and LR in an endeavour to ensure a consistent bar for PIPs but this challenge function happens behind the scenes. A non-contextual review of a PIP could allow for a determination to be made as to whether the PIP was focused on the performance gap, reasonable, well written, if tools were provided to the employee to help them address the gap, and if the timeframe was appropriate. If warranted then an additional review with contextual background could be undertaken. Management would give more consideration to quality control of PIPs including a potential review mechanism of sample PIPs in response to the bargaining agents' request.</p> <p>A representative of RCEA expressed concern that when the HRGs approach a LR officer for advice on a performance case, LR would have already formed an opinion of the case at that level based upon only one side's viewpoint. The same LR officer would then be involved with the second and final level grievance. It was noted that organizations with three and four grievance procedures allow for those involved with the final level to be very removed from the working file. They recognize LR is there for quality control but want the grievance hearing to be genuine and fair.</p>	<p>I.Gingras (J.Grebenc)</p>
--------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

<p>89.4</p>	<p>37.5 vs 1950 Hours Requirements for RO/RCOs</p> <p>Management representatives confirmed that the PIPSC RO/RCO collective agreement provides for a default work schedule of 1950 unless operational requirements do not permit this type of flexible and adaptive schedule. The General Managers (GMs) within Engineering division were contacted as that is where the bulk of the 37.5 work schedule RO/RCO employees are located and within some portfolios, almost all are on that schedule. These decisions were taken 10 or more years ago by senior managers who are no longer with NRC, as a result the supporting rationales that could be provided by the current GMs would most likely not be exhaustive and be based around the 37.5 work schedule working for the group and their clients. A PIPSC representative suggested that management attach an addendum note to the rationales indicating why they were limited for any future review. Management committed to sending to PIPSC the business rationales for the engineering portfolios with 100% of their RO/RCOs under the 37.5 hour work schedule.</p> <p>It was noted by a management representative that the conversations with the engineering GMs regarding the 1950 and the 37.5 hour work schedules were enlightening and resulted in a greater understanding of the 1950 system and that there was a potential openness to review the 1950 work schedule within certain areas where operations are more flexible. As employees within these areas appear satisfied with their current 37.5 work schedule given the provision to earn overtime if warranted, any change to the 1950 work schedule would need be done in the least disruptive manner for all parties. Additionally consideration would need to be given to the requirement for individuals within the same team to work the same schedule.</p> <p>PIPSC representatives responded that they had only requested the business rationales for the 37.5 hour work schedule and not a change in the work schedules. These rationales would enable them to have insightful conversations with their members regarding the type of work being done in the various engineering portfolios and why it was not conducive to 1950. They are not pushing 1950 hours of work if the 37.5 hour system is working noting that it provides compensation for the extra hours worked. They stated some within the 1950 system are working excessive hours and these extra hours are going uncompensated due to the difficulty of finding appropriate alternate time to be absent in recognition for the extra time worked. They expressed appreciation with the discussion held with the current engineering GMs and their openness to review current operational requirements to determine whether a 1950 hours of work schedule was possible. They also supported asking employees for their preference.</p> <p>A representative of the RCEA questioned whether it is management or the employee who makes the decision regarding 1950 within the collective agreement provisions and if it was</p>	<p>I.Gingras</p>
--------------------	---	------------------

ITEM	93 rd JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>89.4 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>possible for management to require an employee to work 60 hours under the 1950 system. Management representatives responded the RO/RCO collective agreement presents 1950 as the default work schedule but it is management that determines whether the operational requirements are such as to not permit it. Working 60 hours under 1950 is possible and the supervisor would need to speak with the employee about the requirement to work more for this period and develop a plan for working less in lieu of these extra hours. Management representatives noted that there has been no situation at NRC where a 1950 employee has worked non-stop and then did not come in for the remainder of the year.</p> <p>It is the supervisors who require RO/RCOs under a 1950 hours of work schedule to work as if they are under a 37.5 hours of work schedule that is an area of concern as expressed by a representative of PIPSC. Management representatives confirmed that the education of supervisors and RO/RCO employees is critical and possibly could be a subject of discussion at an NRC-wide supervisory meeting as it has been a while since the 1950 hours of work system has been discussed and the nuances have been forgotten. Additional confusion has arisen from the warning messages received when recording time worked. LR is updating a presentation on 1950 for the HRGs to provide to their clients and updated instructions for supervisors to track time worked by their employees under this system are being prepared for the Time Coordinators and HRGs.</p>	
<p>90.8</p>	<p>Multi-Zone USB Key – Terms and Conditions of Use</p> <p>In response to concerns raised by union representatives in previous meetings, it was reported by a management representative that Mr. Grubb, the Executive Director of Security Branch had tasked the Manager, Security Programs and Policy to follow up with the Knowledge, Information and Technology Services branch (KITS) on the importance of emphasizing to employees that the multi-zone USB key is for temporary storage use only. As well ensuring that the focus is on encouraging employees to inform security of potential data loss instead of placing the emphasis on the possibility of discipline.</p>	
<p>90.9</p>	<p>New Government of Canada (GOC) Communication Policy</p> <p>Management representatives informed the committee that Lucie Vignola had been hired as the new Director General for the Communication Branch. Ms. Vignola has an impressive work history with Innovation, Science and Economic Development (ISED), Privy Council, Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS), Transport Canada, Minister’s office, and Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA). A representative of PIPSC suggested that this item be placed on the agenda for the JCC meeting in March 2018.</p>	

ITEM	93 rd JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
90.10	<p>NRC Dialogue Update</p> <p>Representatives of the RCEA commented that there were a lot of new suggestions contained in the NRC Dialogue initiative and that the report was impressive. They expressed appreciation in seeing their input visible in the results, that special meetings were able to be coordinated with Roger Scott-Douglas, Vice President of Policy and Governance and their members, and that the focus on research was being brought back to NRC. Both bargaining agents were working together in support of the vital work of the NRC Dialogue.</p>	
90.12	<p>D1 RO/RCO Promotion Documentation</p> <p>Management advised that the Manager of Talent Acquisition, Classification, and Workplace Effectiveness and a PIPSC representative had spoken off-line to explain the difference between the single bar (/) and absence of one within the RO/RCO rates of pay.</p> <p>Clarification was sought by a PIPSC representative as confusion remained regarding the RO/RCO promotion system as they were told that a bar provides the opportunity for advancement of more than one increase but within the other lockstep collective agreements there are no bars and advancement is automatic. Additionally within the RO/RCO promotion policy it specifies that a promotion may be applied at a bar, however, it appears that in the current process, it is applied each time.</p> <p>In response, a management representative reported that the roll-out of the new version of the RO/RCO promotion criteria in the near future with the anticipated approval from the Senior Executive Committee (SEC) at the end of the month, would provide an opportunity to discuss the D1 as well as other general RO/RCO promotion system proposed questions that PIPSC representatives felt would be helpful.</p> <p>There was additional confusion expressed by a PIPSC representative over the difference between the D1 and the CTE such that one could have a good CTE and yet be denied a D1 promotion, especially if they were both covering the same timeframe. They also noted the importance of a rationale being provided to the employee as to why they were not meeting the requirements for the D1. Additionally they raised concern that preparing both the written CTE and D1 represents an administrative burden for all parties and inquired whether it was possible to streamline the two processes together such as would it be possible within SuccessFactors to have the D1 be automatic if the CTE was positive.</p> <p>Management representatives responded that there may be misalignment between the objectives of the CTE for that year and the long-term focus of the promotion criteria objectives. This issue</p>	

ITEM	93 rd JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
90.12 (cont.)	could be discussed with the anticipated rollout of the new version of the RO/RCO promotion criteria.	
91.7	<p>Technical Officer (TO) to Research Council Officer (RCO) or reverse</p> <p>A management representative informed the committee that they had looked into the concerns raised by the RCEA representatives and that the findings were provided directly to the RCEA in advance of this meeting. The information available indicated that there were only a handful of transitions of employees from TO to RCO positions. The moves were either to address new work or a change in the level and type of work; as well many were via publicized staffing actions. It was noted that most of the individuals involved held higher education levels than normally required for the TO positions they held.</p> <p>Representatives of the RCEA reminded the committee that some time ago they had highlighted the increasing number of TOs being hired with PhDs. The TO position should not be viewed as the entry point to an RCO position which in doing so could lead to an erosion of their membership solely due to the individual possessing a higher level of education. However, this is what now appears to be happening whether it is the employee seeking a reclassification or management is pursuing engaging the employee in an RCO position. It is important that serious consideration be first given to the creation of an alternative high level TO as at these levels there is a fine delineation between the TO and RCO work. As well, concerns were expressed that the RO/RCO group may have been an alternative consideration for reducing overtime charges with senior level TO positions within one area of NRC.</p> <p>Management representatives noted that whether the work is allocated to the TO or RCO group is based upon a review by Classification initially against the group standard after which the mechanism to fill the position is determined. The current market has resulted in an increasing number of individual who possess a PhD applying to TO positions and their higher level of education cannot prevent their candidacy from being accepted. If hired to do TO work, it is also expected that most will then seek out opportunities to secure RO or RCO level work more in line with their capabilities. In the recent cases reviewed, mostly involved TO employees applying to the RCO positions that were created as a result from a change in the work required by the portfolio.</p> <p>There was further concern expressed by RCEA representatives that employees within the AS and CS groups were also moving into RCO positions.</p>	
91.8	<p>Electric Car Charging Stations</p> <p>A management representative confirmed that there is currently an electric car charging station at the Automotive and Surface Transportation (AST) Uplands location and that the suggestion that</p>	

ITEM	93 rd JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>92.6 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>letter while actively attempting to secure appropriate funding in the meantime.</p> <p>An RCEA representative raised the question of whether authority to make these decisions would be delegated lower in response to suggestions made during the Dialogue discussions. Management advised that the authority would likely need to remain at the GM and Director levels due to the structure of SuccessFactors.</p>	
	<p>New Business</p>	
<p>93.4</p>	<p>Organizational Changes resulting from Dialogue</p> <p>Management representatives provided the committee with an overview and opportunity for greater discussion regarding the organizational changes referenced in the President's recent Dialogue update communication. The following organizational changes are part of the 59 actions resulting from the Dialogue and will take effect October 1, 2017.</p> <p>At the division level, the current large engineering division will be divided into two, Transportation and Manufacturing under Vice President François Cordeau and Engineering under Vice President Ian Potter, who is on language training until the end of the fiscal year with Michel Dumoulin acting. Emerging Technologies is now reporting to the Vice President Geneviève Tanguay. David Lisk will remain as acting Vice President of the Industrial Research Assistance Program (IRAP).</p> <p>The title of General Manager (GM) will be changed to Director General (DG) as GM did not accurately represent the role to internal and external stakeholders. An RCEA representative questioned whether there was a DG for Design and Fabrication Services (DFS). Management advised that generally speaking, DG titles were classified at the MGT 4 level for the larger scale research centres, MGT 3 for the corporate groups, and MGT 2 for the smaller groups. However as the current senior manager leaves the position, some of the titles will change to Executive Director titles which would be the plan for DFS in the future.</p> <p>There are a number of current DG vacancies along with corresponding acting assignments so plans are underway to staff these vacancies through appropriate processes and provide stability to the organization.</p> <p>The VP, GM and DG positions are identified as CBC imperative for official language requirements. Given the limited pool of qualified candidates available for these types of positions, if someone with all of the qualifications and skills but lacking the language requirements is identified, language training would be provided. An RCEA representative commented that the usage of language training on an imperative staffing action may require an explanation being provided to employees.</p>	

ITEM	93 rd JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>93.4 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>Management representatives reported that Portfolios will be renamed to Research Centres instead of the old Institutes as there were valid reasons why that model warranted changing six years ago. Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) will be divided into digital technologies and component technologies with insights to be solicited from the employees. Nanotechnology (NANO) in Edmonton will be elevated to a Research Centre.</p> <p>An RCEA representative questioned if the work to privatize NINT would not be moving forward. Management advised that while the possibility of privatization into a not-for-profit group remains, it is not intended, that the NRC portion would be privatized at this time. It was further clarified that while Nanotechnology (NANO) will still actively collaborate with universities; there will be no more cross appointments.</p> <p>A PIPSC representative commented that the term Research Centres has the connotation of geographic centres but the employees of the NRC Research Centres are geographically dispersed. Management representatives acknowledged employees are spread out among many sites but the concept is that the diversity of these sites comes together to form one Research Centre.</p> <p>The merger of Occupational Health and Safety (OSH) and the Environmental Services Office (ESO) under a new DG via a competitive process was noted by a management representative. The new DG may make some further changes to foster an appropriate working relationship within this new branch. Both groups used to be part of Administrative Services and Property Management (ASPM).</p> <p>A representative of RCEA inquired whether there would be any reduction in the number of staff as a result of all the Dialogue organizational changes. A management representative responded that there were no reductions planned at this time as the President wants stability within NRC. Although the government may have its own plans and there may also be some additional areas that require further examination to determine their long-term viability.</p>	
<p>93.5</p>	<p>RO/RCO Promotion Cases including D1</p> <p>It was noted that the information requested by the PIPSC had been provided by management even though it was a manual exercise to acquire the data.</p> <p>PIPSC representatives expressed concern that it appeared to be getting harder to obtain a promotion in general although more pronounced at the degree 3 and 4 levels. They were unsure whether this was intentional on the part of NRC due to budget constraints or whether employees were reaching a point in their careers where they were not yet achieving the required levels for a promotion. This was also a concern for the Call for Action discussion forum who were also looking for additional data to analyze for trends. In support of this a PIPSC representative</p>	

<p>93.5 (cont.)</p>	<p>requested if they could share the data that they had received from management. Management agreed provided that the data was only circulated amongst the Call for Action group and the RO/RCO executive.</p> <p>The data provided indicated that 30% of the degree 3 and 4 cases were denied in 2016 and about 45% in 2017. PIPSC representatives expressed the hope that approval rates will increase with the implementation of the new promotion criteria.</p> <p>Management representatives responded that promotions decisions are not tied to budgets nor any quotas. Approvals of promotions into the PRO level are on average around 50%. Given the limited number of promotion cases even one additional person can reduce approvals from 50% to 40% making it difficult to draw conclusions from the statistics. There was also a large increase in the number of cases submitted to the Human Resources Promotions Committee (HRPC) from 2016 to 2017. There have also been a couple of formal complaints and grievances challenging the decisions arising from the last promotion round.</p> <p>PIPSC representatives questioned whether eligible RO/RCO employees were not being encouraged to prepare their degree 3 and 4 promotion cases especially in view of the fact that they are not penalized for their submission being unsuccessful. Accordingly, they requested data, if possible, on the amount of promotions in comparison with the total number of eligible number submitted and at what level they were declined.</p> <p>Management representatives were unsure whether data on the number of employees eligible for promotion was available but committed to investigating whether the promotion review date is automatically advanced six months in SIGMA if no promotion action is entered.</p> <p>At the HRPC level the feedback received is that cases were well thought out and articulated with the active involvement of the employee and their supervisor and at that level would present a balanced perspective on whether the case met the appropriate level required. However, there may not be the same level of consistency in the initial review conducted at the local level. The launch of the new promotion criteria will provide an opportunity to educate RO/RCO employees and managers on the promotion process in general for greater awareness and consistency especially as it can be very demoralizing for an RO or RCO to not be promoted even to the point where they may be unwilling to submit another promotion case for many years even with management's encouragement.</p> <p>A worry was voiced by PIPSC representatives that new RO/RCOs were being hired above the double bar (//) due to market pressures. This may result in newer and potentially less experienced employees being placed at higher levels than those RO/RCOs who have been with NRC for some time. It was suggested that some existing employees may feel frustrated due to</p>	<p>M. Marchand</p>
--------------------------------	--	--------------------

ITEM	93 rd JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>93.5 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>the impression that their promotion is being blocked by management.</p> <p>The importance of a career path for the TOs was raised by an RCEA representative and they were pleased to see this mentioned in the Dialogue.</p>	
<p>93.6</p>	<p>Public Service Employee Annual Survey (PSEAS) Mental Health Question 11</p> <p>An RCEA representative expressed concern that in response to the survey question on whether NRC does a good job of raising awareness of mental health in the workplace, NRC's negative answer's score was higher than that of the overall public service. The RCEA President is involved with the Wellness Strategy committee work taking place in the core public service and offered to help NRC in this area. She also noted that there are core public service questionnaires on mental health but NRC had not participated.</p> <p>Management noted that the merger of OSH and Environmental Services Office was supported with an increase in funding with the possibility that some of the funding could support the health and safety work taking place at the portfolio level and to increase awareness of mental health in the workplace, although the latter is a challenging area to address appropriately. Any suggestions to improve in this area were welcomed as the organization will be looking at best practices in both physical safety and mental health, including the wellness strategy in the core public service. Four or five training sessions on mental health first aid that had been offered to managers and supervisors were well received, although the individual who is currently facilitating these courses is leaving NRC in October. There is a need for a full-time resource dedicated to this area and management is working with Classification to develop an appropriate job description. Any suggestions regarding a job description are welcome from the bargaining agents. It is recognized that some organizations appear to be very effective in positively discussing mental health in the workplace. NRC needs to do more than just openly discuss mental health by equipping managers and supervisors to address the issue as provided in the mental health first aid training.</p> <p>The Director of OSH had previously presented the committee with three different streams to address mental health and a review of best practices could be incorporated into the Dialogue activities. It is believed that NRC had participated in the core public service questionnaires on mental health and that OSH was looking at how to incorporate this into the Hazardous Occurrence Incident Report (HOIR).</p> <p>RCEA Representatives expressed interest in attending the mental health first aid training. Management representatives responded that they would look into the matter.</p>	<p>M.Marchand</p>

ITEM	93 rd JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
93.7	<p>Transition Pay and Final Pay</p> <p>RCEA representatives requested clarification regarding the impact of the transition pay upon the final pay of an employee leaving NRC. A specific case was identified and it was suggested that there appears to be increased confusion around the transition payment especially where some employees are being told to keep ten vacation days to address Phoenix issues upon departure. This has left some employees with the impression they will not get paid fully for the hours they worked upon their final pay. Given these issues, it was requested that a new employee communication be issued to provide clarity.</p> <p>Management representatives referred to a 2013 communication from the VP, Human Resources Branch regarding payment in arrears for salary payments to be implemented in 2014. It was noted that the Public Service was changing to a more effective and timely pay in arrears system in part to minimize overpayments and recoveries. During the implementation of this change on May 21, 2014, existing employees would normally have received no pay on that pay date as the pay period covered April 24 to May 7, 2014 the same period for which they had already been paid on May 7, 2014. However, a special transition pay was put in place to provide salary continuity coverage for the May 21, 2014 pay, thereby effectively paying employees twice for the April 24 to May 7, 2014 period. It was understood that this special transition payment would then be recovered from the employee's final pay after departure. Employees would still receive full payment for all hours worked.</p> <p>Employees who were taken on strength following the implementation of transition pay would not have this issue as their first pay would only be received approximately within four weeks of their start date and pay would then continue every two weeks.</p> <p>Management representatives recognized that the terminology can be difficult for employees to understand even with the Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) questions and answers, and can be even more complicated for term employees. The bargaining agents were encouraged to bring specific cases forward to Joe Grebenc, Manager of Labour Relations and Pay and Benefits who would, in consultation with the responsible Compensation Advisor provide greater clarity on what was happening in any specific case.</p>	J.Grebenc
93.8	<p>Policy on Garbage and Recycling</p> <p>A PIPSC representative inquired whether there was a policy on garbage and recycling within NRC. They questioned the cost, the effectiveness, and the efficiency of having individual researchers, who earn significant salaries bringing their own garbage and recycling to a central location. They further noted that some TOs were now being asked to manage the local central recycling bins, occupying even more of their time. The decrease in availability of</p>	

ITEM	93 rd JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>93.8 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>janitorial staff and NRC stores has caused representatives of both bargaining units to question whether these changes are linked to budgetary constraints.</p> <p>It was confirmed by management representatives that there is no policy on the matter but that the change occurred three or four years ago in conjunction with the larger public service initiative to increase awareness of recycling. There is also a social responsibility for all employees to do their part. While unsure of the impact on budgets, the scope of the ASPM general contract was most likely reduced. Management representatives agreed to inquire of ASPM regarding any additional information that may be available on this matter and report back on the findings directly to the bargaining agents.</p>	<p>M.Marchand</p>
<p>93.9</p>	<p>IRAP Ontario Region Offices</p> <p>Administrative staffs within the IRAP Ontario regional offices have been contacting representatives of the RCEA to inquire if some of the offices will be closing or moving. While RCEA has received a response addressing these local business moves, administrative staff remain concerned that will be consolidated into the new downtown Toronto location on Bay Street whereas other colleagues in higher level positions will move to the Oakville office which is closer to their homes. This would create significant extra costs and travel time, whether by car or public transportation, for those administrative staff currently working in the Oakville location and living in Burlington. It was also suggested that this change, if implemented, would represent an additional 40 to 60 kilometers commute for employees and the 40 kilometer differential for relocation provisions should be applied. An RCEA representative expressed concern that the needs of the administrative staff in these offices appear to be ignored and requested meaningful consultation if the rumors of these changes are founded.</p> <p>Management representatives committed to inquiring of the HRG for IRAP regarding the concerns expressed by the RCEA representative and responding off-line.</p>	<p>M.Marchand</p>
<p>93.10</p>	<p>Pay stubs</p> <p>Management representatives informed the committee of the cessation of the printed pay stubs being mailed to employees' homes effective September 20, 2017. The bargaining agents had already been made aware of this change and a series of announcements had been encouraging employees to access their pay stubs through Compensation Web Application (CWA) with very detailed instructions provided.</p> <p>Initial issues raised by employees included such things as error messages regarding myKEYs, screens not displaying information, accessing via the green network, and how to print privately on a network printer. There were about 30 employees who came forward following the first communication and only 10 with the</p>	

ITEM	93 rd JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>93.10 (cont.)</p>	<p>second communication. Management is feeling relatively comfortable that any future issues encounter by some employees can be sorted out effectively and efficiently and encouraged bargaining agents to bring any issues forward.</p> <p>Representatives of both bargaining agents expressed frustration with using the green network, including the system being very slow, as well as the importance of having clear instructions with a link to CWA. It was acknowledged that a good number of employees will not check their pay stubs.</p> <p>RCEA representatives reminded the committee of the importance of checking pay stubs regularly because if the government makes a mistake on the pay, the employee is still obligated to repay the overpayment. They also requested a copy of the instructions for accessing CWA to post to their website which management representatives agreed to provide.</p> <p>It was confirmed by a management representative that the annual pension statements will not be issued across the government due to the issues with Phoenix.</p>	<p>M.Marchand C.Fraser</p>
	<p>Roundtable</p>	
	<p>Long-standing Term Employee Not Extended or Converted to Continuing</p> <p>A case was presented by a representative of PIPSC, wherein an RO/RCO term employee was not extended nor was the employee converted to continuing after 8.5 years of service even though they had just received a D1 promotion. Concern was expressed that term employees in this position have no rights to be marketed like a continuing employee would be even after only one year of service. They would also be considered an external applicant to any future employment opportunities within NRC after their employment ended. They further inquired as to whether there would be any transition support services and if their resume could be circulated amongst the scientific Vice Presidents to assist with looking for other employment opportunities.</p> <p>Management confirmed that there are a few long-standing terms beyond three and five years of service at NRC who, in some cases, may have occupied positions within different parts of NRC with the result that management may not be fully cognisant of their full length of service. It was agreed that more attention is required in such cases and to consider support that could be provided on a case-by-case basis.</p>	
	<p>Next JCC (#94 – December 13, 2017)</p> <p>The next meeting is scheduled for December 13, 2017 from 9 am to 3 pm depending on the agenda items requiring discussion.</p>	
	<p>Meeting adjourned at: 12:35 pm</p>	