

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL CANADA (NRC)

MINUTES OF THE 94th MEETING

OF THE

NRC – JOINT CONSULTATION COMMITTEE (JCC)

DATE: December 13, 2017
TIME: 9:00 AM
LOCATION: Room S-303, Building M-58

IN ATTENDANCE

Chairperson:

Patricia Loder, President, Consultation Team, PIPSC

Representing NRC:

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
Stephan Grosse, RO/RCO Group Executive

Representing Research Council Employees' Association (RCEA):

Cathie Fraser, President
Marvin Zaluski, 1st Vice-President

Guests:

Monique Boissonneault, Team Leader, Pay and Benefits, HRB
Emily Harrison, Director, Planning, Performance and Development, HRB
Jo Ann Conway, Senior Advisor, Planning, Development & Performance, HRB
Denise Le Voguer, Senior Advisor, Planning, Development & Performance, HRB

ITEM	94th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
94.1	Approval of Agenda The agenda was approved by the members with the addition of Recording Meetings and Job Alerts from Success Factors to New Business as requested by an RCEA representative.	

ITEM	94 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
94.2	<p>Minutes of the 93rd 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"> • 90.9 – New Government of Canada (GOC) Communication Policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Adding this item to the JCC meeting in March 2018 instead of December 2017 • 91.7 – Technical Officer (TO) to Research Council Officer (RCO) or reverse <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Edit the last sentence of the first paragraph to read “most of the individuals involved held higher education levels than normally required for the TO positions they held” • Roundtable – Next JCC (#94 – December 13, 2017) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Correct the reference to the date of the meeting. 	<p>M.Marchand</p> <p>M.Marchand</p> <p>M.Marchand</p>
94.3	Follow-up Action Items of the 93rd Meeting	
87.5	<p>Probation</p> <p>Management confirmed that it would be possible to obtain some statistics on probation for terms with greater than three and five years of service who were converted to continuing positions. However these statistics were difficult to obtain and verify as the data came from multiple sources. It was acknowledged that this probation data is worth further pursuing and analyzing for any trends, such as if there are any gender impacts.</p> <p>PIPSC representatives sought clarification regarding the circumstances under which probation could be extended and for how long. They expressed concerned regarding extensions due to conduct and the impact to their members on Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) and who were close to the end of their probation period.</p> <p>Management representatives responded that there are a number of reasons that would warrant an extension such as misconduct, performance, or general suitability for continued employment. Probation can be extended up to one-half of the original probation period but the actual length is determined on a case-by-case basis and this extension is coded in SIGMA as for “other reasons”. The probation period is also automatically extended for any periods of leave or training greater than 3 months.</p>	<p>I.Gingras (M.Marchand)</p>
88.9	<p>Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)</p> <p>PIPSC representatives noted that PIPs were being used to manage both newer probationary employees as well as seasoned employees, with previous meets or exceeds overall performance assessment on their Commitment to Excellence (CTE). They also commented on the negative impact to their members who were</p>	

ITEM	94 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>88.9 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>then facing lengthy delays, almost 6 months in one case, in capturing the performance gap within the PIP. Many of the PIPs that their members have brought to them have been focused on the full duties and not limited to the performance gap. Additionally the goals have not been realistic given the tight timeframes and limited resources, although in other cases the PIPs were well written with very appropriate training. Other times the review dates have not been respected and the feedback has been mostly verbal instead of documented in writing. Additionally their members have reported that PIPs have had to be extended to accommodate new supervisors or that management has been verbally communicating that their performance is acceptable when they are later informed of the contrary. PIPSC representatives questioned whether there is an issue of personality conflict leading to the PIP instead of performance and if management is taking responsibility for their part as their members feel they are bearing the full burden of closing their performance gap. This is creating stress and mental health issues as they face the prospects of their employment ending without evidence of improvement in performance. Representatives commented that although the Human Resources Generalists (HRGs) have been assisting supervisors with PIPs there were still issues with their appropriate implementation. In response, PIPSC has been advising their members to maintain the PIP review dates and seek written feedback as to what was accomplished and what remains outstanding.</p> <p>RCEA representatives commented that their members were facing similar issues as the PIPSC members.</p> <p>Management representatives acknowledged that the conversations providing negative performance feedback can be difficult for some supervisors as they require appropriate timing and skill to effectively communicate the changes required to these employees.</p> <p>Representatives of both bargaining agents voiced concern over the current way employee comments refuting their supervisor's negative performance ratings are managed within the CTE review process as they felt it should trigger an additional step in the review process. Furthermore they suggested that within the grievance process it would be difficult for the Vice President who approved the original cessation of employment due to continued marginal performance or rejection on probation for reasons of less than full satisfactory performance to then later determine that their decision was not the appropriate one. Given the issues presented, the bargaining agents requested that they and management review the way poor performance is being managed from the CTE through to the PIP via the lens of some sample cases. The objective would be to gain clarity regarding what did and did not work as well as improvements that could be made.</p> <p>Management representatives commented that there may be pockets where the implementation of the PIP process could be improved which highlights the importance of ensuring the PIP is managed appropriately. To assist with this, a review of some</p>	

ITEM	94 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
92.6	<p>End of Term Notifications</p> <p>Management representatives confirmed that the concerns expressed by the bargaining agents regarding the absence of the end of term letters as well as management's reasons for their reinstatement effective November 1, 2018 were relayed to the HRGs. Management confirmed that the end of term letters would be issued for only term employees and not short-term employees as their goal was to provide additional confirmation of the end of employment date for term employees who would normally have been working a longer period for the Council. Communication will also be issued to the Director Generals informing them of these changes and that these letters need to follow the required notice periods.</p>	I.Gingras
93.5	<p>RO/RCO Promotion Cases including D1</p> <p>In response to an inquiry, management representatives confirmed that the six month review date for any denied RO/RCO promotion cases is a manual entry into SIGMA.</p> <p>Representatives of PIPSC expressed concern that this manual entry creates the potential for a six month review to be missed and therefore recommended that SIGMA should automatically advance the review date by 6 months for any promotion that has not gone through. They also questioned the continued need for the D1 promotion case. In their view if the CTE is assessed at a meets level then the D1 should be automatic especially as it is costly to the organization in time spent to prepare, review and revise the required supporting documentation. They also advised of reports from members detailing situations where the D1 was completed without employee involvement or knowledge, and that in some cases, delays were incurred due to the supervisor being too busy to provide feedback or awaiting additional information from the employee. This is further compounded by the lack of retroactivity when the promotion is finally reviewed and either approved or denied with a lack of written feedback.</p> <p>Management indicated that they had not heard of a D1 being denied although during the rollout of the new RO promotion criteria although a number of employees raised issues regarding the D1. Whereas the importance of the D3 and D4 process were recognized by all.</p> <p>PIPSC representatives suggested that given that there are very few CTE being assessed at the Does Not Meet and Met Some expectations levels, it should follow that most D1s should be approved which could question the need for the current D1 process. Its removal could also represent a cost savings.</p> <p>Management observed that since most D1s are approved, it raises the question as to why the D1 remains such a problem for the RO/RCOs. If changes are made to the D1 it is important that they not lead to the advancement of RO/RCOs whose statement of</p>	

ITEM	94 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
93.5 (cont.)	professional development does not support this movement. PIPSC representatives were asked to notify management of any D1 cases for which they had concern.	P.Loder
	New Business	
84.5	<p>Phoenix Update and Issues</p> <p>Representatives of both bargaining agents noted that through their work with other core public service departments and the Treasury Board (TB) sub-committee regarding Phoenix they have a great appreciation for the amazing work of NRC's Pay and Benefits office. To help address the problems with Phoenix on-line training has been developed for managers and employees with the federal government, although most would not be relevant to NRC who retained its Pay and Benefits staff. Unlike the core departments who are waiting months and months for resolution of problems related to leave without pay transitions, acting pay, maternity and parental top-ups, or moving from one pay grade to another, in NRC it is viewed a major issue if an employee's pay cheque is not issued. NRC has also not had the same Phoenix issues regarding maternity leave and so will not be included in the PIPSC policy grievance. They also expressed appreciation for the former bi-weekly updates from Labour Relations regarding any issues with the upcoming pay and enquired as to the possibility of its reinstatement.</p> <p>Management representatives responded that as there were no real issues for our bi-weekly pay periods, RCEA and PIPSC representatives were advised that updates would be provided on an exception basis should problems or issues occur. Every two weeks pay follows up with TBS/Phoenix regarding the relatively few non-regular pay issues such as insurance or other benefits as well as and delays in processing of acting pay under Phoenix which now takes longer as the required actions are spread out over two pay periods whereas under the old pay system all actions were done within the same pay period.</p> <p>An RCEA representative commented that if the implementation of the Phoenix pay system caused members to have incurred any out-of-pocket expenses (NSF or insufficient fees, financial penalty charges, interest charges, etc.), to have been required to obtain tax advice, or received a reduction in government benefits due to an overpayment, they can find out information regarding claims on the TBS website.</p> <p>A management representative indicated that Phoenix bi-weekly updates are being provided to the President's office. These reports detail that NRC's Phoenix average number of total issues that exceeded 30 days amount to approximately 3.8% of our population as opposed to over 20% of the population of other separate</p>	

<p>84.5 (cont.)</p>	<p>employers. It was suggested that even without Phoenix, NRC would most likely be encountering a similar low level of issues.</p> <p>Concern was expressed by a PIPSC representative that the emergency pays would not be reflected on the T4 nor would there be any employment insurance (EI) and Canada pension plan (CPP) deductions. Also when an employees is leaving NRC, it takes weeks and weeks to receive their Record of Employment (ROE) and last pay and there has been an incident when they received zero dollars instead of the amount indicated by pay.</p> <p>Ms. Boissonneault responded that the T4s are issued by Public Service and Procurement Canada (PSPC); however, a delay can occur if all the signatories to the Termination Clearance Certificate do not quickly sign off (electronically) via SuccessFactors or the employee's time has not been entered and approved. It is important for all of these steps to be completed before pay can finalize the termination and any final payments.</p> <p>With respect to a missed pay, that leads to an emergency cheque being issued from Finance, this is eventually entered into Phoenix and paid so that required EI and CPP deductions are made along with a recovery of the amount of the cheque previously issued for the emergency pay. Regarding the variance between the anticipated last pay statement issued from Pay and Benefits and the actual pay received, it was requested that the bargaining agent representative send the details of any cases for further investigation to Ms. Boissonneault.</p> <p>An inquiry regarding retroactive payments resulting from the implementation of the new collective agreements was made by an RCEA representative. They also requested that NRC update them on the status of these payments so they would be able to provide appropriate and timely information to their members.</p> <p>Management representatives responded that if the remaining newly negotiated collective agreements and updated compensation plans arrive at the same time for implementation it will result in a very heavy workload and it is likely that there will be issues to process the revisions in a timely manner. Although Pay and Benefits will try to phase them in in and attempt to meet the implementation timeframe. In particular, calculating the retroactive impact on acting and overtime will be the most time consuming aspect of the work as it can take a full day to review such transactions over the course of the period covered by the collective agreement and recalculate adjustments for a single case that contains significant acting or overtime. The revision process also requires Compensation to update TBS on any changes and this too can take some time. If needed, they will also consider hiring an additional temporary resource and Ms. Boissonneault indicated she knew of a couple of experienced pay officers who would be available. <i>(Secretarial note: Two experienced pay advisors were subsequently hired on a temporary basis.)</i></p>	
---------------------------------------	--	--

ITEM	94 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
84.5 (cont.)	<p>PIPSC representatives expressed concern that one of their members was been charged interest for missed automatic contributions back to 2015 over which he had no control. There were also members who continued to have pension deductions even after their ended their employment with NRC.</p> <p>Ms. Boissonneault responded that while NRC's pay office is no longer involved with the pension, she requested that the details be sent to her so she can connect with the pension office regarding these cases. These examples highlight the importance of the role employees have in regularly reviewing their pay stubs for variations and should they occur to let their pay officer know right away. In particular, pensions, allowances and union dues are now automated and pay is not verifying these amounts so it is incumbent upon the employee to do the appropriate follow-up.</p>	
94.4	<p>Maternity and Parental Changes to Employment Insurance (EI)</p> <p>Representatives of both bargaining agents enquired about the TB and NRC announcements regarding these changes and noted their relevance in light that often childcare is not accessible until a child reaches 18 months of age. They sought confirmation that employees would retain their substantive position rights when selecting to take the full 18 months via 12 months combined maternity and parental leave and the additional six months under leave without pay (LWOP) for care of family. As well as a further clarification regarding whether this additional six months would form part of the five year cap under LWOP - Care of Family. They also expressed the importance to their members to have all relevant information documented prior to their departure on leave.</p> <p>Management representatives confirmed that they are adhering to the direction issued by TB and that an employee's substantive position will be maintained for the 18 month period. The residual six months will form part of the five year maximum under LWOP - Care of Family although they will also have to pay both the employer and employee portions for pension and benefits contributions during this period. This still represents an excellent opportunity for parents. Employees are advised to contact their pay officer should they have questions and anyone taking advantage of this leave will be provided with a letter from pay in advance outlining all the details.</p>	
87.15	<p>Membership Change Notifications to Bargaining Agents</p> <p>RCEA representatives reported that the monthly additions/deletions reports they were receiving from NRC were missing some updates. These discrepancies were discovered during the recent TO ratification exercise. A review of the full membership report revealed numerous discrepancies especially in the areas of changes in levels and changes in groups but also missing some departure data. This impacts the accuracy of membership dues as well as the ratification process.</p>	

ITEM	94 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>87.15 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>Management representatives responded that there is a paper card based system within the core public service for membership updates instead of the electronic reports NRC provides. These reports should capture any changes to memberships over the last two months. In the case of standard reports generated from SIGMA, the discrepancies could be related to retroactivity depending on when the data was entered into the system. In cases of changes in bargaining units, during that retroactive period, the employee would have been represented by their original bargaining agent. For employees who have left NRC, in the past there were often delays in change notifications due to incomplete time entries. It was noted that the Termination Clearance Certificate distribution and approval is now being managed through Success Factors and should remove these delays if all the signatories quickly approve their portion.</p>	
<p>88.6</p>	<p>Onboarding</p> <p>An RCEA representative enquired regarding the type of information provided about the bargaining agents within NRC's onboarding system.</p> <p>Management representatives advised that once notified of new members through the new hire notifications or the additions/deletions report, new employees are contacted to welcome them and direct them to the respective bargaining agent website to register their membership. It was noted that the new hire notifications have not been consistently received and the information regarding employee name, building location, address, group and level is not always provided.</p> <p>Emily Harrison, Director of Planning, Performance and Development, Human Resources Branch (HRB) committed to looking into whether there was any information regarding the bargaining agents contained within the onboarding system. An additional investigation would be made into whether Success Factors can automatically generate the new hire notifications with the information that the bargaining agents are requesting and why these notifications are not currently being issued consistently.</p>	<p>E.Harrison (M.Marchand)</p>
<p>94.5</p>	<p>Commitment to Excellence (CTE) Process</p> <p>Representatives of both RCEA and PIPSC expressed concerns regarding the ability for an employee to comment on their CTE in general and specifically after it is seen by the Reviewing Officer. They are recommending to their members that should there be a discrepancy between the supervisor's assessment and their self-assessment that they utilize the comments to constructively justify the level of their self-assessment and to not sign the document. A further inquiry was made as to whether there was a limit to the amount of characters that could be used within the comments section.</p>	

<p>94.5 (cont.)</p>	<p>Emily Harrison, Director of Planning, Performance and Development and Jo Ann Conway the Senior Advisor of Planning, Development and Performance with HRB responded that the CTE within SuccessFactors, enables the employee to add comments in response to the supervisor's assessment as well as after it has been returned from the Reviewing Officer in advance of the employee's electronic signature check box as the final step. The character limit for the comments is believed to be 4000. This ability to comment is also very clear both within the on-line CTE form as well as the companion reference guide, which contains the exact screen shot for further clarity. It is also possible for the employee to add comments then save and close the CTE without checking the signature box.</p> <p>The representatives of the bargaining agents enquired whether an employee adding final comments, which normally indicates that there is continued disagreement, would automatically trigger these comments to go to the supervisor and Reviewing Officer. In their view an additional conversation is warranted between the employee and supervisor to address the employee's final comments. This is especially important as a PIP often is implemented without further discussion. The PIP should only address the gap in performance and not everything contained in the CTE.</p> <p>Ms. Harrison and Ms. Conway replied that the presence of final employee comments does not trigger an additional step in the process, such as their distribution to the supervisor or the Reviewing Officer. Both could view these final employee comments if they were to proactively look to see if any of their employees had left them. However, the CTE form was never intended to be a tool to replace conversations between the supervisor and their employee. For the small number of cases where the employee continues to truly disagree with their performance rating, they have the option to raise it either with their supervisor or directly with the Reviewing Officer, or to contact their union representative. The HRG, with the assistance of Labour Relations, could also facilitate these additional conversations. As well many groups within NRC review their CTEs through an internal calibration exercise before issuing the individual overall performance assessment rating. A management representative indicated that the supervisor with input from the Reviewing Officer determines the employee's overall performance rating given that there are checks within the CTE assessment system to provide an objective review. The PIP is also a tool available to management to utilize to assist the employee in closing their performance gap. Although a PIP can be triggered by a Met Some performance rating, it can also be implemented mid-way through the year to deal with a performance gap even if the employee's performance on their last CTE met expectations. A review of the CTE commitments and former performance assessments aids in the development of a PIP.</p>	
--------------------------------	--	--

ITEM	94 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>94.5 (cont.)</p>	<p>Representatives from both bargaining agents commented that they have made recommendations to their members to review their CTEs monthly to determine the status of their commitments and whether the assigned percentages remain appropriate in light of the dynamic nature of the job and changing priorities. If not, they should have a discussion with their supervisor regarding the current workload and priorities verses what was planned and update the CTE accordingly. Members are becoming stressed when they have not been able to achieve the planned commitments in these areas. They also questioned the management's expectation for the supervisor in ensuring the CTE accurately reflects the current reality so that they share in this responsibility.</p> <p>Ms. Harrison reported that supervisors have to balance the needs of project reporting and CTE reporting in an endeavour to ensure both remain as accurate as possible. However, within the CTE process supervisors are encouraged to work with their employees to review and update the CTE's as new projects are being implemented throughout the year. There should also be a regular exchange of performance feedback between the supervisor and the employee even though they may not be documented as a formal CTE conversation. It was acknowledged that these can be difficult conversations for the supervisor to have and require appropriate timing and skill, especially if the employee is not in agreement with their assessment of performance to-date. Employees need to be informed early of any performance deficiencies and well before the end of the CTE review cycle. In the New Year communications will be issued regarding the CTE process and it is possible to incorporate the importance of fluid conversations regarding the CTE commitments and performance to date.</p> <p>In recognition of the matrix structure in many parts of NRC, an enquiry was made by the representatives from the RCEA and PIPSC regarding whether feedback could be solicited from other project leaders with whom the employee has worked in addition to the supervisor and whether this feedback could also be directly requested by the employee.</p> <p>The response provided by Ms. Harrison and Ms. Conway indicated that within SuccessFactors, the supervisor is encouraged to solicit feedback on an employee's performance from relevant parties but that that information would only be returned to them and not the employee.</p>	
<p>94.6</p>	<p>Job Alerts</p> <p>Questions were raised by representatives of the bargaining agents as to whether the job alerts were taking place and if so, whether they would include notice of internal appointments?</p> <p>Ms. Harrison confirmed that the job alerts, which had stopped with the cyber intrusion, were now active through SuccessFactors.</p>	

ITEM	94 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
94.6 (cont.)	While she believed the job alerts also included notice of appointments without competition, she committed to verifying this information and reporting back to the bargaining agents shortly after this meeting.	E.Harrison
94.7	<p>NRC Dialogue Implementation verses Management's Expectations</p> <p>PIPSC representatives raised concerns that some communications from Research Directors were not reflective of the time the implementation of the NRC Dialogue will take. For example most ROs from one area were expected to now publish a research paper. While they would like to do so, in recognition that many have confidentiality and patent agreements with clients, this expectation is not possible. It was suggested that researchers require time to first conduct the significant research, such as the 20% time for exploratory research mentioned in the Dialogue, in advance of writing and publishing a research paper that appropriately reflects the high calibre of research at NRC. It was indicated that this issue will also be raised through the Call for Action working group.</p> <p>Management representatives acknowledged that time is required for many ROs to redirect aspects of their research for the purpose of publication while balancing the continued need for revenue based research. A commitment was made to raise this concern in the Dialogue discussions. The Human Resources Promotions Committee also recognizes that adequate research time is required for the development of publications. Although some Research Centres have already been heavily focused on exploratory research and this aspect of the Dialogue does not represent a major shift.</p>	I.Gingras
94.8	<p>20% Time on Exploratory Research</p> <p>An RCEA representative commented that the Dialogue is heavily focused on the ROs but career development is also important to technical staff (such as TOs and CSs) especially as new projects are developed requiring additional training and learning to assist in the research. However, there is no accounting of this requirement in the project time codes. Even the AS and AD staff may require additional training to best support new research projects.</p> <p>Management representatives responded that while the science Ministers and the Government endorse the idea of the 20% time devoted to fundamental research, it is a concept requiring further development through to implementation. There are areas within NRC where this concept is already in practice given the nature of the research, whereas many others are facing challenges on how to appropriately incorporate this when there appears to be no bandwidth within the current reality. They acknowledged that ROs do not conduct research on their own but that a team effort of ROs, RCOs, TOs and CSs and others is required and so the 20% fundamental research will be evaluated through the lens of the</p>	

ITEM	94 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>94.8 (cont.)</p>	<p>whole research team. Some other considerations include whether additional skills are required to manage competing work priorities, whether the budget affords the resources to hire additional staff and if that is the best usage of those limited resources, or whether the current way of working best supports what NRC is trying to achieve.</p> <p>The parties agreed to discuss the development of the 20% fundamental research at the JCC meetings during the course of this year.</p>	<p>Management PIPSC / RCEA</p>
<p>94.9</p>	<p>HRB Response Times</p> <p>A representative of RCEA questioned whether there were established response times within HRB as there have been a number of times when there were lengthy wait times before a response to their enquiry was issued. They recognize that time is often required to research the answer but they would appreciate at least an acknowledgement that their enquiry was received and a response would be forthcoming.</p> <p>Management representatives advised that there are no standard response times for union enquiries although there should be a quick acknowledgement given that someone is looking into the matter at hand. While some issues or questions require time to resolve or investigate there should not be long period of silence without providing regular updates to the bargaining agents. If this issue persists, HRB management could consider the development of service standards if shown to be necessary taking into consideration to time required to manage them.</p>	
<p>94.10</p>	<p>Recording Meetings</p> <p>A representative of the RCEA sought clarification regarding the legitimacy of recording meetings, especially when their members are feeling vulnerable. They further noted that they discovered National Committee on Occupational Safety and Health (NCOSH) meetings are being recorded although not all parties were aware of this.</p> <p>A PIPSC representative reported that they have advised their members to take notes in the meeting or bring someone with them to capture the discussions.</p> <p>Management representatives responded that it is believed that NCOSH is the only meeting being recorded to ensure that matters of health and safety were being captured accurately. They were under the impression that this was known to everyone present. It has come to light that there have been several hidden recordings of meetings by employees when they were concerned about their employment or performance. While secret recordings are not permissible, there could be some limited special circumstances where an advance request to record a meeting could be</p>	

ITEM	94 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
94.10 (cont.)	considered. Should there be valid reasons and all parties consent to the recording in advance then it could be acceptable.	
	Roundtable	
	<p>Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) related roles and responsibilities</p> <p>A representative of RCEA reported that the bargaining agents at the June 20th 2017, NCOSH, put forth a draft proposal with recommendations for the Senior Executive Committee (SEC) regarding the recognition of OSH related roles and responsibilities that are being asked of employees, as follows:</p> <p><i>RCEA and PIPSC members on local or national Occupational Health and Safety Committees or in various facility safety roles play an important part in facilitating NRC to fulfil its safety commitment. The NRC recognizes this valued role by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Providing reasonable time, with pay, during normal working hours to undertake the role;</i> • <i>Providing formal recognition proportional to time and effort spent on this role in their annual performance review and assessment (CTE) and ensuring that the performance assessment of employees carrying out this role will not be negatively impacted;</i> • <i>Providing time codes; the time spent for OSH related activities be counted toward utilization rate and contribution be considered in promotion cases. Awards be given annually for outstanding achievements by NRC and Portfolios;</i> • <i>Providing essential support, training and resources;</i> <p>Mmanagement noted that this statement is generally in-line with the OSH Dialogue Tiger Team.</p>	
	<p>93.8 - Garbage and Recycling</p> <p>A PIPSC representative questioned whether it was NRC management's idea to have staff bring their garbage to central collection points or whether this action was taken following the practice in other government departments. It was acknowledged that the response received identified cost savings to NRC for the change. The matter of cost savings was questioned as it the time and cost involved in having employees responsible for bringing garbage to collection points could be more costly than hiring additional housekeeping services. In addition they voiced the potential for health and safety concerns should mold form when an employee does not regularly remove their individual garbage and recycling to the central repository.</p>	

ITEM	94 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Management representatives indicated that Administrative Services and Property Management (ASPM) had evaluated the costs and determined the savings in advance of making the change. However, management will ensure that the Director General, ASPM is aware of these continued concerns.</p>	M.Marchand
	<p>RO and RCO Promotion Criteria</p> <p>Management representative indicated that with the launch of the revised RO promotion criteria, it is hoped that work will begin in January 2018 on revising the RCO promotion criteria and will involve discussions directly with PIPSC. While SEC has endorsed a review of the RCO criteria, any change to the education criteria would have to be evaluated cautiously as there would be those within some elements of the community who would not welcome any reduction in education levels.</p>	
	<p>RCEA Open House</p> <p>Management representatives expressed appreciation to the RCEA President for the invitation to the open house at their new location.</p>	
	<p>JCC Meeting Dates in 2018</p> <p>The parties confirmed that the dates for the JCC meetings in 2018 would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 95th – March 21, 2018 • 96th – June 20, 2018 • 97th – September 26, 2018 • 98th – December 12, 2018 <p>The meetings would commence at 9 am and if required, due to the agenda items requiring discussion, could run until 3 pm.</p>	
	<p>Meeting adjourned at: 12:47 pm</p>	