

**NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL CANADA (NRC)**

**MINUTES OF THE 98<sup>th</sup> MEETING**

**OF THE**

**NRC – JOINT CONSULTATION COMMITTEE (JCC)**

**DATE:** December 12, 2018  
**TIME:** 9:00 AM  
**LOCATION:** Room S-303, Building M-58

**IN ATTENDANCE**

**Chairperson:**

Cathie Fraser, President, RCEA

**Representing NRC:**

Roman Szumski, Vice-President, Life Sciences  
Emily Harrison, Vice-President, HRB  
Amy Campbell, Manager Special Initiatives, HRB  
Meredith Marchand, Senior Labour Relations Officer, HRB  
Anthony Galipeau, Student, Labour Relations, HRB

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

Christine Poirier, Labour Relations Team Lead  
Patricia Loder, President, NRC-PIPSC Consultation Team  
Cathy Cheung, President RO/RCO Group  
Dominique Charbonneau, President LS Group  
Stephan Grosse, RO/RCO Group Executive

**Representing Research Council Employees' Association (RCEA):**

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

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>98<sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<b>98.1</b>	<b>Approval of Agenda</b> The agenda, as drafted, was approved by the members.	
<b>98.2</b>	<b>Minutes of the 97<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the JCC</b> Members approved the 97 <sup>th</sup> minutes with the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>96.10 – Outsourcing</u> – change “on” to “an” on-going practice in first paragraph</li></ul>	

ITEM	98 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
98.2 (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>96.11 – Rehiring of Terms</u> – change “of” to “struck <u>off</u> strength” in second paragraph</li> <li>• <u>97.4 – Overtime Payments</u> – clarification provided on two items</li> <li>• <u>97.5 – Pay and Benefits Department</u> – removal of last sentence in paragraph five</li> <li>• <u>97.6 - Maternity and Parental Information</u> – removal of second “the” in the second paragraph</li> <li>• <u>97.8 – CTEs in SuccessFactors</u> – change “sough” to “sought” – in second paragraph</li> <li>• <u>97.9 – Security Investigations</u> – change “implement” to “implemented” in the second paragraph and “span” to “spam” on page 13.</li> <li>• <u>RT – Membership Dues Report for RCEA</u> – remove “one to” and last sentence of first paragraph</li> <li>• <u>RT – Safety Concerns</u> – remove second paragraph</li> </ul>	M.Marchand
98.3	<b>Follow-up Action Items of the 97<sup>th</sup> Meeting</b>	
88.9	<p><b>Performance Improvement Plans (PIP)</b></p> <p>As committed, Management had forwarded the proposed PIP process document which included the requirement of 48 hours to review and consult in advance of signing. As PIPs form part of performance management, ownership resides with Keith Blundon, Director, Planning, Development and Performance with HRB. He is working with Denise LeVoguer, a Senior Advisor within his group to create tools to assist managers.</p> <p>The Bargaining Agents expressed concern that tools were now being developed when in their view the consultative process was still on-going to address their concerns related to streamlining the process in a way that is fair and transparent, addressing gaps with appropriate performance indicators, making the PIP form and warning less intimidating, improving resources to genuinely help the employee, and collaboratively seeking the employee’s input into how they can improve their performance. They believe PIPs, along with rejection on probation, are being employed by NRC to release employees from employment wherein there is no external redress mechanism.</p> <p>In response, Management reiterated that the current Commitment to Excellence (CTE) Program Procedures for Not Meeting Expectations speak to managing poor performance including a PIP. It is an auxiliary support process to ensure that there is appropriate rigor and clear documentation when working with the employee to support them in closing the performance gap. The PIP is not intended as a means to terminate an employee. While the warning of consequences of continued poor performance can be perceived as intimidating, Management has a duty to inform the employee that this could impact their employment. The afore mentioned tools were to assist managers in having these difficult conversations in a manner that is productive in helping the employee understand what is required and how they will support them in closing that gap. <b>Management agreed to provide this feedback to Mr.</b></p>	M.Marchand

ITEM	98 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<b>88.9 (cont.)</b>	<b>Blundon and Ms. Le Voguer and ask that they convene a meeting with the Bargaining Agents and Labour Relations.</b>	K.Blundon D. Le Voguer
<b>89.4</b>	<p><b>1950 vs. 37.5</b></p> <p>Management reported that the feedback from PIPSC regarding the need to exercise reasonable flexibility when recalibrating extra hours worked under 1950 had been provided to the HRGs. A more in-depth review is required regarding the agility and adaptation of the 1950 Hours of Work under the RO/RCO collective agreement, the 1950 Frequently Asked Questions, and the Hours of Work policy general requirement for common core hours in light of what is occurring at the local level in some research centres. The results of this review would be then shared with the Director Generals and R&amp;D Communities of Practice as required to ensure a common understanding.</p> <p>PIPSC requested that clear documentation of acceptable practices affirming the negotiated provisions in the RO/RCO collective agreement and where they take precedence over the policy core hours of work be developed for local supervisors and management.</p>	
<b>90.4</b>	<p><b>Mental Health</b></p> <p>RCEA followed up regarding whether a special time code for mental health activities would be created or would these activities fall under the OSH code. Management responded that this is something they are investigating.</p>	
<b>93.5</b>	<p><b>RO/RCO Promotion Cases including D1</b></p> <p>Updates on the three cases raised by PIPSC were sent by Management in advance of the meeting. Management further noted that Classification is working with David Lisk, Vice-President Industrial Research Assistance Program (IRAP) on reviewing the Industrial Technology Advisor (ITA) promotion criteria as part of a review of the larger diverse non-research RCO group. Work is proceeding slower than desired but as its importance to NRC is recognized by Senior Management, consideration will be given as to whether assigning key employee leads, as suggested by PIPSC, would provide the appropriate additional support.</p> <p>PIPSC noted that a review of the RO/RCO promotion criteria was a Dialogue action item and with the RO criteria was already revised with the input of key PIPSC members, it is important that this valuable project move ahead to completion.</p>	
<b>96.10</b>	<p><b>Outsourcing</b></p> <p>Management responded to the RCEA's concerns over outsourcing in two areas of NRC that this is not the norm. Utilization rates are an important key performance indicator so if at all possible work demands are leveraged across staff and facilities to ensure the quality of service is maintained. Overtime and addition staffing are also considered.</p>	

ITEM	98 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
97.6	<p><b>Maternity and Parental Information</b></p> <p>PIPSC informed the Committee that this item is on hold until further notice. Although if some of this information were available on MyZone it would support employees in advance planning according to RCEA.</p>	
97.7	<p><b>Posting of RO/RCO Collective Agreements</b></p> <p>The only outstanding collective agreements remaining to be posted to MyZone were the TO and OP, as the CS had just been posted noted Management. For accessibility reasons PDF documents need to be converted into HTML and in doing so some formatting discrepancies were found.</p> <p>RCEA cautioned that the terms and conditions of the negotiated agreements remain unchanged. Additionally they requested that they receive an update on the two outstanding collective agreements as well as the process to update the language of the signed collective agreement on MyZone.</p>	
97.8	<p><b>CTEs in SuccessFactors</b></p> <p>In response to an earlier request from the Bargaining Agents, Management indicated that they would forward instructions regarding how to access CTE commitments and performance history in SuccessFactors.</p> <p>RCEA inquired whether NRC utilizes a bell curve distribution for the CTE performance ratings as there is a general belief among their membership that quotas are employed. Management clarified that NRC has no established distribution scale for CTE ratings.</p>	
RT	<p><b>Staffing</b></p> <p>An inquiry was made by the Bargaining Agents regarding the utilization of Right-Fit in staffing positions at NRC. They expressed concern that this would enable external candidates to be favoured over internal ones and questioned whether candidates are informed up front of the broader assets related to the current and future needs of the position and organization. While multiple candidates could be successful based upon the documented requirements of the statement of qualifications, they may not address these other right-fit areas due to a lack of awareness when in fact they do possess these other areas as well.</p> <p>Management responded that in the past NRC was required to select the highest ranking candidate based on the essential qualifications, with the exception of if there was a close secondary candidate who was also representing an employment equity deficit area. However, with the introduction of Right-Fit for internal candidate only in 2013, additional consideration can be given to future needs of the organization in addition to what is required for the position now. These asset criteria would be noted in the screening and/or the assessment criteria sections of the Statement of Qualifications. The Bargaining Agents had been consulted</p>	

ITEM	98 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	on these changes in 2013 and <b>Management committed to forwarding them the resulting hiring policies.</b>	M.Marchand
RT	<p><b>No Local Steward</b></p> <p>Management confirmed off-line with PIPSC that an external steward cannot be substituted when there is not a local steward as the collective agreement specifies that stewards must be appointed from amongst the employees.</p>	
RT	<p><b>Safety Concerns</b></p> <p>Management informed the Committee that the safety concerns raised by PIPSC regarding asbestos were being addressed by the National Committee on Occupational Safety and Health (NCOSH) and that in the fall all staff had received an update regarding asbestos inventory in NRC buildings.</p>	
<b>Recurrent Business</b>		
81.8	<p><b>Status of LLMCCs in Research Centre</b></p> <p>Both Bargaining Agents expressed the desire to see the LLMCCs expanded to a number of other locations and inquired whether Management would issue another all-staff communication in support of employee involvement in these committees. The last one was in March 2016.</p> <p>As a regional site-based approach, wherein the most senior manager on-site is responsible for the leadership of internal and external stakeholders for that location is part of the Dialogue considerations, <b>Management will raise the LLMCCs with the Vice President tasked with that part of the Dialogue.</b></p>	E.Harrison M.Dumoulin
90.12	<p><b>D1 RO/RCO Increment Documentation</b></p> <p>PIPSC requested an update from Management regarding the option to replace the D1s with a “Met Expectations” CTE rating as the President had indicated this was under consideration. In their view, the CTE commitments are often related to the RO/RCO promotion criteria, two CTEs could be used to span the required dwell period and ease the burden of the obtaining the additional D1 approvals. To mitigate concerns over a mass roll-out they proposed implementing a pilot with one Research Centre known to be amenable to this change. However, if Management decides it is appropriate to retain the D1, then they asked that it be revised to be more easily matched to the promotion criteria.</p> <p>Since the spring Management has met with stakeholders regarding the D1 in an effort to streamline the promotion process. Feedback was divergent ranging from those who wanted to move to a Met CTE in place of the D1 to those who view the D1 as valuable in developing future promotion cases at higher levels as CTE commitments many not address the promotion criteria. D1s also provide an opportunity for the DGs to see the work being performed by this key community whereas many CTEs remain at the lower Reviewing Officer level. As opposed to a longer pilot,</p>	

ITEM	98 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	in the next several months they anticipate being in a position to start rolling out the next steps in a manner so that what is valuable is retained.	
91.8	<p><b>Electric Car Charging Stations (Tesla)</b></p> <p>The Bargaining Agents expressed the belief that an official review and subsequent policy is not required to appropriately manage the installation of electric car charging stations at NRC and the associated cost recoveries from their usage by employees. Accordingly they asked that an <b>update to this item be received off-line via a meeting with the appropriate manager from Administrative Services and Property Management (ASPM) or as an item for discussion at the next JCC.</b></p>	M.Marchand
95.5	<p><b>Committee on Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)</b></p> <p>RCEA requested an update on the EDI Committee as they had recommended one of their members in response to NRC's call for interest in the November 8<sup>th</sup> edition of Echo. PIPSC stated that their Consultation President had also offered to participate as a regional employee who represents two designated groups. Active involvement in the EDI Committee was sought by both Bargaining Agents.</p> <p>Management noted that the former Diversity Consultation Committee (DCC) is being replaced by the new and broader EDI Committee. While they had received 21 expressions of interest, they were still looking for more to increase the level of diversity represented from regions, IRAP and the TO community. Representation from IRAP is important as the EDI Committee, in addition to its internal focus on building an inclusive culture, is also tasked with developing ways to ensure NRC's work with clients, partners and entrepreneurs is free from barriers to inclusion. When evaluating the diversity of those interested individuals have been asked if they would be open to sharing which diverse groups they identify with in addition to their self-identification data. <b>Management welcomes the Bargaining Agents' support in soliciting more interest in the Committee on EDI and will follow-up with them regarding who volunteered in advance of finalizing membership and convening the first meeting hopefully in January.</b></p>	RCEA & PIPSC J A. Conway
96.11	<p><b>Re-hiring of Terms</b></p> <p>The rehiring of term employees in the same capacity instead of extending them and thereby resulting in breaks in service and causing financial difficulties by delaying their pay for weeks continues to be a concern for the RCEA. Another alternative suggested was the usage of a leave without pay for as little as a day. Short-terms are for a year less a day of employment and were not intended to be used again to rehire the same employee in a similar capacity after a short break in service.</p> <p>Management informed the committee that any break in employment of more than the weekend and holiday necessitates a struck off strength action and for this reason NRC does try to extend a term employee's contract where possible except for post-retirees working 12 hour or more a week wherein a break in service is required. However, as each situation would need to be examined individually from a pay perspective,</p>	

ITEM	98 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
96.11 (cont.)	Management offered to review cases of concern directly with the Bargaining Agents. <b>Verification would be sought from Pay regarding the usage of extensions instead of breaks in service for reasons other than the short-term maximum timeframe or post-retirement contracts and if there is any known related issues due to Phoenix.</b>	A.Campbell (M.Marchand)
97.5	<p><b>Pay and Benefits Group</b></p> <p>The Bargaining Agents expressed concerns regarding a number of <u>pay processes</u>. They inquired whether the usage of the out of office message by the Pay and Benefits Advisors (PBAs) had ceased. A recommendation was made for an acknowledgement message from the common pay inbox indicating that the employee's e-mail was received and would be responded to as appropriate. The service standards and processes related to recoveries of overpayments especially the level of explanation provided to the employee throughout the process including emergency salary advancements was raised as an area for improvement in their view. They noted that NRC as a separate agency should exercise its discretion to have compassion for the employee when considering the pay rules regarding recoveries from first available funds even though in the core public service this is the norm unless there is a claim for financial hardship.</p> <p>The Director, Special Initiatives, who is responsible for Pay and Benefits, responded that the out of office messages have been changed to direct employees to the common pay inbox so that all e-mails can be triaged by urgency via each responsible PBA on an hourly basis. <b>Management agreed on the importance of an acknowledgement e-mail from the generic pay inbox.</b> The new Manager of Pay and Benefits would be developing criteria regarding what constitutes an urgent priority and how those cases should be managed, considering service standards, and reviewing processes to determine if improvements are required. <b>Management will verify the current processes and communications related to overpayment recoveries and Emergency Salary Advances (ESA) and notify the Bargaining Agents accordingly.</b> Employees should be notified in advance of all overpayments and the plan for recovery from first available funds unless it resulted from the Phoenix pay system. If warranted they can request an alternative repayment plan based upon the financial impact, although less than 10% requires a claim for financial hardship to the NRC President. For recoveries originating from the Miramichi pay centre only the employee is notified directly but <b>Management will inquire if notification can also be provided to NRC's Pay and Benefits Group.</b></p> <p>PIPSC noted concerns regarding the communication from Management of issues arising from the recent <u>salary revision retroactive payments</u> for the RO/RCO group and in particular the instruction for those employees to wait until January 10<sup>th</sup> to submit suspected problems to the generic pay inbox to prevent overloading the system. They indicated that it would have been helpful if Management had notified both local and corporate PIPSC in advance of the communication to members from that group and questioned why there appeared to have been inadequate planning for Phoenix maintenance. A request for tools to assist their members,</p>	<p>A.Campbell (M.Marchand)</p> <p>A.Campbell (M.Marchand)</p> <p>A.Campbell (M.Marchand)</p>

ITEM	98 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>97.5 (cont.)</b></p>	<p>including former employees, in understanding their mass revision retroactive pay statements was made as many members were requiring this additional support.</p> <p>Management reported that in the urgency to notify the RO/RCOs of the potential for errors in the mass retroactive salary revisions due to the timing of the Phoenix maintenance being advanced with limited warning and the resulting inadequate time for full verifications in advance of the payroll deposits, PIPSC was inadvertently not given advance notice of the communication. The PBAs were already aware of many the errors and anticipated resolution in the majority of cases within a month. Accordingly in an effort to avoid RO/RCO employees flooding the generic pay inbox regarding the same matters and potentially causing urgent priority requests such as ESAs to be missed, the request was made to wait until January 10<sup>th</sup>. <b>Management will investigate whether changes can be made to the generic pay inbox to adequately allow for the influx of RO/RCO problem queries and respond to PIPSC offline.</b> However, any RO/RCOs experiencing financial hardship are instructed to e-mail the generic pay inbox in advance of the date communicated. Ways to improve communications around mass revisions will be examined by the new Manager of Pay and Benefits and input from the Bargaining Agents is welcome. The Compensation Web App (CWA), available via MyZone, has tools to aid employees in understanding their mass retroactive pay statements as does Public Services and Procurement Canada's <a href="#">How to read your pay stub</a>. As former employees no longer have access to CWA, <b>Management will investigate if they receive any additional documentation regarding retroactive salary revision payments in addition to their detailed pay statement.</b></p> <p>Delays in <u>leave without pay (LWOP)</u> for union business being reflected in pay were raised by PIPSC as they are unable to anticipate when the loss of income will occur and were concerned about impacts to the T4 as December 31<sup>st</sup> approaches.</p> <p>With LWOP, Management replied that the delays may be related to when the budget holder for local management approves the LWOP time entry instead of Pay and Benefits or Phoenix. <b>Management would confirm the current process for LWOP with new Manager Pay and Benefits. The Bargaining Agents were asked to contact the Director, Special Initiatives regarding the details of these cases.</b></p> <p>The <u>reinstatement of the bi-weekly reports</u> detailing number of members not receiving pay was requested by the Bargaining Agents.</p> <p><b>Management</b> reported that while there have been few ESA, they would <b>confirm whether there is a more appropriate report that could be shared with the Bargaining Agents on a bi-weekly basis regarding the number of emergency pays</b> as an alternative to the former no payment report which also captured employees who were legitimately are receiving no payment.</p>	<p>A.Campbell</p> <p>A.Campbell (M.Marchand)</p> <p>A.Campbell (M.Marchand)</p> <p>A.Campbell</p>
<p><b>97.9</b></p>	<p><b>Security Investigations</b></p> <p>The Bargaining Agents reported continued apprehension regarding how Security views their role in security investigations by how they are</p>	

ITEM	98 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>97.9 (cont.)</b></p>	<p>treated. In their view, these investigations are conducted more like a formal Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) or Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) interview than one under Treasury Board. Once they have been asked by their member to be involved then in their opinion the notion of embarrassment no longer exists and they should be presented a copy of the investigation report directly from Security and not to obtain one through their member. When there is a violation of the Policy on Acceptable Network and Device Use (PANDU), having the report is critical to be able to assist their member who could be facing discipline as a result. They believe as certified bargaining agents with security clearance this provides adequate coverage to determine how to best store the investigation reports.</p> <p>An update was provided by Management that Security has now made provisions for the employee to sign off on the investigation report being issued directly to their Bargaining Agent by Security. While the employee may initially wish to have the full support of the Bargaining Agent, Management has known of members facing violations under PANDU to them become embarrassed due to the content such as images in the report and as such then do not want this private material shared. Dependent upon the information contained in the report there may be an additional level of security concern when this data is then kept in a location external to NRC.</p> <p><b>Management recommended that a separate off-line meeting with Tim Grubb, Executive Director Security Branch be scheduled with the Bargaining Agents to address continuing points of concern, to which the Bargaining Agents agreed.</b></p>	<p>M.Marchand T.Grubb RCEA/PIPSC</p>
<b>New Business</b>		
<p><b>98.4</b></p>	<p><b>Official Languages – Supervision in Bilingual Region</b></p> <p>RCEA commented that members working in bilingual designated regions need to be able to speak in the language of their choice as per the Official Languages Act. This is being raised on a general level as individual members are reluctant to come forward to have their concerns addressed. Their English speaking supervisors are being hired in non-imperative bilingual positions and subsequently trained in French which takes time and requires interim administrative arrangements. In their view these individuals will never be comfortable utilizing French on a full-time basis with their employees as it is not their mother tongue. Accordingly the usage of imperative staffing is highly recommended by the RCEA for supervisory positions and personal services in bilingual regions. This had been raised with Management from one Research Centre but the problem persists. Language of work issues have the potential to increase with supervision or personal services being provided by employees in non-bilingual regions to those in designated bilingual areas which are further complicated by differing time zones. This concern was amplified recently when one of their members, who was facing a health issue in a bilingual region, was not able to receive personal services support in French from their assigned remote HR provider and had instead to seek out aide from the local bilingual Human Resources Generalist (HRG).</p>	

ITEM	98 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>98.4</b> <b>(cont.)</b></p>	<p>They have also seen some non-bilingual communications being issued including a recent Terms of Reference mentioning the Bilingual Champion in English only.</p> <p>Management responded that under Official Languages for Language of Work, supervisors in a bilingual region occupy bilingual positions and already supervise employee(s) in bilingual positions(s); therefore, employees may be supervised in the language of their choice. The Act also provides for the usage of non-imperative staffing with agreement to language training and interim administrative measures implemented when bilingual supervisors and managers cannot be found who have all the required technical competencies. This occurs not only NRC but also in other science based departments and agencies. Functioning bilingual management of NRC is important to the President and as such reporting on non-imperative staffing and the maintenance of bilingual profiles for MGTs is done on a bi-annual basis. The necessity for bilingual communications with employees and the public is also recognized. Accordingly an article on official language requirements is planned for Echo. Bilingualism also known to be important to the Director General for the <b>Research Centre with which the Bargaining Agents have raised concern and Management will follow-up accordingly. The Bargaining Agents were requested to raise directly with Management any other specific cases of concern.</b></p> <p>It was confirmed by Management that there are some legacy unilingual Human Resources (HR) positions in the regions with administrative arrangements for the provision of bilingual services as required. <b>A list of locations where bilingual HR services are available would be provided;</b> however, due to budgets the number of buildings and regions supported by a single HR resource has been increasing. While the main focus for HRGs is supporting the business goals of one of more Research Centres through providing advice to management on human resources matters, it also includes answering employee questions so they understand options and policies available to them and directing the individual to their Bargaining Agent. However, they are not there to counsel employees in personal matters nor are they mental health specialists, which is why NRC's bilingual Employee Assistance Plan is so important.</p> <p>Greater clarity on where their members should go for HR support was requested by the RCEA.</p>	<p>E.Harrison (M.Marchand)</p> <p>RCEA/PIPSC</p> <p>M.Marchand</p>
<p><b>98.5</b></p>	<p><b>Compensatory Leave Management</b></p> <p>It was reported by PIPSC that a group of their members were reminded of the need to take their remaining compensatory leave from the prior fiscal year only days before the September 30<sup>th</sup> deadline for utilization or the overtime would be cashed out. While the communication did indicate that employees could speak with their supervisor about exchanging prior vacation time for compensatory leave, it was a general communication and as such did not provide the specific employee details regarding the amount of leave remaining. The effect was that many employees were off the day prior to the deadline creating a risk for the organization whereas earlier communication would have prevented the situation. RCEA</p>	

ITEM	98 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>98.5</b> <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>inquired if the remaining compensatory leave amounts are listed on the annual leave balances that have been provided to employees in April.</p> <p>The importance of supervisors and employees having early planning discussions was agreed by Management who would speak to Communications regarding whether a reminder could be incorporated into the corporate calendar in Echo and MyZone in May. Employees also have a responsibility for appropriate utilization as the compensatory leave is included on the individual leave balances distributed in the new fiscal year and the self-service portal (SIGMA) time summary provided the time has been entered, approved and uploaded overnight. As indicated any unused compensatory leave is not lost but rather paid out as overtime and employees may also have the opportunity to convert some used vacation to compensatory leave.</p>	
<p><b>98.6</b></p>	<p><b>GC Workplace and NRC Workplace 2.0</b></p> <p>RCEA requested an update on whether GC Workplace is being implemented at NRC as they believed the changes to M-19 and M-50 were done under those requirements. GC Workplace is also the subject of discussion at NJC’s Service-Wide Committee on Occupational Safety and Health (SWOSH) and given the RCEA’s participation in that committee they are of the opinion that there are systemic issues such as not accommodating employees’ need for quiet places to complete their work and the lack of adequate natural lighting. Those who require accommodation are also reluctant to request it. GC Workplace is predicated on a some employees teleworking which would in turn require the review of NRC’s Alternate Work Arrangement policy. They questioned whether there was a shortage of office space at NRC. PIPSC also had received negative feedback regarding the office changes in London, Toronto as well as the future developments in Winnipeg and cautioned concern over appropriate storage of protected documents in an open concept as well as office space efficiency does not equate to increased productivity. Both Bargaining Agents were against the implementation of GC Workplace.</p> <p>It was noted by Management that in 2016, SEC approved NRC Workplace 2.0 for the purpose of maximizing existing office and cubicle space utilization in advance of securing new facilities which is in keeping with PSPC’s Workplace 2.0. The additional support space allocations for break out rooms has also recently been incorporated. The recent office changes at NRC are only applying the physical space allocations and desk requirements whereas every aspect of the space, such as paint, carpet, colour pallet, lighting, ceiling tiles, level of white noise, air quality, etc. are captured in the provisions. <b>Given the concerns expressed by the Bargaining Agents a recommendation for a meeting with Daniel Therien, Director of Real Property who is responsible for NRC Workplace 2.0 was made, to which the Bargaining Agents agreed.</b></p>	<p>M.Marchand RCEA/PIPSC</p>
<p><b>98.7</b></p>	<p><b>Nepotism</b></p> <p>An inquiry was made by RCEA regarding whether NRC had a policy on employees supervising or reporting to spouses or other family members and if not how are these situations managed? They know of these types</p>	

ITEM	98 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p><b>98.7</b> <b>(cont.)</b></p>	<p>of circumstances occurring within NRC with the knowledge of management. In their view they should not be permitted as they can only cause friction and a negative perception or suspicion, even if arrangements are made for the spouse to report to another higher manager and there is no signs of favouritism. Other team members feel they have no safe place to raise concerns. While the current situation is believed to be temporary, it has the potential to become permanent.</p> <p>Management replied that all employees are bound by NRC's Conflict of Interest and Code of Conduct policies which both speak to the need to avoid any real or perceived conflict of interest for which a reasonable observer could believe to exist. There is the need to act with integrity in a manner that would bear the closest public scrutiny by upholding the highest ethical standards and taking all possible steps to resolve any real, apparent or potential conflicts of interest related to their private affairs in favour of the public interest. Given the amount of time employees spend at work, there are times when personal relationships and even marriages occur but when they are in the same area, they necessitate a fulsome discussion with the Values and Ethics Officer who will work with Management and the employees in question to determine the best course of action.</p>	
<p><b>98.8</b></p>	<p><b>Support for Retiring Employees</b></p> <p>Concern was expressed by RCEA that their retiring members were not being adequately supported through this transition. Directing them to the Pension Centre without providing any additional local support, even if the level of service from the Pension Centre is excellent, is inadequate. These are often employees who have dedicated their careers to NRC and this experience is leaving them feeling lost and alone through this process. There have been times when the Pay and Benefits termination letter detailing benefits was not issued two to four weeks in advance of departure as detailed on MyZone and in one case it was received only after their last day of employment. PIPSC also noted that retiring members who wish to put any applicable severance to be received into an RRSP without taxes being deducted at source are required to contact Canada Revue Agency (CRA) three to four months in advance identifying themselves as retiring so that CRA can send the appropriate information to NRC.</p> <p>Pay and Benefits on MyZone provides a <a href="#">NRC Guide to Retirement</a> detailed reference document noted Management. Contacting the Pension Centre directly provides employees with the best service as they are able to speak directly with a Pension Advisor. HRGs have also been directing employees to fax to the Pension Centre their accepted retirement letter indicating their PRI. NRC also has Planning for Retirement courses to be taken about 10 years from retirement in addition to Ready for Retirement courses to be taken about 2 years from retirement which are well received, funded centrally and also take place at times in regional locations. <b>Management will publish these courses once budgets have been approved for the next fiscal year.</b></p> <p><b>RCEA also reported that they would send the contact information for the National Association for Federal Retirees (NAFR), which is</b></p>	<p>E.Harrison (K.Blundon)</p> <p>C.Fraser</p>

ITEM	98 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
98.8 (cont.)	free across Canada and provides advocacy support and training applicable after retirement. NAFR could be publicised at NRC as an additional service available to retirees.	
98.9	<p><b>2019 Meeting Dates</b></p> <p>Management informed the committee that this will be the last meeting for Roman Szumski, Vice-President, Life Sciences as he will be passing the torch to Michel Dumoulin, Vice-President Engineering. The committee members all thanked Dr. Szumski for all his contributions over the years. Dr. Szumski expressed his appreciation for the forthrightness from the committee members as he found the discussions at the JCC valuable.</p> <p>Given the schedules of many of the committee members, Management noted the dates for the 2019 JCC meetings as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• March 20<sup>th</sup></li> <li>• June 12<sup>th</sup> (<i>Secretarial Note: This date has subsequently been changed to June 13<sup>th</sup></i>)</li> <li>• September 11<sup>th</sup></li> <li>• December 11<sup>th</sup></li> </ul> <p>RCEA requested that if Dr. Dumoulin cannot attend a meeting that a suitable replacement senior manager attend in his place.</p>	
	<b>Roundtable</b>	
98.RT	<p>The Bargaining Agents commented that the Government of Canada Workplace Charitable Campaign (GCWCC) – Biggest Loser fundraising activity, while done with the best of intentions had some undesirable consequences in light of equity, diversity and inclusion of negative body images for those who struggle in this area. As discussed at NCOSH, weight loss should only be undertaken with appropriate medical supervision. If NRC wanted to provide additional support in this area they could have a program like Weight Watchers be offered on site.</p> <p>Management confirmed that this specific fundraising activity will not be repeated.</p>	
	<b>Next meeting is scheduled for March 20, 2019</b>	
	<b>Meeting adjourned at: 12:25 pm</b>	