

**NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL CANADA (NRC)**

**MINUTES OF THE 104<sup>th</sup> MEETING**

**OF THE**

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

**DATE:** September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2020  
**TIME:** 9:30 AM  
**LOCATION:** ZOOM Videoconference

**IN ATTENDANCE**

**Chairperson:**

Cathy Cheung, President RO/RCO Group (for Patricia Loder)

**Representing NRC:**

Michel Dumoulin, Vice-President, Engineering  
Emily Harrison, Vice-President, HRB  
Amy Campbell, Acting Director Labour Relations and Compensation, HRB  
Leah Kennedy, Labour Relations Officer, HRB

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

Patricia Loder, President, NRC-PIPSC Consultation Team (absent)  
Cathy Cheung, President RO/RCO Group  
Stephan Grosse, RO/RCO Group Executive  
Louis Poirier, RO/RCO Group Steward  
Sara Boulé-Perroni, Employment Relations Officer, PIPSC

**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>104<sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES – DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<b>104.1</b>	<b>Approval of Agenda</b> The agenda was approved as drafted, with some additional items added. These included the topics of Management Presence at Building M4, and the MOU on Implementation of the Collective Agreements (Joan Van Den Bergh), in addition to Vacation Leave Carryover (Michelle Levesque).	
<b>104.2</b>	<b>Minutes of the 103<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the JCC</b> The RCEA, PIPSC and NRC Management all agreed with the revisions made to the Minutes of the 103 <sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the JCC. Formal approval was provided by email on 15 September 2020 by the RCEA and 1 October 2020 by PIPSC. The Minutes were subsequently sent for translation.	

ITEM	104 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<b>104.3</b>	<b>Follow-up Action Items of the 103<sup>rd</sup> Meeting</b>	
<b>91.6</b>	<p><b>Terms – Length of Service (Quarterly Reports)</b></p> <p>Management provided statistics on the two Quarterly Reports depicting the workforce breakdown. One report was for Q4 of 2019/2020 that would have been shared if the June 2020 JCC Meeting had taken place. The second report is for Q1 of 2020/2021.</p> <p>The RCEA inquired if it was possible to identify whether the terms outlined in these reports can also show whether the employees who were extended most recently are long-standing term employees or new term hires.</p> <p>Management committed that they would look to see what was possible to produce within the reporting features of the reports generated from SAP.</p>	<b>A.Campbell</b>
<b>96.10</b>	<p><b>Outsourcing CSs</b></p> <p>Management shared that a meeting has not been held to discuss this matter since the last JCC due to ongoing priorities as a result of the Pandemic. Paul Wagner has been seconded out which means that a meeting with Paul Cooke is required while there is a search underway for a new Chief Information Officer.</p> <p>Management committed to setting up a meeting offline with the RCEA to discuss next steps.</p>	<b>A.Campbell</b>
<b>100.5</b>	<p><b>Joint Learning Program (JLP)</b></p> <p>Management shared that at the last JCC meeting in March 2020, NRC committed to looking for date that worked whereby two facilitators from the Core PS as part of JLP would put on a Labour Management Workshop for the IRAP &amp; Royalmount LLMCC teams together. Unfortunately the JLP is not positioned to offer this session virtually, so this initiative will need to be put on hold until there is more clarity around potential virtual offerings.</p>	
<b>101.RT1</b>	<p><b>Classification of AD/AS in IRAP</b></p> <p>Management shared that this matter should be resolved as the letters were signed by the VP of IRAP and sent to the AD's by their DGs in mid-July. Pay and Benefits has confirmed that all revisions to pay and retroactive payments have been initiated, with all employees seeing their new rates of pay as of 16 September 2020.</p> <p>The RCEA raised that on this matter in particular, they wish to raise the topic of the MOU on Implementation of the Collective Agreement. The RCEA shared that while the AD employees were advised that they were to be reclassified with a specific retroactive date, the RCEA feels that there are issues in how the retroactive pay has been calculated. They learned from the Compensation team that there is now a reconciliation process which will cause delays to employees getting their payments.</p> <p>The RCEA conveyed concerns over this delay and are seeking clarification.</p>	

ITEM	104 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>They stated that the MOU on the Implementation of the Collective Agreement has language about how long the employer has to implement and how to calculate without rounding. The RCEA said it was not their understanding that this MOU was to apply to every potential situation that involves pay and how it is calculated. The RCEA believes there has been some kind of misunderstanding and that if this only a matter of processing a reclassification, this should be initiated quickly and accurately.</p> <p>The RCEA asks Management to investigate whether the MOU applies to all pay calculations going forward and they encouraged PIPSC to take this matter back to their table to discuss and outline their understanding on the matter.</p> <p>The RCEA also highlighted that there are individuals on maternity leave who are also not getting paid correctly as a part of the MOU and the RCEA wants to make sure that individuals on leave are getting the appropriate retroactive pay.</p> <p>Management committed that they will look into these specific cases to understand the implications and whether the MOU affects all pay implications going forward (as with reclassifications). Management is also investigating the sub plan coverage for those on maternity leave and will set up an offline discussion to address this matter directly with the Bargaining Agents.</p>	<p><b>A.Campbell</b></p>
<p><b>101.RT3</b></p>	<p><b>Phoenix Damages MOU</b></p> <p>Management shared that it is not PSPC who handles former employee files as it relates to Phoenix Damages days but rather TBS. NRC has not done anything to reach out directly to former employees as this process is being done centrally. Management further shared that there is an established process in place where former employees can go to learn more about this leave through a Government of Canada website that is well advertised.</p> <p>The RCEA shared that they would like to know what Treasury Board Secretariat is going to do about the “Me too” clause that the NRC has in their collective agreements given the Public Service Alliance of Canada has signed their collective agreements. The RCEA would like to know if their members will be getting the \$100.</p> <p>Management responded that they are still waiting for a TBS interpretation and direction on the potential impact of this signing and will report back when they know more.</p> <p>The RCEA shared that they have a meeting with TBS in the near future and will pose this question directly and should they hear news they committed that they will share that as well with the NRC.</p>	<p><b>A.Campbell</b></p>

ITEM	104 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
102.5	<p><b>Probation Waivers</b></p> <p>Management reported that there have been 66 requests for probation waivers. For the RCEA, there have been 21 requests approved, 1 placed on hold (due to particular circumstances) and there are 2 requests pending. For PIPSC there have been 40 requests approved, 1 denied and 1 is still pending. Cases that are denied are generally linked to there being a Performance Improvement Plan in place.</p> <p>Based on these stats, management conveyed that they feel the process is going well and HRGs have reminded their management teams that this probation waiver process is still in place and to assess each case as the request comes in. Management further noted that they do not chase people down to have their probation waived, that it is at the request of the employee that these waivers are considered.</p> <p>Management provided an update that they are almost ready to commence their first meeting to discuss the impact of terms being on probation as part of the MOU established during Collective Bargaining. Management has the list of names for those individuals who will participate in this committee and will look for dates to the get first committee meeting held.</p>	A.Campbell
102.6	<p><b>Parental Leave – Cheat Sheet</b></p> <p>Management updated that Pay and Benefits is working to revise their letters and documentation for employees with new content on the specifics of the changes to Parental Leave and the Pay Team has been using information that PSAC has posted to provide consistent messaging to employees on the new LWOP language.</p> <p>They further shared that the Labour Relations group has inquired with TBS to see if they will be providing something as well but NRC has not been informed yet. NRC shared with the Bargaining Agents the current versions of the letters which includes new language but they commit to sharing a new letter in the near future on this topic given the NRC now has a letter that has come from PSPC for employees in the Federal Public Service.</p> <p>Management will forward the letter to the Bargaining Agents as soon as changes are made to adapt it for NRC employees.</p> <p>Note: Bargaining Agents were forwarded the current version of maternity and parental leave letter provided to employees in September 2020.</p> <p>PIPSC requested to see this information also posted on MyZone so that it is accessible to all employees. They shared that employees often do not get to see the information pertaining to maternity leave benefits, allowances and the same for parental leave prior to submitting a maternity/parental leave request. PIPSC has requested that an article be posted that would link employees to a user-friendly page that explains the impacts and considerations an employee must take into account prior to requesting these types of leave.</p>	L.Kennedy/ A.Campbell

ITEM	104 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Management agreed with the Bargaining Agents that having an informative article available for employees is a good idea. They will first look to TBS to see what they are doing in communicating this information out and if there is nothing, NRC Management commits that they will develop something. The RCEA requests that this action happen before the next JCC meeting in December and they would like to be consulted prior to it being posted.</p>	<p><b>A.Campbell</b></p>
<p><b>89.4</b></p>	<p><b>1950 Work Schedule – Case Scenarios</b></p> <p>PIPSC shared that they are still awaiting case scenarios from their team for this item and stated that they believe this item may need to be placed on hold given there are activities underway to address timecoding, such that employees would only document their absences from the workplace rather than attendance. This may become the new timecoding process at NRC therefore identifying 1950 work schedules and specific cases in how to use this time coding may not be required going forward. This new process for time recording is a suggested change coming out of the Finitiative projects.</p>	
<p><b>102.RT1</b></p>	<p><b>Union Participation &amp; Steward Role</b></p> <p>Management shared that a memo intended for Directors General and their Management Teams has been drafted by the Labour Relations team. It would be used to introduce PIPSC and RCEA representatives and stewards along with outlining the role of the Steward. This draft memo was emailed to the JCC members on the 9<sup>th</sup> of September for their comments and feedback.</p> <p>Management requests that the Bargaining Agents forward their comments directly to Amy Campbell as the intention is to forward the memo and lists in the next month (prior to the next JCC in December 2020).</p> <p>PIPSC shared that they are very much in agreement with the content and information found in the memo and await seeing the final version.</p> <p>Note: An email was sent to DGs and HRGs on November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2020 explaining the role of stewards and providing an updated list of current stewards for both RCEA and PIPSC. A copy of this email was provided to the Bargaining Agents in November 2020.</p> <p><b>Update on NCOSH &amp; JCC Articles for ECHO</b></p> <p>Management has enlisted the help of Corporate Communications to assist in writing an article on NCOSH and will work in conjunction with the HSE Branch to craft this messaging for a future ECHO article. A subsequent article on the JCC is also in the works at a later date. The article on NCOSH will be crafted by Ronald Rino of HSE with support from Carolyn Lauzon in Labour Relations.</p> <p>Note: The NCOSH article was posted on MyZone as of 1 October 2020.</p>	<p><b>A.Campbell</b></p>

ITEM	104 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
98.8	<p><b>Retirement Courses – NAFR &amp; Federal Council Offerings</b></p> <p>Management shared that a new webpage titled “Preparing for Retirement Resources” was created on MyZone and is now available to all employees. This page provides employees who are either ready to retire or starting to think about retirement with a list of resources and topics to consider as they navigate the transition to retirement.</p> <p>Management outlined that there is a list of NRC programs for those employees interested in transitioning into retirement and/or staying engaged with the NRC in their retirement years, such as the NRC Pre- and Post-Retirement Program. It also introduces the new NRC Alum Agreement, an option that gives employees the flexibility to continue to contribute in areas of interest and it is available for both research and non-research employees.</p> <p>The new webpage also outlines various virtual “ready for retirement” offerings from the Federal Council as well as the National Association of Federal Retirees. Employees were informed of this new webpage from an ECHO article that was released on September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2020.</p>	
103.RT1	<p><b>Union Dues Info for EEs</b></p> <p>Prior to the JCC Meeting held on 14 September 2020, PIPSC shared with the Labour Relations team specific language found in a Pay and Benefits letter that they felt was misleading to new hires whereby it suggested that upon hire, new employees automatically became members of a union. New language was proposed to alleviate any confusion and both Bargaining Agents were in agreement with the revised letters. These changes clarify that while union dues are deducted automatically, employees will need to sign on with their individual unions to officially become union members.</p>	
<b>Recurrent Business</b>		
88.9	<p><b>CTE Calibration Process</b></p> <p>The RCEA outlined the Minutes from the April 2015 JCC Meeting whereby a commitment was made that employees would see their performance rating prior to it moving into a calibration exercise or to the reviewing officer. Given this, the RCEA stated that based on this commitment, they believe that employees must know what their supervisor’s recommended rating is before calibration to ensure transparency so that they know what their supervisors think and so that they have an opportunity to respond. The RCEA asked Management to comment on why this is not happening in Research Centres and Branches at the NRC.</p> <p>Management responded that there is no formal process or requirement for calibration, and that Research Centres and Branches are carrying out calibration exercises at their discretion because the CTE process is much more understood and normalized. Others are still holding calibration meetings and are providing an opportunity to review all CTEs in a consistent and fair way.</p>	

	<p>Management stated that the practice of sharing ratings has evolved since that JCC Meeting in 2015 and the rationale behind this is that it is the calibration exercise that sets the rating through a committee reviewing the evaluations. Further, Management added that calibration exercises generally resulted in people’s final ratings going in to the committee and coming out at the same level, with some actually going up and only a few going down.</p> <p>The RCEA responded that they are extremely disappointed with hearing this information from Management. They outlined that their belief is that employees need to know their ratings so that they can prepare comments and disagree if they are not aligned which therefore results in a non-transparent process. The RCEA shared that by not sharing the rating, the CTE process ends before the employee has a chance to know what is going on.</p> <p>Further the RCEA stated that if the process or practice has changed or evolved since 2015, they should have been consulted. The RCEA noted that they are extremely bothered by this change in practice. They stated that so much that happens to an employee will be and can be based on this rating, it can determine if a PIP is established, whether a promotion occurs and whether a path towards termination is being laid out.</p> <p>Additionally, the RCEA shared that the CTE process seems only to be an electronic exercise so conversations are often not happening with employees and they therefore have no idea what is going on. Employees are often forwarded information only through Success Factors. In the absence of conversations employees have no understanding of what their supervisor thinks about their work output and their performance. The RCEA added that they see a fine line between Does Not Meet, Met Some Expectations and Met Expectations ratings and given this, if employees are thinking they are doing well and then they get a Does Not Meet rating, this is unfair as they are completely unaware and unprepared to address. The RCEA acknowledged that there are cases where borderline performance employees feel their supervisors are not treating them fairly and they feel that they have been blind-sided by a CTE.</p> <p>The RCEA shared that Labour Relations Officers are being informed by the union of problematic cases and yet things are not changing and the results of CTE grievances are not successful, therefore the RCEA feels it is a no-win situation for their members.</p> <p>The RCEA inquired as to how the current remote working situation is going to affect the next round of CTE given employees of the NRC are living and working in a matrix environment.</p> <p>Further, the RCEA inquired what the Core Public Administration’s process is for handling performance evaluations and how ratings are shared with employees.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>The RCEA outlined the current language of the Collective Agreements which states that those who assess an employee's performance must have observed or been aware of the employee's performance for at least one-half (1/2) of the period for which the employee's performance is being evaluated.</p> <p>The RCEA stated that they hope this clause is being given significant consideration.</p> <p>PIPSC agrees with the opinions of the RCEA and added that they believe that the actions which take place in the CTE meetings is really not calibration at all.</p> <p>Management responded that there is no evidence to suggest that the CTE process is problematic. NRC has undertaken regular review and improvement of the program, taking into account feedback from the bargaining agents. While management remains open to receiving feedback from employees, managers and the bargaining agents, there is no intention to make changes to the program at this time.</p> <p>Management strongly believes that discussions should be happening so employees should have feedback on their performance on an ongoing basis so that the rating provided at the end of the year makes sense and is aligned with conversations that have taken place. Management stated that there is a bigger issue if conversations are not happening and if there are in fact many cases where this is not happening, Management wants to know about these specific cases.</p> <p>Management stated that the calibration exercise serves to ensure alignment of supervisor expectations across a collection of employees such that performance is evaluated consistently from one group to another.</p> <p>They added that management teams need to be clear about the expectations that would bring about any changes in a calibration exercise and if employees are uncertain of the end result, they should inquire as to what came to light to help support a rating.</p> <p>Management concluded by saying that the NRC and the Bargaining Agents do not appear to be on the same page with regards to this process, however there are best practices for performance management in place and NRC is acting in good faith. If there are specific cases where things are not being conducted fairly, Management would like to know about these cases. NRC is not able to revisit changing the CTE process and the Bargaining Agents concerns are duly noted and will be shared with the rest of the HR Performance Management team.</p>	
<p><b>102.11</b></p>	<p><b>IP - Awards Policy Definitions</b></p> <p>PIPSC raised an issue with the IP Awards which was launched in February 2020. They shared that for the most part it has gone well but there seem to still be some issues with a few of the definitions, namely what is eligible as a disclosure versus what isn't.</p>	

	<p>The policy definition of disclosure is “the submission of a fully-signed Public Servants Inventions Act ("Form 1") document disclosing a previously undisclosed Invention.” The term “previously undisclosed inventions” was identified as a problem area and as such the policy needed to be clear on what was considered included or not. PIPSC says it is unclear to people reading the policy and it seems there is something circular in the definition.</p> <p>PIPSC shared that there are some cases in HHT where Form 1s were started in Q4 of 2019/2020 and some were signed early while others were not signed until much later. This means that an individual can submit the info to the IP committee without having a signed Form 1 and this is then considered a disclosure. PIPSC feels that this interpretation of the definition can inadvertently exclude people and hence the language needs to be reconsidered and changed.</p> <p>PIPSC also inquired as to the matter of IP cases that should have been filed years ago but were not. Should those cases be eligible?</p> <p>PIPSC highlighted an additional concern dealing with IP Committees who often sit on cases that have been submitted. The researchers cannot do anything nor speak about the IP so it puts them in challenging situation because this forms part of their work. PIPSC highlighted that this is quite problematic for several Research Centres at the NRC and highlights the fact that if the cases are not discharged, the researchers cannot report on this work which can impact their overall statement of professional development.</p> <p>Management said that during the creation of the new policy, the expression ‘previously undisclosed inventions’ was used to mean a new signed Form 1, and agreed that the words ‘previously undisclosed’ might create confusion as a Form 1, by definition, must be new. Further, Management stated that they are aware that there are some specific and problematic cases, which amounted to only a few cases.</p> <p>Management said that they want this policy to be positive and flexible so that people do feel encouraged to make disclosures and while there are some that have fallen into the cut-off date for submission, and that NPBS management is looking into the cases and the intention is for there to be a positive resolution.</p> <p>Management shared that initially there were some thoughts that after the Policy was revised that there might be a flurry of Form 1s being filed, but the increase was not a tidal wave or a flurry, nor were these filings deemed or reviewed as frivolous. That being said, Managers still need to sign and move these cases forward in a reasonable amount of time. Therefore if there are things are being held up at the IP Committee, PIPSC should inform Michel Dumoulin and he will investigate these specific cases further.</p>	
<p>103.4</p>	<p><b>Meet the new Secretary General, COI Action Plan Update and Bill C-65</b></p> <p>Serge Bijimine was introduced to the JCC in his new role of Secretary General. Karine Gauvreau and Erin Skrapek joined the meeting.</p>	

	<p>Erin Skrapek provided an update on the implementation of Bill C-65. She shared that regulations came out in late summer of 2020 and a plan needs to be developed to then be implemented at NRC by January 2021. These regulations require that a new comprehensive NRC policy on harassment and violence prevention and resolution be developed in collaboration with with NCOSH and with all of the bargaining agents input so that it is reflective of what is important from an NRC context. NRC is moving this forward as the timelines are coming up fast. TBS has committed to providing a draft Directive and tools in the coming months. There will be mandatory training requirements coming and CSPS will be creating some course offerings available for employees and NRC may supplement with some of their own training to support this initiative further.</p> <p>Bill C-65 will bring about several changes that include (to name a few):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced roles of NCOSH and COSH committees</li> <li>• Recommendations following an investigation must be implemented within one year of the complaint</li> <li>• Mandatory training for all employees on harassment and violence prevention to be implemented according to suggested schedule and refreshed every three years;</li> <li>• A workplace assessment jointly conducted by the employer &amp; NCOSH</li> <li>• Emergency procedures to be followed in situations where an occurrence of harassment and violence poses an immediate danger to the health and safety of employees or when there is a threat of such an occurrence happening in the workplace;</li> <li>• Acceptance of anonymous complaints, provided they meet identified criteria set out in the regulations;</li> <li>• Acceptance of former employee complaints within a specified timeframe (with discretion);</li> </ul> <p>NRC has brought on Quintet as a consultant to assist with the implementation plan to help conduct the workplace assessments. There will also be a joint working group meeting held between Corporate Secretariat, HSE, Labour Relations and consultants to discuss action plans, roles, and responsibilities. Consultation with the Bargaining Agents is hoped to take place in October 2020 and Gender Based Analysis will also form part of the analysis for planning for implementation.</p> <p>The workplace assessment will be NRC wide and will become more specific where there are highlighted problematic locations.</p> <p>The workplace assessment draft report is due in December 2020 with the delivery of the NRC Policy on Harassment and Violence Prevention and Resolution and Operating Procedures due also in December 2020. The regulations must be implemented by January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021.</p> <p>Erin Skrapek shared that there are important pieces that will form part of the NRC's implementation and as such NRC needs to understand where there any potential gaps. She stated that procedural fairness needs to be considered with acceptance of anonymous complaints.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>She shared that this will change a lot of how the NRC undertakes their work and as such, we need to understand more what the new wording means for moving forward with the new regulations.</p> <p>Karine Gauvreau further added that we have to consider the impact of fear of reprisals. The intention is not to create conflict in the workplace but it can become challenging to manage how these discussions unfold and it will be important to be open-minded as NRC navigates the path forward after implementation.</p> <p>The RCEA shared that they look forward to consulting on this and while they know it is legislated and it falls under mandatory regulations that must be implemented, the RCEA is concerned for their members. The RCEA wonders whether individuals who believe they are being harassed will have the courage to feel safe to come forward.</p> <p>The RCEA stated that they wonder if this is a government attempt to try and reduce the number of cases (like a deterrent) that are filed because it would be challenging and harsh for people to come forward.</p> <p>The RCEA says it still seems unclear how the process will roll out and what it will bring to determining that harassment occurred, but they are hopeful it can help their members in these situations. The RCEA inquired if NCOSH or local COSH committees will know about harassment and violence complaints. PIPSC further inquired how these complaints will be handled at the local COSH level.</p> <p>Erin Skrapek explained that the current directive and guidelines provide the process for how to handle these cases and that currently NCOSH is aware of violence complaints but not harassment. Going forward, if there is a finding of harassment found to be legitimate, the local COSH would be advised but the names of the implicated individuals would be kept confidential. The intent will be to provide a summary of the situation without names being shared, however it may be hard in some cases as the situation may be quite widely known and obvious. Each case will need to be delicately managed so that employees can be assured that they can feel safe to come forward without fears of reprisal.</p> <p><b><u>Audit of COI Management</u></b></p> <p>Erin Skrapek shared that timelines are a little behind schedule for the Audit of the Conflict of Interest Management program but an analysis of positions at risk has been conducted. This list will be shared with the Bargaining Agents and a follow up meeting will take place. Once the Conflict of Interest policy is finalized there will be training happening after.</p> <p>Some of the changes to the process will include the automation of the self-declaration form which should facilitate the process for identifying COI situations. Further a few key elements have been elaborated on within the policy speaking to: Gifts and Hospitality and Adjunct Professorships and these should help to clarify expectations for employees and considerations that should be undertaken when entertaining these situations.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Erin Skrapek further added that going forward, mandatory requirements will state that a more standard timeline is required for self-declaring and this is meant to protect employees from a potential COI situation arising so that employees understand the implications. Erin shared that if an individual now believes that they are in a COI situation they should make a declaration. Further Erin clarified that she in her role as Senior Ethics Officer has the delegation to make the final decision on a COI case, but this happens only after extensive consultations have been completed.</p> <p>PIPSC inquired if all requests for Leave Without Pay have to go through the Ethics office and the answer is No. Erin explained that not all requests for LWOP are flagged, only those that may (for instance) have an individual going to work in another organization that does similar work. There are of course a variety of situations, but each one can be reviewed on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The RCEA inquired what will happen with all of the consultation that is required to take place between now and January 2021 and if the work is not able to be completed as forecasted?</p> <p>In response, Erin Skrapek shared that while there are many competing projects underway, the Harassment Policy has to become the priority because it is legislated so the COI work may have to be delayed a little. The hope is to move everything forward as soon as possible.</p> <p>Erin Skrapek further extended a “thank you” to the Bargaining Agents for their efforts with the Research Integrity Policy Directive on Communication and Dissemination. This Directive went to the Senior Executive Committee and has been approved with a few minor revisions and it will be launched soon. The Final Version of the Directive will be sent to the Bargaining Agents by Erin shortly.</p>	
<p><b>102.8</b></p>	<p><b>Wellness Article and Updates + EDI Stats</b></p> <p>Emily Harrison shared that the HR Branch has been very busy on the Wellness front. On the 5<sup>th</sup> of March 2020 the Wellness Strategy was presented to the Senior Executive Committee and it was approved. Since that time, efforts have shifted to focusing on pandemic related wellness supports. Since the pandemic began Karine Constantineau has delivered over 50 presentations to approximately 2500 participants, which included employees, supervisors and specific teams on Wellness at NRC. Karine has also prepared a 2 hour session for supervisors on Mental Health (MH) and Wellness for supervisors. Two sessions have been held thus far with others scheduled to take place over the next month. In keeping with the themes of the MH Commission “Working mind” training will be rolled out more extensively at a future time.</p> <p>Additional Wellness guidance has been shared with NRC employees in ECHO articles, in messages from Iain Stewart, Emily Harrison and Dale McMillan all pointing to wellness resources. The NRC Wellness Portal is available to all employees online as well. NRC has worked hard to stay connected with other government programs on wellness as well to seek other opportunities for employees to take part in when they are interested.</p>	

	<p>The current struggles of managing workloads, working in isolation, the impact of having employees away and others remaining, burnout, difficulties with productivity and working in uncertain times have been key areas for employees at NRC and have highlighted the need for additional supports for people dealing with stress.</p> <p>The RCEA inquired about whether the Public Service Employee Survey is going to be held this year.</p> <p>Management responded that the PSES will most likely be launched in November 2020 and this year's survey will include some COVID-related topics along with remote-work questions. NRC has asked if results can be broken down into smaller sub groups such that there can be a depiction of the differences between the various sub groups. This would be key for larger research centres and teams like AERO and IRAP. Results from the survey will not be available until at least the spring of 2021.</p> <p><u>EDI Update</u></p> <p>The latest statistics on employment equity were shared with the Bargaining Agents.</p> <p>Management shared that NRC is accountable for putting measures in place to make sure that the workforce is representative of the labour market availability for groups that have faced historical disadvantage and underrepresentation as addressed by the EE act.</p> <p>In reviewing the statistics, Management shared that NRC saw a decline in its representation levels last year when new Labour Market Availability (LMA) rates were applied. The Labour Market according to most recent census is more diverse as a result of more immigration, and also having a broadened definition of disability.</p> <p>Statistics showed that as of the end of June 2020, at the aggregate level: Women were at 100% of LMA, Visible Minorities at 86.7%, Indigenous at 51.2% and Persons With Disabilities at 36%.</p> <p>Management further shared that there is a new campaign planned for October 2020 to encourage self-identification (including testimonials on why it is important to self-identify).</p> <p>There will also be a session for hiring managers on inclusive hiring and steps they can take to increase representation through jobs and assignment opportunities that can arise.</p> <p>Dan Wayner and Emily Harrison are currently working on a review of NRCs recruitment, retention and HR systems through the EDI lens. They will need to report back to SEC by December 2020. Some of this review will feed into the next EDI strategy.</p> <p>The Committee on EDI has been solicited for feedback and this is also feeding in to the process. There will be more information on this forthcoming and it will be shared with the Bargaining Agents as well.</p>	
--	---	--

ITEM	104 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>The Bargaining Agents inquired about how the Finitiative project on the hiring process will be impacted by these EDI initiatives. They also asked if Gender Based Analysis is being incorporated into the Finitiative projects.</p> <p>The RCEA had some specific questions about the data and understanding how the results were calculated.</p> <p>PIPSC inquired how positions are depicted in the EE stats and why they are coded the way they appear in the reports.</p> <p>Management responded that any specific questions can be directed to Keith Blundon or Emily Harrison to understand the exact breakdown. It was explained that when positions are classified they assigned a National Occupational Code which then places them into a job categories. The statistics outlined in the reports speak to various areas and jobs that have various levels of labour market availability and also shows where there are gaps in who is occupying NRC's positions.</p> <p>Management also explained how it is important that the Finitiative projects align with NRC's EDI strategy. Everything may not easily mesh together so there will be meetings with all of the leads of the Finititiave projects to seek an understanding and to ensure there is no over-lapping that is going to occur in finding productive solutions for these projects.</p>	
<b>New Business</b>		
<p><b>104.4</b></p>	<p><b>Domestic Violence Leave</b></p> <p>The RCEA inquired into the process that takes place when an individual needs to take Domestic Violence Leave and how this time is recorded.</p> <p>Management responded that the primary concern is to ensure confidentiality and that the NRC is not tracking when people take this leave and as such no code has been created. The delegation to approve domestic violence leave is low (at the supervisor level) with the assumption that employees needing this leave would not want to speak about it with many people. Additionally, if an employee went to HR to seek approval, the employee would then be referred back to their supervisor. Supervisors have been directed to approve and support this leave for their employees and as such they would code the leave to 0699 – other paid leave. Management explained that there have been very few cases at NRC requiring this leave but these have not been widely discussed nor shared and no individuals have been denied this leave.</p> <p>The RCEA inquired what an employee should do if they do not wish to speak with their supervisor directly.</p> <p>Management responded that while it is normally the supervisor who is informed first, the employee may choose to go to another individual like the Ombudsperson and that is acceptable as well. However the approval for the leave under time code 0699 would come at the supervisor level, so they will find out that the leave is requested.</p>	

ITEM	104 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Should this case happen and the employee seeks support from the Ombudsperson, the requested leave will be approved and every effort made to respect the confidentiality of the situation. If there were issues with the direct supervisor, the Ombuds-person could facilitate informing the director that time will be taken on 0699 and the supervisor should approve of this leave. Given the few instances that this leave has been used, NRC has not encountered this situation quite yet but it is possible that it could in the future. Each case will be handled delicately with the primary concern for the individual.</p>	
<p><b>104.5</b></p>	<p><b>RO/RCO Promotions Statistics</b></p> <p>RO/RCO Promotions Statistics for Degree 3 and Degree 4 cases was shared with the members of the JCC.</p> <p>PIPSC shared their concerns that while they appreciate seeing the data on where people are being refused at the HRPC, they would appreciate knowing the data for those who are refused at the Research Centre level. The bigger concern for PIPSC knowing if their members are progressing or not. Is it because management has denied submission to the HRPC or is it because the employee has chosen not to submit? And if so, what are the reasons around the employee choosing not to submit?</p> <p>PIPSC shared that feedback is often given by a supervisor and because they don't have the context from Management to give the feedback, the information given to the employee is often not helpful nor constructive. Additionally, PIPSC feels that the feedback coming back to the employee needs to be clear, helpful and obvious whether it is a small tweak or significant work to get a case stronger. PIPSC says that employees want to have confidence that this submission will meet the mark going forward. PIPSC suggested that maybe there needs to be an RO/RCO Promotion 101 type course offered.</p> <p>Management shared that there currently is a project underway where Emily Harrison and Dan Wayner are looking to see if there are any EDI factors that may also impact decisions to not submit a case. In providing data back to PIPSC, Management stated that they also need to be conscious of whether individual information can be shared but in a protected way. Management also inquired with PIPSC if the issue is that there is a specific RC or others that a preventing people from putting cases going forward and whether the feedback has been helpful or not.</p> <p>Management shared that the provision of feedback has been an evolving process but the ultimate goal has been to ensure that the feedback is helpful. Management does acknowledge that there may be some supervisors that are unsure how to communicate the feedback, so they may need help in providing the details such that they are able to clarify the reasons why a case is not successful or being submitted. Management agrees that there need to be opportunities to help increase awareness.</p> <p>Management commits to exploring the prospect of having an education course for supervisors in guiding them to have these conversations about promotions feedback.</p>	<p><b>E. Harrison</b></p>

ITEM	104 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
104.6	<p><b>December Shutdown for FY 2020/2021</b></p> <p>The RCEA shared that there have been discussions on the topic of December Shutdown occurring at the weekly meetings with President. What has been conveyed is that people who are on full time 0699 (other paid leave) are not able to bank shutdown hours. The RCEA inquired about whether there is a consistent approach across NRC for handling December Shutdown for all other employees who are not on full time 0699 (other paid leave). They shared that they have heard from their members who have been told that as a result of their teleworking they are not eligible to bank December shutdown hours.</p> <p>Management responded that NRC is looking for people to be flexible. So some people are working at different points during the day but putting in their regular number of work hours. There are now fewer people who are using 0699. Notwithstanding this, December shutdown hours will not be approved until employees have worked their regular number of work hours.</p> <p>Management stated that Overtime will be approved if the person is told they need to work by a supervisor outside of the normal working hours as per their collective agreements. Further, people who are working full time at home should be given approval for working extra time to put towards December Shutdown. Even if an employee is working non-consecutive hours, supervisors should allow their employees to bank their shutdown hours if they have completed their daily working hours. The expectation though is that employees are operating in good faith, where people are working their hours and producing good quality work. Management stated that where employees cannot bank the hours, they can use vacation or other banked leave to cover off the December Shutdown time away as has always been the case.</p> <p>The RCEA states that they believe that their members are operating in good faith. They stated that if an employee works extra time on a weekend this is overtime and it should be paid at the premium rate. Given this, if the employee then chooses to use this Overtime worked to be banked against December shutdown they also believe that it should be banked using the premium hours worked and not straight time hours.</p> <p>The RCEA wants a communication to go out on the subject of December Shutdown to all employees informing them that they can work the extra time if they are working full time to be able to enter their working time and extra hours up to March 31<sup>st</sup> 2021.</p> <p>Management responded that NRC is currently waiting on further guidance from OCHRO but that there is an article upcoming in ECHO that could be used to inform and also provide some scenarios.</p> <p>The RCEA responded that an ECHO article is not specific enough in their opinion and they request that an email be sent out as soon as possible titled: "December Shutdown" so that the topic is specific and obvious to all employees.</p>	



ITEM	104 <sup>th</sup> JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>This means that where there have been deviations from a Standard COVID Operating Procedure, problems can arise and the RCEA feels that there needs to be managers in the workplace to address these situations. Further, the RCEA feels that this does not send a great message to those that are in the workplace.</p> <p>Management commits that they will bring this information and these concerns up to Dale McMillan at the September's 15<sup>th</sup> meeting with Senior Management and may ask if there is a possibility to explore intermittent presence in the workplace where there can be managers in M-3 close by if M-4 is at 50% population in the workplace.</p>	<p><b>A.Campbell</b></p>
<p><b>104.8</b></p>	<p><b>Vacation Leave Carry-Over</b></p> <p>The RCEA raises the issue of Vacation Leave carry-over in the context of what was shared about compensatory leave. They shared that at the end of July, this topic was brought to the BMSC committee and the response back was that NRC will need to be flexible. There were no specifics stated and as such COVID related project-people were implicated. The RCEA says that there seems to be a strong reluctance to allow for carry over. People have worked tremendously long hours on the COVID projects yet there seems to be a lack of recognition for their hard work by management. The RCEA is bothered that they have not heard from management and they have no ability to help inform their members as no official decision has been taken. Further the optimal window of time to use vacation leave in summer has passed and the next windows are Christmas and March Break.</p> <p>The RCEA says that some members have been given a small amount of reassurance and encouragement to take their leave, but employees are still unable to take the time off due to work and now family commitments. The RCEA says the groups impacted are from HHT and Medical Devices.</p> <p>Management stated that there are some groups in those research centres who have been told that they can carry-over, so it is unclear where the confusion is coming from. Management shared that NRC must continue to still manage the cap on vacation leave and people still need to schedule vacation leave however there is still some uncertainty around 0699 and what will happen there which may be why people are expressing concern. Management is willing to discuss possible options but these are going to be for specific groups only.</p> <p>Management will respond on this topic offline to keep this matter moving.</p>	<p><b>E.Harrison</b></p>
<p><b>104.9</b></p>	<p><b>Round Table</b></p> <p>There were no round table items raised.</p>	
	<p>Next meeting is scheduled for December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2020. Catharine Fraser will be the Chair of this Meeting.</p>	
	<p><b>Meeting adjourned at: 2:00 pm</b></p>	