

**Minutes**  
**Human Resources Labour Management Consultation Committee (HRLMCC)**  
**January 11, 2011**

**Management Representatives**

Lynette Cox, ADM, Human Resources Branch	Michelle Laframboise, Director, Compensation, LR and Classification
Donna Richard, DG, National HR Services	Martine Sigouin, Manager, Labour Relations
Deirdre Keane, DG, HR Corporate Programs	Michèle Hort, Senior LR Advisor
Don Bilodeau, DG, HR Strategic Planning, Performance Measurement, Monitoring and Systems	

**Labour Representatives**

Luc Gervais, CAPE (Labour Relations Officer)	Bill Sukloff, PIPSC (President, National Consultation Team)
Ole Jacobsen, PIPSC (Vice-President, National Consultation Team) (Absent)	Paul Cameron, IBEW (Absent)
Manon Desormeaux, UEW-PSAC (Service Officer)	Vivian Gates, ACFO (Absent)
Daryl Hoelke, UEW-PSAC (Executive Assistant)	William Pynn, UEW-PSAC (National President) (Absent)

Items	Issues	Actions
1. Review and approval of Agenda	The Agenda was approved.	
2. Review of minutes and action items from last meeting	<p><i>One outstanding item from the meeting on April 13, 2010, was reviewed:</i></p> <p><u>Item 5 – Pension Buyback:</u>            Human Resources (HR) informed the bargaining agents that they were in the process of preparing letters to be sent to PWGSC/Superannuation Branch with a copy to the employee.</p> <p>For employees who have not yet received a response, please note that their files are still being reviewed.</p> <p><i>Two outstanding items from the meeting on July 15, 2010, were reviewed.</i></p> <p><u>Item 4 – Quarterly Reports on Long term Acting appointments and terms:</u>            HR informed the unions that they are unable to produce a list of Sunset employees at this point. The data needs to be validated in order to ensure accurate information. Some information on sunset positions is available in the Dashboard. HR is willing to share the information, and will as soon as they have the system capacity to produce it.</p> <p><u>CPU (box to provide access to UEW):</u>            HR offered to have a CPU provided to UEW in order for them to have access to EC's Intranet. HR is working with the Chief Information Officer Branch (CIOB) representatives to find the best way to do this.</p>	<p>HR confirmed that they will inform employees when the files go to PWGSC/Superannuation Branch.</p> <p>HR is working with CIOB to find the most effective and efficient way to do this.</p>

	<p><i>One item from the meeting on October 5, 2010 was reviewed:</i></p> <p><u>Informal Conflict Management System</u>          UEW noted that it did not attend the meeting of October 5, 2010 and as such should not have been identified in the minutes. HR agreed to amend the minutes in order to remove the reference to UEW. UEW also asked about the last paragraph and what was meant by it. It was discussed among the group and agreed that it was not clear, therefore HR agreed to re-write it to make it clearer.</p>	<p>HR to amend the minutes of the HRLMCC of October 5, 2010 for the section on Informal Conflict Management System.</p>
<p>3. Budget</p>	<p>This issue was brought forward by the bargaining agents. They wanted an update on the department's current budget situation, as well as to discuss the impact of the HR branch restructuring on EC managers and employees.</p> <p>HR stated that many branches have had to reduce their budget and are evaluating their options. There have been no decisions on a common departmental approach on how to deal with budgetary constraints (e.g. a departmental staffing freeze). Each branch is being asked to develop their own approach. Several of the Branch Heads are doing so by minimizing travel, reviewing the necessity for overtime and delaying staffing of some positions. Everyone is expected to meet their budgets.</p> <p>UEW asked if there were some branches that were more affected than others. HR's response was that those branches considered "enablers", such as Finance, CIOB and Human Resources Branch (HRB) are more affected however; there are also some programs that are affected as well.</p> <p>PIPSC had questions on budget pressures within HRB, more specifically on the centralization of a number of services and the possible reduction of services. The Assistant Deputy Minister (ADM) HRB assured the unions that the department will continue to comply with legislative obligations and the clients will be kept informed during transition.</p>	
<p>4. Survey on learning plans</p>	<p>PIPSC requested information on a Survey on Learning Plans being conducted by the Department. They have heard concerns from their members that requests for training which are presented in the employee's learning plan are not funded on a continual basis.</p> <p>HR indicated that they conducted a short annual survey that focuses on whether or not employees have a documented learning plan and if so, is it or will it be fully implemented by the end of a given fiscal year. For 2009-2010 the survey reported that over 90% of employees had learning plans and that by the end of the year over 60% of these plans had been fully implemented. This year's survey will also ask employees if they have written performance objectives for 2010-2011 and had a mid-year review of the performance objectives with their supervisor/manager. The survey has not assessed or gathered statistics on the perception of fairness and/or accessibility to learning activities.</p> <p>CAPE asked if there was an established minimum number of days of</p>	<p>HR to send the Learning Policy to unions.</p>

	<p>training per year per employee. HR explained that the equivalent of 1.5% of the salary budget is targeted for training and that Branch Heads can decide how they want to distribute the amount to best meet their needs. HR also mentioned the departmental Learning Policy that addresses, among other things, learning plans.</p>	
<p>5. Agenda item submission</p>	<p>In order to ensure that labour-management consultation meetings are as efficient and effective as possible, HR brought up the importance of having sufficient information from the bargaining agents regarding their submitted agenda items. A discussion took place on the most effective way to ensure this is done. The unions and HR agreed that the unions would send their agenda items in the following format:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• subject</li> <li>• context</li> <li>• objectives</li> </ul> <p>It was agreed that the agenda item submissions as well as the subject, context and objectives would be shared by HR with the all of the bargaining agents (not just the one that submitted the item) prior to the meeting.</p>	<p>HR to share the agenda submissions with the unions prior to every meeting.</p>
<p>6. Classification</p>	<p>UEW requested an update on the Classification Center of Expertise (CoE) activities. More precisely, they asked how the CoE was addressing the backlog of generic job descriptions and how the budget pressures are impacting classification services, and they requested more information on how work descriptions are drafted (who does what).</p> <p>HR clarified that there is no backlog on generic work descriptions and that they are moving ahead according to plan and both the CR and AS group generics should be completed by the end of the fiscal year.</p> <p>As for how the CoE is dealing with budget pressures, HR stated that although the classification CoE has a few vacancies that they cannot staff at the present time due to the freeze, the turnaround time for operational classification activities has not been affected. Resources have been reassigned to priority areas.</p> <p>Lastly, HR clarified that a review of duties is usually initiated by the manager – in cases where positions are vacant or there has been a change (e.g. in reporting relationship). Alternatively, positions have a review date and when possible, HR advises management of positions that have reached the review date. Managers would then determine where an update and review is required. The development of unique job descriptions is the manager’s responsibility, with the assistance of their HR classification advisor. Generic job descriptions are developed by the CoE, with management input.</p> <p>More information on the roles and responsibilities of management in classification, as well as the processes, is available on the Intranet site, under “Manager’s Corner”.</p>	

<p>7. Guidelines for consultation on reorganization</p>	<p>In response to a question from PIPSC on when should the unions be consulted on restructuring and reorganizations, the ADM HRB explained that there are no specific guidelines on consultation on reorganization, but the following are important aspects to take into consideration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• size</li> <li>• impact</li> <li>• sensibility</li> </ul> <p>The ADM HRB spoke of the HRB restructuring to demonstrate those points.</p> <p>UEW wanted to clarify that staff meetings where union representatives are present are not to be considered consultation with the unions. UEW stated that it doesn't negate the fact that there has to be an official consultation even if a union representative is at the meeting.</p> <p>UEW also asked that branch issues be brought to the HRLMCC; HR indicated that Branch Labour Management Consultation Committees (LMCC) are the appropriate forum for branch issues. It would be very difficult to ensure that all of the appropriate participants and decision-makers are available at the HRLMCC to make decisions on behalf of the branches.</p>	<p>HR to have a discussion with Portfolio Directors on when to consult.</p>
<p>8. Terms and acting under four months</p>	<p>UEW raised a concern regarding acting assignments less than four months in length. At issue is that acting assignments, independent of their initial length, should be advertised and made available to all employees so as to prevent just a select few being given the opportunity to act for these short periods. HR explained that some flexibility is required when appointing employees on a temporary basis to meet short term operational requirements or to provide staff with developmental opportunities and the departmental policy on acting appointments provides this flexibility.</p> <p>HR also explained that long term acting assignments continue to be monitored by the Executive Management Committee (EMC) via the dashboard statistics. If there is an indication that there is a concern in a particular branch, it is brought to the Branch Head's attention. HR professionals continue to work with managers to ensure that the decisions they take respect the staffing values and their delegated responsibilities and accountabilities in HR management.</p>	<p>Policy on acting appointments to be sent to the unions.</p>
<p>9. Professional Services contracts</p>	<p>PIPSC is concerned about contractors who are in the workplace for long periods (more than 6 months) doing the same work as employees and requested a report on trends and statistics on the use of professional service contracts in place in the department.</p> <p>HR responded that there are no reports on trends or analysis available at this time and that there are no resources available at the present time to do this analysis. The data is available on the department's Internet site and the bargaining agents are invited to use this data if they wish to conduct an analysis.</p>	

<p>10. Electronic Leave Self Service</p>	<p>PIPSC had concerns about the accessibility of the electronic leave system. HR explained that EC is actively working and leading work with the Government of Canada Human Resources Management System Program Centre at Public Works and Government Services Canada to identify business requirements so that Oracle (the PeopleSoft vendor) can respond to required changes. The Adaptive Computer Technology Centre is involved in these steps to address the current software releases and the future software upgrades so that Environment Canada employees and users across government will have access to self service functionality such as Leave Management.</p>	
<p>11. Dashboards</p>	<p>The September 30, 2010 Dashboard was presented to the unions. It will be presented to the unions twice a year (mid- and end-of-year) to coincide with the presentation made at EMC.</p> <p>There was a brief discussion on items contained in the dashboard and the rationale behind the selection of certain statistics instead of others.</p>	
<p>12. Standing Item – Tracking tool</p>	<p>The tracking tool was sent out to union members and was updated on the website on March 31, 2010. (<a href="http://intranet.ec.gc.ca/hr-rh/default.asp?lang=En&amp;n=AD171FCA-1">http://intranet.ec.gc.ca/hr-rh/default.asp?lang=En&amp;n=AD171FCA-1</a>)</p>	<p>Ongoing. The tracking tool will be updated and sent to the unions prior to each HRLMCC</p>
<p>13. Round Table</p>	<p>UEW reiterated its position with respect to Sector meetings. UEW would not agree to establishing regular Sector meetings. UEW supports holding Ad Hoc meetings depending on the agenda items.</p>	

The meeting was adjourned at 16:50.

<p><b>Prepared by: Michèle Hort, Senior Labour Relations Officer</b></p>
<p><b>Approved by: Lynette Cox, Assistant Deputy Minister, Human Resources Branch</b></p>

*Date Sent to Unions: March 2, 2011*

*Feedback Received by Unions: March 3, 2011*

*Final version: March 11, 2011*