

Minutes
Human Resources Labour Management Consultation Committee (HRLMCC)
July 12, 2011

Management Representatives

Lynette Cox, ADM, Human Resources Branch	Don Bilodeau, DG, HR Planning, Perf. Measurement and Systems
Donna Richard, DG, National HR Services	Martine Sigouin, Manager, LR
Deirdre Keane, DG, HR Corporate Programs	Carol Doiron, Senior LR Advisor

Guest

Randy Larkin, A/DG, Finance Directorate

Labour Representatives

Michel Charrette, CAPE (Labour Relations Officer)	Bill Sukloff, PIPSC (President, National Consultation Team)
Manon Desormeaux, UEW-PSAC (Service Officer)	Pierre Tourigny, PIPSC (Steward)
Daryl Hoelke, UEW-PSAC (Executive Assistant)	

Items	Issues	Actions
Due to the fact that the guest Randy Larkin could not stay for the full meeting, Item # 5 was addressed first.		

5. Employee Support Mechanisms	<p>Management provided information on the 3 key mechanisms being developed within Environment Canada (EC) to support employees as the department realigns its resources to the 2011-12 budget.</p> <p>(a) Internal priority clearance system: An internal priority clearance inventory of affected & surplus employees will be kept centrally by the Human Resources (HR) Branch. For each staffing action, including assignments of more than 4 months, managers will be required to look at the inventory to determine if there are employees with the required skill set. In addition to being in the EC inventory, surplus employees will also be placed in the Public Service Commission (PSC) priority system to be considered for positions across the Public Service.</p> <p>Canadian Association of Professional Employee (CAPE) asked if EC will be participating in the alternation process.</p> <p>Management explained that, at this point, EC will be providing a guarantee of a reasonable job offer (RJO); therefore, employees will not have access to the 3 options outlined in the collective agreements and the National Joint Council (NJC) directive. As such, the alternation process is only applicable to opting employees.</p> <p>CAPE then asked if EC will consider alternations with opting employees from other departments.</p> <p>Management reiterated that the DM has clearly provided direction that the department's priority is to take care of EC employees; therefore, alternations with other departments will have to be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>(b) EC credit union: This is a mechanism whereby branches who have surplus salary dollars can loan these dollars to a branch that has a salary deficit or that</p>	Statistics will be provided at ECLMCC and HRLMCC
--------------------------------	---	--

	<p>requires dollars to staff a position on a short-term basis. In addition, this mechanism will allow the loan of a person from a branch that has an affected/surplus employee to a branch that has a need for a certain skill set but does not have the salary dollars. These mechanisms will assist branches to meet approved priority work commitments.</p> <p>(c) Communications strategy: Management is considering a proposed communication strategy which includes the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -July 25: DM meeting with unions at the national level to provide a preliminary assessment. After this meeting, some ADM's will hold separate meetings with union representatives to discuss their proposed branch strategy in more detail. -end of July: DM will send a message to all employees with a status report. -July to Sept: Branch heads will implement their individual branch strategy. <p>CAPE asked if it is possible for unions to receive advanced copies of letters/emails being sent to employees. He indicated that it would make it easier to address concerns. Professional Institute of Public Service of Canada (PIPSC) suggested that these emails/letters could be added on the respective branch website.</p> <p>Management indicated that they will try to accommodate both requests and encouraged the unions to make this same request to ADMs directly.</p> <p>Management reiterated that the current realignments are due to the budget impacts for this fiscal year 2011-2012. The Strategic and Operating Review launched by the government will only impact the fiscal years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014.</p>	<p>UEW will confirm by the end of the week with Deirdre if they are available for the subsequent meetings with ADMs on July 25</p> <p>HR will verify if ADM letters/emails to all staff can be added to branch website</p>
<p>1. Approval of Agenda</p>	<p>The agenda was accepted.</p>	
<p>2. Review of minutes and action items from last meeting</p>	<p><i>Item from the meeting on July 15, 2010:</i></p> <p><u>CPU:</u> Union of Environment Workers (UEW) was provided with a departmental CPU box which allowed access to the Department's intranet site. UEW expressed its appreciation to the Department for its efforts to provide UEW with access to its intranet. However, after trying the CPU, UEW did not find it very functional and as a result, requested that the Department arrange to have it picked up. The Department agreed to make the necessary arrangements.</p> <p><i>Items from the meeting on April 19, 2011:</i></p> <p><u>HR Plans:</u> UEW asked when the unions will be consulted on the HR plans.</p> <p>The Department indicated that the intent is to provide the unions with a consolidated Draft Departmental HR plan once it is completed. These plans will focus on the current workforce impacts resulting from the assigned budget for 2011-12 and key anticipated recruitment and career development initiatives of the branch heads.</p>	<p>EC to pick up CPU from UEW office</p>

	<p><u>EG progression at Environment Canada:</u> UEW requested an update on the situation that had been raised at a regional LMCC regarding the staffing and classification of EG positions. The Department will obtain an update from PYR.</p>	<p>HR will request an update on EG progression from PYR</p>
<p>3. Wording in Letters of Offer</p>	<p>PIPSC asked why the termination letters for some terms indicated that the reason for the termination was lack of program funding when their letters of offer did not include this reason as one of the reasons for terminating employment prior to the end of the contract.</p> <p>The Department explained that the lack of program funding does lead to a lack of work or discontinuance of functions. When there is less or no money in a program, there will be less or no work.</p>	
<p>4. Sunset Terms</p>	<p>UEW had requested an updated list of Sunset Programs and this information was provided before the meeting. UEW asked if the Department could provide the names of employees attached to each Sunset Program. UEW also asked what was the acronym "SPA".</p> <p>The Department reiterated that the names of term employees under Sunset Programs cannot be easily rolled-up in one report. The only way to gather this information is to go through each individual pay file. The Department does not currently have the resources to gather this information.</p> <p>The Department will verify the acronym and if the letters of offer include the name of the Sunset Program.</p> <p>PIPSC expressed concern regarding long periods of time that an employee can work under a Sunset Program.</p> <p>The Department indicated that there is no set timeframe; however, managers are encouraged to regularize the situations as soon as possible where they can. A few years ago, the Department had gone through an exercise to reduce to number of terms under Sunset Programs that had been employed for long periods of time.</p>	<p>HR will verify on the acronym "SPA" and if letters of offer include name of program</p>
<p>5. Employee Support Mechanisms</p>	<p>Discussed at the beginning of the meeting.</p>	
<p>6. Employment Equity</p>	<p>PIPSC asked how the comparison was done in the report provided and asked if the Department has a report showing trends.</p> <p>The Department explained that they follow the requirements from the Canadian Human Rights Commission. The analysis is based on the labour market availability and it is first done at the department level, then at the occupational group & level and then at the branch level. Since branch heads have accountability for regional programs, the information is not reported regionally.</p> <p>The Department will be providing a report showing trends later in the meeting under items 9 & 10.</p>	

<p>7. Harassment Complaints</p>	<p>UEW requested a status update on the impact of the changes made to the Harassment Complaint process back in the fall.</p> <p>The Department indicated that they had not yet done a formal analysis because it had not been one year yet. The revised process was launched in October 2010. However, management did provide the attached summary which indicates improvements in the length of time it takes to process harassment complaints.</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>Harassment Complaint Process</p> </div> <p>Both PIPSC and UEW indicated that they have received feedback to the quality of investigators.</p> <p>Management indicated that HR tries to hire the companies with a good reputation. However, it always welcomes comments and suggested that the unions provide these concerns to Michelle Laframboise, the Departmental Coordinator for the Prevention and Resolution of Harassment in the Workplace.</p>	
<p>8. Contracting Out</p>	<p>UEW expressed concern that with the current financial situation, the Department may turn to contracting to deliver the work, especially if there is no change in workload. They asked if the Department can provide the number of personal contract and temp help.</p> <p>CAPE also suggested that, if the information is not available for the past, the Department could start capturing it for the future.</p> <p>The Department reiterated that our current system is not capable of providing a report with that type of information. They explained that the Department does not have and will not have in the near future the resources to gather this information.</p> <p>CAPE requested that consideration be given to having managers go to the EC priority list of affected/surplus employees prior to contracting out.</p>	<p>HR will explore the option to have work contracted out clear through the EC internal priority system</p>
<p>9. Staffing</p>	<p>UEW requested an update on staffing activities within the Department by Branch as a result of the budget; i.e. vacancies related to indeterminate positions.</p> <p>The Department provided statistics and a discussion followed. Reports will be provided to the unions when they are produced on a quarterly basis.</p>	<p>Provide these stats to unions when they are produced on a quarterly basis</p>
<p>10. Departmental Strength Report</p>	<p>PISCC requested the Departmental Strength Report.</p> <p>The Department provided statistics and a discussion followed. They clearly explained to the unions that the information in this report is a "snap-shot" in time and not an accumulation for the year. This information will be provided to the unions when the reports are produced on a quarterly basis.</p>	<p>Provide these stats to unions when they are produced on a quarterly basis</p>

<p>11. Standing Item – Tracking tool</p>	<p>The tracking tool was sent out to union members and was updated on the website on June 29, 2011: http://intranet.ec.gc.ca/hr-rh/default.asp?lang=En&n=EFF4269B-1.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>12. Round Table</p>	<p>PIPSC thanked the Department for the reports provided and found them to be very useful.</p> <p>CAPE asked if the Department intends to create WFA committees.</p> <p>Management asked the unions how they see the role of a WFA committee.</p> <p>CAPE indicated that they see this committee as a place where rumours can be dispelled, information and updates can be shared. This committee would not look at individual cases, question programs that are cut or reduced or positions declared surplus. It was acknowledged that there may not be a need at this point but there may be a requirement as the numbers become clearer.</p> <p>UEW agreed with the importance of WFA discussions with unions. However, they indicated that the HR Policy Committee could be the forum for WFA discussions. They also suggested that this could become a standing item on the HRLMCC agenda for a while.</p> <p>PIPSC also supports the idea of a WFA committee and indicated that there is an obligation under the collective agreements. Management clarified that the collective agreements state: “Departments or organizations shall establish workforce adjustment committees, where appropriate, to manage the workforce adjustment situations within the department or organization.”</p> <p>The Department will take all these points into consideration and will get back to the unions on an approach.</p>	<p>HR will look at a strategy for WFA committees</p>

The meeting was adjourned at 16:05.

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

Date Sent to Unions: July 22, 2011
Feedback Received by Unions: August 12, 2011
Final version: August 12, 2011