Staff Consultation Committee
(General Staff members) 22 March 2006
Enterprise Bargaining

Chair: Barbara Fergusson
Present: Paul Alderson, Central Library; Gary McLaughlin, Flinders Housing/Central Admin; Charisse Gallagher, Human Resources; Meredith Legg, Pall Care SOM; Maxine Fourmy, Law; Judy Kuckhahr, Humanities; Debbie Kuss, Law; Wendy Hill, Humanities; Stephen Norris, ISD; Tony Clarke, ISD; Karen Siegmann, Health Sciences; Julie Stone, Health Sciences; Debra Hackett, Social Sciences; Marie Cimasko, Social Sciences; Nadia Lucia, Social Sciences; Tony Nugent, SOCPES; Greg Hewitt, SOCPES; Bill Drury, SOCPES; David Bain, Science & Engineering; Pam Smith, Science & Engineering; Tricia Butterfield, SOCPES; Melinda Pike, Science & Engineering; Karen Smith, Psychology/Social Sciences; Mary Addyman, Central Library; Jane Cook, Central Library; Tracy Barlow, Central Library; Peggy Brooksby, Central Library; Natalie Reece, Central Library; Jo Hall, Central Library; Veronica Ghee, Sturt Library; Andy Hollitt, EHLT; Annette Gray, Social Sciences; Vickie Armstrong, Social Sciences; Carol Gibb, Health Sciences; Meg Apsey, Library; Gillian Dooley, Library.
Apologies: Heather Paull; Amanda Bettesworth; Corey Durwood; Leonie Hardcastle.

Welcome

Barbara Fergusson, Executive Director, Administration welcomed all to the forum and gave an overview of the following:

Consultation and Communication Process

- emphasised that the University is committed to direct consultation and communication with staff;
- The importance of having this forum as part of the consultative process;
- The use of the Flinders University Enterprise Bargaining website as one form of communication and consultation;
- John Marshall and Carol Gibb are the elected General Staff representatives who are consulting with General Staff independently of the University. John and Carol have access to a General Staff email listing to enable efficient communication.

Overview of the Enterprise Bargaining process to date

Significant Issues:

- Development of a performance management framework – will be looking for feedback and suggestions from staff.
- The University has provided the General Staff Matters and Academic Staff Matters Working Teams with some draft proposals for the next enterprise agreement. The
NTEU has responded to some of those proposals.

- All parties to this round of enterprise bargaining have been working cooperatively thus far.
- During this round of enterprise bargaining, the University is hoping to achieve:
  - The ability to recruit and retain staff whilst maintaining quality employment environment;
  - A package of salary and conditions which is financially manageable for the University;
  - A HEWRR compliant enterprise agreement;
  - Meet the objectives in the University’s Strategic Plan.
- The next enterprise agreement will look quite different to the current Agreement. It will be principle-based.
- It is contrary to the HEWRRs to have policies embedded in an enterprise Agreement, otherwise reduces the University’s flexibility.
- The policies and procedures will be detailed.
- Any enterprise agreement provisions that are contrary to HEWRRs will be removed.
- Request Staff to trust in the University’s policies and procedures.
- The University will undertake consultative processes regarding changes to policies.
- Formal University consultation processes will change ie ACG & JCG.
- Dispute, Appeal, Review and Grievance provisions have to change to meet HEWRRs.

**Significant Proposals Tabled by the University**

**Management of excess long service leave and recreation leave:**

- There has been a long-standing tradition of accumulation of recreation leave in some areas of the University.
- It is an important principle that staff take their leave.
- Email process currently in place advising those staff (& their supervisors) if they have excess recreation leave.
- Staff and supervisors should work together to develop plans to reduce excess leave.
- Suggestions from staff welcome regarding management of excess leave (may go through EB staff representatives).

**General Comments from meeting regarding management of excess long service leave and recreation leave proposal:**

- *Matter of workload management;*
- *Combination of recreation, long service and flexi leave accumulation – all have to be managed by supervisors and staff;*
- *Recreation leave is there for a reason;*
Solution could be better resourcing for general staff;
Pay out rather than ‘cap’.

Performance Management Framework presented by Mary Solomon:

- 2 handouts provided to meeting – HEWRRs & Performance Management (Key Requirements) and DEST Performance Management Framework (from DEST web-site).
  - ‘Straw’ vote conducted at meeting which revealed that approx 5% had undergone performance review with supervisor in the last 12 months.
  - 2 options for University 1) ‘massage’ current review & planning program or
  - 2) heavily ‘massage’ current program.
  - Either way performance management program has to be in place to meet HEWRRs.
  - Need to turn current framework around to performance assessment-based framework.

Questions posed to meeting:

1. Should there be the same process for HEO 1 – 10?

Responses:
- Look at each group separately because of diversity;
- ‘commercial organisation’ example given where performance and developmental standards for each level are established;
- As there are inconsistencies across faculties need to establish which tasks should be done across levels;
- Establish generic skills required as KPIs;
- Performance management should be driven from the ‘top down’;
- Supervisors should be told as a group that performance management must be undertaken by them;
- Training is essential;
- Current framework is seen as being very broad;
- How do you identify what is ‘good performance’?
- Staff and supervisors need to recognise value of staff undergoing process;
- May have to link incremental progression to performance management process

2. What is your view regarding linking incremental progression to the performance management process?

- Issue regarding 'academic' staff supervising general staff;
- 'holes' in the current system.
3. What is the definition of high performance?

- exceeding industry standards;
- thinking outside the square.

4. What is there to offer a high performer?

- public recognition (beyond small groups);
- 'linked positions' ie across classifications;
- bonuses;
- higher increment step upon appointment;
- flexible working conditions ie working from home;
- 'extraordinary' achievement - bonus plus public recognition;
- support for conference attendance;
- support for study;
- combine training and linking;
- not just rewards but incentives and encouragement;
- 'slush' funds ie free movie tickets;

5. General comments - performance management

- linking is a nightmare for supervisors;
- staff have to wait to move up the promotional structure;
- money doesn't motivate everyone;
- public recognition can create lots of ill-feeling;
- some people are 'stars', whilst others are not;
- may cause under-performers to under perform less;
- improve the current reclassification system as relativities are all over the place;
- job satisfaction is more important than salaries;
- re-training - sense of worth;
- high performing staff already rewarded by ability to move up;
- 'tick box' assessment in conjunction with updated job description;
- subjectivity.

6. General comments - under-performance

- key training area for supervisors;
- cognitive of personal issues;
- can be a de-moralising time;
- supervisors must deal with under-performance straight away;
- demotion.