

## THE UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE

### PROFESSIONAL STAFF CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (PSCC)

Notes of a meeting of the **Professional Staff Consultative Committee** held at 10:00 am on Tuesday 16 December 2014 in The Canberra Room, The Chancellery.

---

#### PRESENT:

University – Sharon Champness, Paul Munro, Greg Kerr

NTEU – David Rambaldi, Lance Dale, Jenny Whittard

CPSU – Sue Freeman, Jodie Ryan, Jann Jeffries

#### APOLOGIES:

University- Jackie Fox (Secretary)

NTEU – Margaret Clarke, Fran Munt

CPSU – Nick Koster

Chair - Sharon Champness

Note-taker – Greg Kerr

---

#### 1. NOMENCLATURE OF GSCC TO PSCC

The Consultative Committee agreed to the change of name for this consultative committee from General Staff Consultative Committee (GSCC) to Professional Staff Consultative Committee (PSCC) in line with the new title for non-academic staff captured in the Professional Staff Enterprise Agreement 2014.

<b>Action 1:</b> All members – Refer to this consultative Committee as the Professional Staff Consultative Committee (PSCC).
--

#### 2. IMPLEMENTATION OF A RECOGNISED EXTERNAL JOB EVALUATION METHOD

Ms Sharon Champness, Director, People and Workforce Strategy, noted that discussion in relation to the implementation of a recognised external job evaluation method arises out of clause 9.5 of the Professional Staff Enterprise Agreement 2014.

Ms Champness advised that consideration has been given to Hay and the Mercer Job Evaluation System. Ms Champness provided a brief description of the Mercer CED Job Evaluation System and indicated that Mercer is the main provider of job evaluation and remuneration advice to Universities in Australia.

Ms Champness advised that there are two stages for the implementation of a job evaluation method:

1. Train and accredit staff (15 HR staff have been trained in the Mercer Job Evaluation Method); and
2. Work with Mercer to understand their standard evaluation system and establish work value boundaries for the HEW Classification Structure.

Union representatives asked for the points to grade table to be provided to the Unions. Ms Champness advised that she would be happy to explain the points to grade table but not to provide a copy.

Ms Champness noted that the Mercer Job Evaluation System would be supplementary to the HEW Level Descriptors and would provide extra rigour in the job evaluation process. It is important to ensure position descriptions are clear and accurate. The Human Resource Services team has established and is currently implementing a new position description template which includes areas of accountability and measures of performance.

Union representatives expressed concern with correspondence received from HR which could be interpreted that all units within the University were now required to update all position descriptions into the new format within the next 12 months. Ms Champness explained that this was not the intention of the correspondence. It was the intention that all PDs should be updated to the new format as they are reviewed and revised, however, HR staff are not mandating that all PDs must be updated to the new format within 12 months; although this is being encouraged. Given that PDs should generally be reviewed on an annual basis, it is likely that many will be updated within the next 12 months. However, if the current PD is still an accurate description of the role, there is no need to update the PD just because there is a new format. HR staff are strongly encouraging the new PD format to be used where the role is being recruited for and for any new PDs that are being written, as the new PD assists with role clarity.

Union representatives expressed concern that including measures of performance within a position description could be used punitively and some measures may be very specific (for example, a turnover time of 24 hours). Ms Champness explained that the position description will describe how performance is measured, however, targets of performance are best described in the Performance Development and Review process.

Union representatives expressed concern that the University should have been more consultative in choosing a methodology for job evaluation and they would have liked to have considered other methodologies. Ms Champness advised that the Mercer Job Evaluation System has not been implemented and it was the University's intention today to consult on the method and how it could be integrated with other processes.

Discussion took place regarding how an external method could be integrated in the University's existing recruitment and classification review processes.

Union representatives asked whether there is potential for extra people to be trained, particularly Inquiry Officers who review classification outcomes. Ms Champness advised that the University will consider this.

<b>Action 2:</b> University – consider discussion and who should be trained in the external job evaluation method.
--

### **3. ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE – STANDING ITEM**

Mr Paul Munro, Associate Director ER, advised that the University will provide a consolidated report on the overall status of all Organisational Change processes and provide a summary of the outcomes to the unions by the end of January 2015.

A brief discussion took place regarding changes in the following areas:

- **Council Services and Chancellery**

Union representatives expressed concern that the University may be holding off on commencing recruitment action until staff have left the University, as there are positions that are still not filled but there are staff already displaced.

- **Student and Academic Services**

Union representatives raised concerns in relation to the process that was applied for the filling of positions and commented that they had received very negative feedback about the “cascading” process and its impact on staff.

Union representatives stated that it is fairer to deal with placements at-grade first.

The NTEU requested data on placements (both numbers and by level) and the total number of staff who exited the University as part of the process.

Union representatives requested that staff be given the opportunity to provide feedback on the process as part of the evaluation. The University will provide an opportunity early in 2015 to seek feedback on what could have been done better.

- **Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL)**

Union representatives noted that in regard to the teaching spaces support function, this is still outstanding and it is not clear where the former CTL positions ended up. There are two teaching spaces support staff from CTL who are not yet placed, but positions are being advertised externally. Mr Munro said he would follow up and advise.

- **Infrastructure and Facilities Services**

University representatives advised that there is no outsourcing of mail or logistics in the current tendering process.

- **Information Technology**

University representatives indicated that it is possible that there may be a change process next year with the appointment of the new Chief Information Officer.

- **Financial Services**

University representatives advised that it is likely there will be a change process in early 2015.

- **Faculties and Schools**

University representatives advised that there is likely to be a review of the Faculties and Schools structure, however, there are no plans or briefing papers as yet and the University is still considering the process to progress the review. At this point, the University wants to engage staff in a conversation about the overall structure. If this does proceed it is unlikely that any paper would be forthcoming before mid-2015.

- **Research Services**

This is a possibility but no formal consideration as yet.

- **Review of International and Advancement**

University representatives reported that the outcome of the external review is known and has been made available to the Executive Committee. There will be a conversation with staff, expected to be in January 2015, which would then lead to a change process.

**Action 3:** i. University – By end of January 2015, provide a consolidated report on the overall status of current Organisational Change processes including a summary of the outcomes.  
ii. University – Follow up and advise on the status of the two teaching spaces support staff from CTL not yet placed.

#### 4. REVIEWS

4.1 **Finance**– see notes under Item 3

4.2 **International & Advancement**– see notes under Item 3

#### 5. PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Ms Champness advised that a Performance Expectations Framework for Professional Staff is being made available for staff to trial during 2015. The Framework is different for Professional Staff than it is for Academic Staff, as it is not KPI based but is more a capability framework (the basis for KPIs would be the position description).

Ms Champness advised that the University will provide a briefing on the framework to the Unions in 2015. It was noted that there has already been staff feedback on the draft document and the Unions were invited to provide feedback.

**Action 5:** University - Provide a briefing to the unions on the Performance Expectations Framework for Professional Staff.

## 6. SCHEDULE OF GSCC/PSCC MEETINGS FOR 2015

Consultative Committee members noted the University's proposed schedule of items to be dealt with as part of the EA implementation.

NTEU representatives indicated that their priority for discussion in 2015 is the redundancy/career transition scheme.

Following discussion, it was agreed that to accommodate attendees' availability, University representatives will aim to schedule the PSCC and CSCC meetings on a Tuesday and the ASCC and TCC meetings on a Wednesday, with the first meetings to be scheduled during the week beginning 9 February 2015.

**Action 6:** University - Schedule consultative committee dates for 2015.

---