

Approved Minute of the meeting of the National Joint Negotiating Committee – Side Table Lecturers held on Thursday 26 May 2016 at 10:00 hrs in EIS, Moray Place, Edinburgh.

In Attendance

Charlie Montgomery	Staff Side (Chair)
John Kelly	“ “
Penny Gower	“ “
Pam Currie	“ “
Donnie Gluckstein	“ “
Ian McKay	Management Side (Chair)
Margaret Cook	“ “
Liz McIntyre	“ “
John Gribben	Management Side Secretary
David Belsey	Staff Side Secretary

10/16 Welcome and Apologies

The Staff Side Chair welcomed all to the meeting.

Apologies were noted from, Jim O’Donovan, Rob Wallen, Judy Keir

11/16 Minutes

Joint Secretaries confirmed a draft minute had been prepared, and would be presented at a future NJNC Side Table Lecturers for consideration.

It was agreed that the meeting should be considered as a continuation of the previous NJNC Side Table Lecturers.

12/16 Roadmap & Pay Scales

EIS requested a response to its paper presented in advance of the previous meeting. Management Side advised it did not consider a two point scale could accommodate all the aspects presented in the Management Sides roadmap as a number of factors including costing would determine scales and migration.

EIS acknowledged that the introduction of any new pay scales would cost more, and set out its position that all aspects of the March agreement are independent work streams that can be run in parallel, with pay scales coming first with a May Deadline and others with their stated implementation points.

The EIS set out that shorter pay scales are more progressive, provide greater equality and significantly less scope for discrimination. EIS expressed concern that the Management Side were bringing interdependency to independent work streams which could be considered as breaching the March agreement.

Management Side set out that the contribution from the EIS illustrates the complexity of the agreement at point 5, A – G, and set out their belief that the March agreement is a total package of measures, with a strong focus on the future, which would mean significant modernisation and change. That assumptions should not be made on the agreement where there is no express detail. The EIS welcomed the potential for change, and acknowledged that the micro detail is not set out in the agreement, but that does not alter the terms of the agreement.

Management Side set out that there are some fundamental difference on position, with both sides having differing interpretations of the same agreement, therefore further negotiation and mechanisms would be required to close the gap between both sides.

EIS raised a concern over financing the agreement, and the potential for redundancies, an example was provided of a college who were undertaking a redundancy exercise as a result of the agreement.

Management Side confirmed that costing for the agreement was an integral part of the sectors spending review, and that there was no truth in the named college undertaking a redundancy exercise as a result of the March agreement.

In seeking to make progress, the EIS advised they would alter their position on a two point scale and set out their bottom line of moving to a three point scale. The EIS stressed that it would go no further than a three point scale due to Edinburgh College already operating a 2 point scale and it did not wish to breach the principle of no detriment.

Adjournment:

Management Side advised they were also prepared to alter their position and confirmed they would move to a six point scale – points 5 to 10 (i.e. Level 2 Only) on the previously shared Management Paper proposed roadmap and pay scales for unpromoted lecturers.

Whilst the progress was welcomed by the EIS, it confirmed that it could not accept a six point scale, and set out its disappointment at the lack of progress and failure to meet agreed dates, and what appeared to be a lack of depth or clarity in Management Side proposals.

Management Side set out that it believed in good faith both sides have brought forward proposals on pay scales and a roadmap, believing agreed targets have been met, but significant work remained to be agreed on detail. Management Side confirmed there is no reneging on any aspect of the agreement.

An additional paper (EIS Proposed Roadmap) was tabled by the EIS setting out how the NJNC Pay Deal 2015-17 identified a roadmap, a response to the Management Side's proposed roadmap and an EIS proposed roadmap which included elements of the Management Side roadmap that were within the NRPA.

The Management Side welcomed the paper, independent work streams, EIS advised the paper would be updated and circulated by email.

A discussion ensued around the requirement for greater joint working and sharing of information, a requirement to increase capacity on both sides.

Adjournment:

It was agreed both sides would set out their reasoning and rational for their respectively proposed pay scales.

Management Side advised it could not alter its position on pay scales without further reference to its members. The next meeting of the sectors Employers Association is likely to be 6 June 2016.

It was agreed to meet again on 2 June 2016 with work progressing on Terms and Conditions, it was acknowledged that the EIS progress in this regard is more likely to be more advanced than the Management Side's.

EIS requested further thought be given to scales for promoted lecturers advising that some employees covered by the NRPA include Principals. In addition, the EIS expected Management Side to respond to its proposals on migration or put forward its own proposals

Next Meeting 2 June 2016 - Glasgow -2.00pm