

## **Draft Technical Working Group Notes**

**Meeting held on Thursday 23 February 2017 pm in Argyll Court, Stirling.**

Present:

Carol Scott, Andrew Lawson, Joanna McGillivray, Stephanie Graham, David Gunn, Heather Stevenson

Pam Currie, John Kelly, Jim O'Donovan, Charlie Montgomery.

No formal protocol. Agreed that CS would chair and that notes and outcomes would be recorded rather than formal minutes.

Technical Working Group established to look at two areas:

1. Professional Gateway
2. Job Matching for promoted Posts.

EIS also asked to discuss all outstanding issues, including class contact, annual leave, permanency, salary conservation. This was agreed as it was important to establish the current positions of both sides.

### Professional Gateway:

- EIS wished to remove bar to progression
- Management noted that there may be interim arrangements for existing staff
- Needs to be an appropriate qualification
- EIS only wished to use GTCS as a means to check qualifications, and that they did not wish to pursue GTCS registration at this time . Agreed to park this.
- Discussion on bar point. Management wished to retain point 3 as the 'bar'. EIS requested different arrangements for existing staff. Management confirmed happy to work together to frame suitable proposal in this regard.
- It was noted that there needs to be parity between new starts and existing staff.
- Need to ensure access to TQFE for staff
- Discussion on Remission time. Agreed to come back with further proposals

### Job Matching for Promoted Posts

- Both sides had prepared initial documents on the principles of job matching and outline criteria.
- Discussion around criteria definitions, groupings of jobs, appeals, differences in levels.
- Agreed that matching criteria was very different to recruitment.
- Agreed to do further work on papers before the next meeting (Friday 24/02/17)

### Salary Conservation

- Management Side confirmed that their proposal was for one year although there was some empathy to move to 2 years.
- EIS confirmed they wished life time scale point conservation based on 'no detriment'.
- Discussion took place on case law, legal and equality issues and impact on staff.
- Agreed to revisit at next meeting

## **Draft Technical Working Group Notes**

**Meeting held all day on Friday 24 February 2017 in EIS Offices, Moray Place, Edinburgh.**

Present:

Carol Scott, Joanna McGillivray, David Gunn, Stephanie Graham, Heather Stevenson  
Apologies from Andrew Lawson

Pam Currie, John Kelly, Jim O'Donovan, Charlie Montgomery

Agreed that CS would continue as chair.

### Professional Gateway:

- General consensus on differentiating between existing and new staff
- May need further costings before moving forward
- Management noted wish to include contractual requirement to complete TQFE (or equivalent). Form of words to be developed by Management Side.
- Discussion on new start placements. Noted that further work required but management view that new starts will commence at minimum point of scale, there will be a requirement for all staff to satisfactorily complete TQFE and consideration will be given to matching scale points for staff transferring within the sector.
- EIS requested industrial and teaching experience be taken into account to ensure consistency
- Paper prepared by EIS to be revised and used as the basis for further discussion.
- Remission – Management revised their position from 80 to 120 hours per annum and EIS are requesting 324. Further information from providers being sought.

### Job Matching for Promoted Posts

- Discussion and debate took place on the revised criteria headings and what might be included in each of the three levels
- It was agreed the headings required clarification and examples of what would fall within the different levels
- The Group agreed the headings/criteria and Management would come back with further detail and explanations of what would be under the different levels.

### Annual Leave

- EIS advised they could see no benefit to colleges in reducing annual leave
- EIS requested evidence of the reasons for reducing leave and extending the college year
- EIS very unhappy about one paper referring to 55 days leave then the next one stating 45 days.
- Management provided rationale but EIS requested further information, as the EIS did not consider sufficient rationale was provided.
- EIS indicated that unless management reverted to its original position on annual leave, they could not enter into serious negotiation on agreement.

### Class Contact Hours

- EIS advised that 1000 per annum class contact is not acceptable and this was acknowledged by Management to progress matters.
- EIS advised they would work up a proposal to be discussed at the meeting scheduled for Thursday 2 March 2017.
- Management confirmed that all areas would be considered together as a package.
- EIS repeated their request for further evidence in support of their proposals

### Salary Conservation

- Management Side advised of relevant case law, and advised it would forward any relevant cases to EIS
- It was noted that management have already moved from 1 year to 2 years and will not support preservation in perpetuity.
- EIS advised they are looking for 'no detriment' in any agreement
- It was agreed to explore options and discuss further at the meeting on 2 March.

Technical Working Group – Note Agreed  
Thursday 9 March 2017

DRAFT