

Side Table Lecturers – Minute Thursday 9 February 2017

Approved Minute of meeting of the National Joint Negotiating Committee (NJNC) – Side Table Lecturers, held on Thursday 9 February 2017 (13:30) at City of Glasgow College, City Campus.

In Attendance	
Margaret Cook	Management Side (Chair)
David Alexander	“ “
Paul Little	“ “ (Until 4.00pm)
Carol Scott	“ “
Shona Struthers	“ “ (Observer)
Stuart Thompson	“ “ (From 4.00pm)
Pam Currie	Staff Side
John Kelly	“ “
Charlie Montgomery	“ “
Jim O'Donovan	“ “
David Belsey	Staff Side Secretary
John Gribben	Management Side Secretary

01/17 Welcome and Apologies

The Staff Side Chair welcomed all to the meeting.

Apologies were noted from Ian McKay

02/17 Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of Thursday 16 December were approved as a true and accurate minute of the meeting.

03/17 Matters Arising

None.

04/17 Report on Short Life Working Groups

Staff Side set out its position that it was attending the NJNC STL meeting seeking to obtain agreement on the implementation of the NJNC March 2016 Pay Agreement (the Agreement), on both pay and terms and conditions. The EIS further advised that if the NJNC was unable to deliver an agreement that meeting to deliver the first tranche of the pay harmonisation payments for both promoted and unpromoted lectures in April 2017, then the Staff Side advised that they would enter into a dispute with Management Side.

Management Side set out they were also seeking to obtain positive agreement on all aspects of terms of the March 2016 Agreement, which is inclusive of pay and conditions of service.

SLWG T&Cs: Management Side set out it was content with the areas in black on Paper 5 (Agreed Output of SLWG T&Cs: National Condition v7), subject to the required Equality Impact Assessment and required legal checks, however remained concerned at substantive issues not being addressed, specifically;

- Annual leave
- Teaching hours
- Salary Conservation
- Salary progression, registration and qualification bars

Management Side set out that without flexibility and agreement in these areas from the EIS, the Agreement could not be implemented in full.

Staff Side sought to establish if the Management Side accepted the SLWG Pay Agreed Outputs set out in Paper 4 (SLWG Pay Agreed Outputs 1 and 2).

Management Side set out that it accepted the principles on the paper, but reminded the NJNC that the output lacked any context, particularly around the link to terms and conditions, incremental progression and professional registration. Management Sides set out that there is a clear bridge between the SLWG Papers with a number of substantive areas remaining unresolved.

Staff Side reminded the NJNC that if there was no agreement on paper 4, there would be a dispute.

Management Side advised provided we could reach agreement on terms and conditions, the March 2016 Agreement could be implement in full. Management Side explained paper 4 was a mechanism, and the application of that mechanism was inextricably subject to terms and conditions.

Staff Side reiterated the position that they wanted to make progress on all aspects of the agreement and that members would be looking for a 25% harmonisation uplift in April 2017, Staff Side reiterated their position that the elements of the Agreement are not co-dependant.

Staff Side said it was willing to discuss terms and conditions as soon as promoted lecturers was resolved.

Management Side Secretary reminded the full NJNC that the express terms of the agreement were not just related to pay, therefore the EIS referring to the Agreement as simply a “Pay Agreement” was inaccurate, as it encompass more than pay. The Management Side clearly stated that they felt that the workforce for the future had to be underpinned by the following principles:

High quality learning
 Professional standards
 Terms and conditions
 Pay and Grading across the sector

The EIS confirmed that they agreed with all of the above and that high quality learning and the interests of students had to be the key point in these negotiations

Staff Side Secretary stated to the NJNC that agreeing the implementation mechanism for promoted and unpromoted lecturers does not, in of itself, bind the employers to paying in April.

With both sides setting out their respective positions, it was agreed compromise would be required.

Adjournments

Following a succession of adjournments, the following was agreed as part of a national pay scale for promoted lecturers:

There would be three fixed points:

- £43,850
- £46,925
- £50,000

That the principle of 'no detriment' expressed in the 2016 March agreement would apply

That there would be an agreed job matching mechanism to match promoted lecturers with the correct role & pay point, to be agreed by the NJNC, facilitated by a joint NJNC technical group.

Adjournment

With regard to the substantive issues not addressed on the terms and conditions document, EIS proposed they are prioritised and addressed individually.

- Annual leave
- Teaching hours
- Salary Conservation
- Salary progression, registration and qualification bars

The first to be considered was qualification bar:

Management Side set out this could be subject to the appropriate professional qualification required for the role, or for example could be TQFE, or an agreed professional registration such as GTC, or a degree, or membership of a relevant professional body.

EIS explained they could not agree to any salary bar underpinned by a vague rationale. Furthermore, the EIS had a genuine concern a salary bar could be used so that individuals would be prevented from progression due to artificial barriers being put in place. Safeguards would be required to ensure support and remission was available to obtain the qualification or status needed. The EIS proposed a salary bar at point 5.

The Management Side undertook to provide additional detail on variables associated to the bar inclusive of safeguards against an artificial barrier.

"Annualised Hours"; The Management Side proposed the contractual term of 1000 annualised teaching hours. The EIS set out its position that annualised teaching hours was something that it would never accept and would not be prepared to negotiate on. The EIS challenged Management Side to be more specific in relation to its proposal on annualised hours.

Annual Leave: The Management Side proposed the contractual term of 45 days annual leave for all lecturing staff. The EIS noted that the Management Side appeared to be adopting a harder position than that adopted during the Short Life Working Group, and suggested it was either out of touch with the Employers Association, or its own side at the SLWG. Management Side explained there had been no agreement at SLWG's, and that it was prepared to negotiate from its starting position.

Salary Conservation: The Management Side stated that they wanted a contractual term giving 1 year cash conservation. The EIS asked if this would replace the 3 years/ 5years/ life-time conservation agreements that some staff had from college mergers. The Management Side responded by stating yes. The EIS asked the Management Side whether the proposed term would trump "TUPE". The EIS also asked the Management Side if "no detriment" in the NJNC Agreement actually meant no detriment for one year. The Management Side said yes, with the previous caveats of an EQIA requirement and change of contract being required to implement agreement.

Management Side stated that it would provide the EIS with further particulars in relation to its proposals on 14 February 2017.

The EIS stated that it had agreed to discuss the proposal of a salary bar, and suggested that if the salary bar was to be used as a measure of professional standard the it should also be the starting salary for those who meet that standard. The EIS also proposed that if remission and resources were not available to enable lecturers to gain the appropriate qualification or registration then the bar should be dis-applied. The Management Side agreed to the second point in principle.

The EIS expressed dissatisfaction at this position, insisting they were here to negotiate a settled outcome regardless of the length of time it would take indicating almost 11 months have lapsed without substantial movement, reiterating today was the last day to reach agreement.

Management Side responded that it would not be bound by EIS artificial deadlines, insisting that it had hoped to conclude today, but clearly proposals would need to be further set out to the EIS in a considered manner.

Adjournment

Management Side advised that we consider we have taken this as far as we can this evening. We have made significant progress and there remains further room for manoeuvre. We remain confident we can reach agreement and we will bring forward further detailed proposals next Tuesday and reconvene next Thursday.

Staff Side responded by advising that they would continue to negotiate, but they were now officially in dispute, setting out that after 11 months they considered the lack of any concrete proposals entirely unsatisfactory.

END