

Staff Consultative Group

A meeting of the Staff Consultative Group will be held at 9:30 am on Wednesday 29th APRIL 2009 in the Senate Room, C8A (Lincoln Building).

Members who are unable to attend the meeting are requested to send their apologies to Carolyn (e-mail carolyn@ics.mq.edu.au).

AGENDA

- * 1. APOLOGIES
- * 2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING
- * 3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES
- 4. HOUSEKEEPING
 - a. IDENTIFICATION OF ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION
 - b. PASSAGE OF UNSTARRED ITEMS
- 5. WELCOME OF NEW MEMBERS TO SCG
- * 6. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND DEPUTY CHAIR FOR 2009
- 7. DISCUSSION OF REPORT FROM HR REGARDING PDR
- 8. OTHER BUSINESS

Notes from Meeting held December 2008

Present 10 persons (J Disney, T Davies, C Wright, S Grolimund, I Stewart, V Saparamadu ,K Pearson, G Stark, P Dangerfield, C Kennett)

Apologies: 9 apologies (names not noted)

Call for nominations for election

- need to clarify MGSM and ASAM general staff reps
- need to speak to Andrea re. numbers and allocation of staff, timing for elections and 2 weeks closing time. Clarify fixed term period of appointment more than 2 years?
- general staff now professional staff terminology.

Flexible Working Arrangements

- lack of progress on this matter (ball is in HR court)

Working party on proposed HR delegations

- see list of recommendations
- approved by SCG

Code of Conduct

- SCG has done draft COC.
- COC going to Council is only "interim" because of ethics cttee concerns.
- HR has circulated new draft which will go to CCI.
- SCG resolves MU should stick with current COC and not adopt interim one.
- SCG to comment on bonuses.
- SCG will be on Cttee developing new bonus scheme.

Presentation by Michael Carley Mgr Staff Health

- changes to OHS consultative arrangements
- info is now all on the web
- SCG will put group together to look at OHS policy.
- SCG comments- consultation via MQ announcements not a valid consultation process; OHS review documentation – consultation process not valid.

DRAFT

MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY

STAFF CONSULTATIVE GROUP

MINUTES OF MEETING OF 13 October 2008

Minutes of the meeting of the Staff Consultative Group held on 13 October at 10 am in the Council Room, E11A.

Present:

Ms Laura Billington	G7
Dr Peter Browne	A10
Associate Professor Suzan Burton	A2
Ms Leanne Cameron	G8
Phoebe Dangerfield	G6
Mr Edward Davies	CPSU
Mr Dylan Hodson	G5
Ms Stephanie Grolimund	NTEU
Ms Carolyn Kennett (Chair)	NTEU
Dr Rosalind Kitson	A4
Mr Michael Marston	G3
A/Professor Marea Mitchell	A5
Ms Dianne Mitchell	CPSU
Mr Lachlan Morgan (Deputy Chair)	G4
Mr Vasantha Saparamadu	NTEU
Ms Cathie Shanley	G13
Mr Greg Stark	CPSU
Ms Cathy Wright	G14

Apologies

Catherine McMahon	G11
Vasantha Saparamadu	NTEU
Dr Iain Stewart	A6
Associate Professor Julian Leslie	A3
Associate Professor Catriona McKenzie	A7
Ms Cathy Rytmeister	A1
Ms Sue Spinks	A9
Ms Sondra Wibberley	CPSU
Ms Carlene Kirvan	G9

Vacant Electorates General Staff VC
Academic Staff ELS
General Staff ELS
General Staff Law

The apologies as listed above were noted.

Guests: Mr Tim Sprague Director, Human Resources

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Minutes from 8 August 2008 SCG meeting were accepted without alteration.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES

Constitution of the SCG 2009 -2011

There was lengthy discussion amongst SCG representatives with respect to the proposal put forward by Human Resources in June related to the constitution of the SCG including the disproportionate representation of academic to general staff related to the size of the constituency.

Resolution 20/08

The SCG recommends the SCG electorates be established as proposed by Human Resources in the proposal dated 29 June 2008 with one additional academic representative for each of the 4 Faculties.

Passed Unanimously.

The Director Human Resources Tim Sprague confirmed that management would accept the recommendation of the SCG.

5. REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR HUMAN RESOURCES

Code of Conduct

The draft Code of Conduct had been circulated to the SCG prior to the meeting. It was identified that the University intended to send the Code of Conduct to the December meeting of Council following further consideration by the Ethics Committee.

HR Delegations

The Director HR identified that the draft HR Delegations document had been circulated to the Executive and that he had received feedback that the document was too complex. The University will wait for feedback from the SCG before making further revisions.

Flexible Working Arrangements

The Manager Employee Relations has identified that further work needed to occur with respect to this policy and had made contact with the Working party Chair Suzanne Burton with respect to the lack of progression on this policy with acknowledgement that Human Resources needed to progress this matter in the short term.

6. REPORTS FROM SUB COMMITTEES

There were no reports circulated from Sub Committees.

7. REPORTS FROM WORKING PARTIES

Promotions Policy & Casual Employment Policy

The Working Party report on the revised Promotions policy and the Casual Employment policy was circulated and endorsed unanimously.

Other Business

It was noted that the new Sustainability policy and anti discrimination guidelines needed to be circulated to the SCG.

Meeting closed 11:50 am

**Next Meeting 4 December 2008
9:30 am Senate Room**

MEMORANDUM

To: Staff Consultative Group
From: Tim Sprague, Director Human Resources
Date: 24 June 2009
Subject: **PDR Review update**

Dear new and returning SCG members,

I apologise for being unable to attend the first meeting of the SCG for 2009. As you may be aware, I am currently not only ill, but excluded from attending the University until I have clearance from my doctor. In light of these circumstances I felt it important to communicate with you regarding progress on the PDR Review process.

As you are aware in 2008 the new PD & R process was implemented across the University. At the outset we identified that at the end of the first PD & R cycle we would conduct a review of the effectiveness of the new process.

Summarised below is the review methodology and a summary of the key recommendations arising out of the review.

Review Methodology

In March 2009 we conducted an extensive review of the PD & R process. This review sought input from the following sources:

- Staff survey posted on the University intranet 2-20 Feb 2009
- Feedback from academic and professional staff supervisors
- Feedback from members of management and the Executive.
- Feedback from Faculty HR Managers
- Feedback forum conducted on March 17 attended by a cross section of academic and professional staff, nominated SCG representatives and representatives from the NTEU and CPSU.

The extensive consultation process has provided a wealth of valuable feedback which will inform and strengthen the process in the future. Having now considered the feedback I wanted to provide you with a summary of the most significant process recommendations that we intend to implement as a consequence of the review process.

Recommendations

1. Review the organisational planning cycle to determine if we can better coordinate the, strategic planning, budget and PDR cycles.
2. Redesign the PD&R form to improve ease of use whilst still enabling capture of relevant information about individual performance. Including:
 - a. The amalgamation of Parts A and C
 - b. The removal of Part D – Behavioural Indicators and Review. Where specific behaviours are required for role such as customer service or leadership - in future they will be incorporated into relevant objectives.
 - c. Inclusion of a review of development objectives in the PD&R review section to ensure individual development goals remain in sight over the year.
3. Remove overall performance ratings from the review of academic staff performance. (The exception is where an overall rating is required as an input in determining salary loadings.) There are existing acceptable reward and recognition mechanisms for the individual components of academic performance. These include mechanisms such as teaching awards and internal research grants.

The proposal is to work with academic areas to review and enhance existing reward methodologies.

4. Retain a performance rating mechanism for professional staff. This is particularly important for staff who have reached the top of their incremental range, consistently perform at a high level but currently do not have access to reward and recognition mechanisms beyond those outlined in the current Reward and Recognition policy. The performance ratings system is required to inform decisions related to Reward and Recognition.

We acknowledge that there is a significant amount of work to be done in developing this part of the process.

5. Develop communications and interim procedures for the completion of the 2009 PDR cycle.
6. Undertake amendments to policy, procedure and communications to reflect these changes

This is a broad summary of the key proposed changes to the PD & R process. I look forward to presenting and discussing these recommendations in detail at the SCG meeting of 20 May 2009

Regards,

Tim Sprague
Director Human Resources