

Issues Forum – Senior Officers Union - MINUTES

Deputy Commissioners Office - Kedron Park Building - Corner Kedron Park and Park Roads Kedron
26 October, 2010 - 10:00am – 12:00 noon

Attendees		
Iain MacKenzie - Deputy Commissioner - QFRS	John Cawcutt - State President SOU	
Marie Daniec – A/Deputy Commissioner’s Staff Officer QFRS	Andrew Short - State Secretary SOU	
Christiane Strong – Employee Relations Officer	Stewart Rinkevich – Senior Employee Relations Advisor- ERU	
Item No.	Topic	Action Item/s
Action Items from previous meetings:-		
1.1 -	<p>PDO’s - SO-04-09-06</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E-timesheet 4.01 was released 11 October 2010, however a few glitches were identified with the new version and it was subsequently removed from distribution and staff were advised to revert to the previous version (S3a or M3a) until further notice; 	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> QFRS to investigate timeframes for new timesheet to be ready; DC-QFRS to put out a Memorandum to all AC’s regarding how timesheets are to be filled out for PDO’s; Update to be provided at next SOU Issues Forum.
1.2 -	<p>Rural and Remote Issues - SO-12-09-03</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SOU indicated that they received the letter from QFRS asking for their feedback on the due date, thus requested more time within which to provide formal feedback; Feedback so far from members so far has indicated a negative response with a general consensus that the improvement falls short of other industry standards (ie. Department of Transport) which is more comparative to QFRS. 	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SOU to place concise thoughts into an email to the Commissioner-QFRS, DC-QFRS and ERU (actioned 03 November 2010); Update to be provided at next SOU Issues Forum.
1.3 -	<p>ERV’s for Scientific Inspectors/Inspectors - SO-2010-02-03</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ERV’s for Scientific Officers are not considered to be suitable. A range of issues pertinent to this issue were discussed in a separate meeting outside of the SOU Issues Forum. Meeting involved DC-QFRS Iain MacKenzie, Phil Horn, John R Martin (ERU), Andrew Short, John Cawcutt, Dr. Michael Logan and Ray Bott. C/Supt. Michael Logan has developed alternative service delivery options and this may have an impact on resources; QFRS - seek feedback without going 24/7. Conditions would be same – have an Inspector on shift now; SOU – there are pro’s and con’s being on shift and a con will be that shift allowances will not be received. Concerned also about service delivery as staff will not park an ERV at home whilst on call; QFRS – it would be a matter of whether to call a truck or go and pick up a truck. Would like to open up discussions sooner rather than later. 	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DC-QFRS and A/DC-Staff Officer to meet to discuss business model further; QFRS to notify the SOU of further discussions to come; QFRS to prepare a Brief to Commissioner-QFRS with recommendations post discussions with the SOU; Update to be provided at next SOU Issues Forum.

Item No.	Topic	Action Item/s
1.4 -	<p>Senior Officer Review - SO-2010-06-29-03</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOU – frank discussions are being held as team dynamics have changed; • A meeting has been set for further discussions with the intent of including [REDACTED]. Issue involving [REDACTED] has now been resolved. 	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standing Agenda Item.
1.5 -	<p>Performance Management Policy and Process - SO-2010-06-29-04</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOU had raised the need for clear, concise and consistent application of what the policy and process is. Officers need to be able to manage at the lowest level before a situation potentially gets out of hand and officers need to be aware of the correct process flow. • John R Martin (ERU) is currently delivering a powerpoint presentation on performance management which will also be offered to each AC and their teams; • ERU in process to organise communication to DC-QFRS incorporating suggestions made. Performance management sessions have already been undertaken in by ERU in Far Northern Region and Senior Officers in Northern Region with positive results. 	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update to be provided at next SOU Issues Forum.
SO-2010-08-31-01	<p>Backfilling of Senior Officer Positions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOU were concerned with Station Officers being placed straight into Superintendent positions as there is a gap in levels of skills and experience. There are also limitations on abilities with not being prepared which could have consequential effects; • The SOU believed that this is watering down the purpose of the Senior Officer Review and goes against the fabric and intent of the three rank structure. The SOU's view is that replacements should be at level or rank below. If no one is available to fill a Superintendent role, feedback is that there are Inspectors around the State who can move around. DC-QFRS raised the issue of expense to the organisation with that option. • Linear progression was outlined as part of previous discussions on the proposed Senior Officers Structure and accepted by both QFRS and the SOU were to do with promotions within the rank structure and it was agreed that the matter of backfilling of Senior Officer positions was a different issue; • The SOU want to have AC's avoid automatically placing a Station Officer into a Superintendent role without asking an Inspector first and would like to see further discussions occurring on this; • Both AC Mark Roche and the SOU agreed that Superintendent role be either via direct approach or expression of interest (within the Region or outside the Region). 	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memorandum to be generated to all AC's from DC-QFRS asking for consultation with himself prior to acting on any decision to place an SO into the rank of Superintendent. The DC will then look at each situation on a case by case basis and liaise with the SOU as to whether they agree or disagree.

Item No.	Topic	Action Item/s
New Agenda Items:-		
SO-2010-10-26-01	<p>Recruitment and Selection of Dual Class Inspector/AO7 Role</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOU – acknowledge memorandum regarding dual class position and have no real issues with it, however it was their understanding that dual class positions were to be done away with and have now since seen the AO7 in OBSD advertised; • The SOU would like to understand what the approach was with regards the recruitment process for this taking into account the placement of an Inspector off the merit list into that role for the Brisbane Employment Location. There does not seem to be a clear process for recruitment into a dual class position; • QFRS – when a dual class position is advertised, the most meritorious person is chosen – if an Inspector is appointed into the position, they would have had to have met the requirements of an Inspector; • SOU – if AO7/Inspector (BEL), still do a separate process. Inspector can move onto another position within the BEL, but not automatically be backfilled from the BEL. Means an Inspector does not necessarily own a position, is part of the BEL, but not in terms of rotation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DC-QFRS to liaise with Russell Neuendorf regarding this issue; • Update to be provided at the next Forum.
SO-2010-10-26-02	<p>Use of Behavioural Assessment in Recruit Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SOU have been made aware of a Behavioural Assessment component being used as part of a current Inspector level selection process in FNR. The use of Behavioural Assessment instruments is new for selection at this rank level and the SOU would like to discuss process aspects and potential consequences; • DC-QFRS stated that there was no particular intent behind this and this has not been used as part of the decision making process. FNR (AC Weston) have only used this as a team dynamics tool, allowing selectors to identify behaviours (communication and behavioural styles) that are best suited for the position being filled and also assists with team building efforts; • SOU believe the application of assessments of this nature should be of a consistent approach across the State and that staff should be made aware that this will be approach taken within a recruitment process. 	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DC-QFRS to discuss this issue at the next SEM regarding use of behaviour assessment tools in the recruitment process on a statewide consistent basis and for all AC's to first discuss their intention to use this in the recruitment process with the SOU.

Item No.	Topic	Action Item/s
General Business:-		
	<p>ERV's – FBT Application on Unmarked Vehicles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOU – If unmarked vehicle – incur a reportable FBT, if no markings – no FBT from a Chief Super perspective – given many now respond (example given of Chief Super in Townsville in Cairns being called out 500 kms away); • There would be a difference in savings on each car; • Vehicle fit out costs saved; • Could take on private use component with possible changes to employment contracts; • DC-QFRS – something Senior Officers could consider from an EB stand-point, however may change FBT status. Could consider what that means for Chief Supers into the future 	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOU to obtain QAS Motor Vehicle Policy for the SOU; • SOU to undertake some research on this topic and provide a written paper to the QFRS; • Update to be provided at next Issues Forum.
	<p>Next Meeting Tuesday, 21 December 2010 10:00am - 12:00 noon DC-QFRS Office</p>	