



## **GPEP SECA (CA) NEGOTIATIONS**

### **23RD DECEMBER 2014**

Earlier this month we commenced bargaining with the RNZCGP working towards the renewal of the GPEP year 1 collective employment agreement between NZRDA and the RNZCGPs. We began by exploring the issues and what follows is a brief report back on those issues and what next.

Attending discussions with me, Melissa Dobbyn, were Sara Simmons (GPEP2 from Blenheim and Vice President of the National Executive) and Michele Stanton from the RDA office. Abby Clement (GPEP2 from Christchurch) is also part of the bargaining team but was unable to attend on the day.

We were hosted from the RNZCGPs by Rochelle Leahy (Group Manager, Business Services), Tracy Woods (Business Analyst) and Linda Scott (HR Manager).

The issues and their response to them, in no particular order, are:

1. Parental leave ex gratia payment being restricted to birth mothers. We queried why in this day and age the payment was not extended to fathers if they were taking parental leave. The College expressed concern around not knowing how many fathers this would apply to and therefore being unable to cost it. We advised that we did not think the number would be particularly high. We also asked to have adoption included in the entitlement. On this topic attached is our submission to the Minister of Health requesting the inclusion of GPEP registrars under the Parental Leave and Employment Protection Act 1987.
2. Study leave being insufficient. The College has asked for a comparison between DHB MECA entitlements and College entitlements in relation to study leave.
3. No clear understanding of what happens when a seminar day doesn't happen. We believe this should be a personal directed learning day, not a "return to the practice" day particularly as often practices have not booked patients so there is no need to return. The College advised that their position is that the best learning takes place in the practice, however as some practices already agree to personal study days in this scenario that there is no need to include this in the agreement. We advised that in order to achieve consistency and avoid potential disputes this should be in the contract.
4. Discretionary leave to be added to annual leave to remove the "discretionary" component of the entitlement. The College advised that they were concerned around having to pay for any annual leave untaken at the end of the year and this would have to be costed. The College have also asked that annual leave be included in the comparison between DHB entitlements and College entitlements.

5. The issue around Clause 10.6.5 provides for mileage twice a week to and from a rural practice when you don't relocate (in which case you get \$3000) has still not gone away. Our view is that this provision should be more flexible to accommodate those that stay during the week at a rural place (but commute home at weekends) or mileage on all days when driving to and from. It is the College's view that registrars should move to the rural location rather than commute but we advised that this is not always possible. We also advised that \$3,000 was not always sufficient when relocating but the College wanted to have a capped amount so there could be no budget blow-out.
6. Certificate of good standing – as this is a College requirement it should be paid for by the College and not by DHBs or the applicant themselves. No other College requires this and it would seem that the College is just shifting its costs to the DHB. The College reports that they are investigating instituting an application fee similar to other colleges to which we responded that it was the DHB that pays for college application fees and not the registrars so again just shifting their costs to another group.
7. All costs relating to training, attending conferences etc should be paid rather than having a \$500 cap. Again the College expressed the need to have a cap but have asked to have a comparison of DHB entitlements versus College entitlements.
8. That otoscopes, ophthalmoscopes and dermoscopes should be provided by the host practice, or if not, reimbursed by the college. The College understood that all practices provide these pieces of equipment or at the least have them available on site.
9. And finally the big one salary – we pointed out that the salary has not gone up in the past two years and in order to keep up and competitive with DHBs there needed to be an increase. We pointed out that the more the College falls behind the DHBs the greater the catch up will need to be when “the crunch comes”. The College advised that they settled their contract with HWNZ and the amount they have received has not increased. We jointly explored some remuneration alternatives such as incentive payments dependent on income generated for the practice and the College are investigating these further.

There were a couple of other areas where general tidy ups in particular greater transparency when assessing past experience for the purposes of determining which step on the scale and how in fact the scale differs from the DHB MECA with there being no anniversary date.

Having explored the issues, we have taken an adjournment to do some more in-depth work and have arranged to meet again in January 2015.

If you have any comments to make or require further clarification, please don't hesitate to get in touch.

Kind regards  
Melissa Dobbyn  
Advocate