



## **Newsletter following the Service control Health and Safety council meeting** **March 2011**

A number of issues were raised prior to the beginning of normal business

### **Breach of collective bargaining principle.**

This item related to the decision by the tier 2 management of the service control council not to include ASLEF within the consultation process that surrounded this and other tier 2 meetings. Despite ASLEF requesting management agree to the inclusion of a stand in representative due to LU's insistence that the current ASLEF tier 2 rep attend training and that LU's own policies allow the inclusion of stand in reps the tier 2 management refuse ASLEF's request. Your reps made clear to management their concern that management have ignored the principles surrounding the collective bargaining and consultation arrangement, Management stated that they did not believe their decision breached that principle, however it is clear that the result of management's decision excluded ASLEF from the proceedings.

### **Not allowing reps the opportunity to prepare ahead of issues.**

This item stems from the act of management forwarding the documentation relating to all the items of discussion at this meeting after the date given to the reps to prepare. Your reps stated that they do think it is reasonable or within the spirit of safety legislation for management to send documentation to them for the purpose of them reviewing the documentation without management also affording them the time to review that documentation. Unfortunately management for some reason couldn't grasp this point so your reps are having to raise this issue higher up the chain of command.

### **Losing the plot.**

Following your reps raising these issues the management chair of the tier 2 council took it upon himself to direct what can only be described as personal abuse towards the reps. Your reps made it abundantly clear that they would not accept this abuse and advised management that they would be withdrawing from the meeting. Management suggested the reps should consider an adjournment while the management chair could take the opportunity to calm down. The reps accepted this as a way forward and the meeting resumed following a short break.

### **Previous meeting record.**

The first item of normal business was to deal with the official recording of proceedings. Your reps have for many years struggled to get an accurate record made by management with management constantly mis quoting and mis representing what was said by the reps. Now management have stated that they will in future publish their own version of proceeding whether the reps agree with it or not. That position flies in the face of what is considered good practice and is systematic of LUs attitude towards the workforce at this time. We would advise staff to ignore any wording contained in management published records of this and future meetings

### **De-icing referral.**

This issue relates to the failure by a number of LU departments to ensure adequate safety arrangements were in place when persons were de-icing parts of the central line. Despite the local service control reps trying to get their local management to take charge and resolve this, they did not. LU management on the tier 2 council have accepted the arrangements in place are unsatisfactory and are in the process of instigating a resolution.

### **Queens park RGI.**

This item raised the issue first highlighted by the local reps within service control regarding the inadequate safety arrangements at Queens Park where there is no RGI protecting the sidings. Management have concluded that its too expensive (£90,000) or thereabouts to put an RGI in. Your reps argued that that amount was a small price to pay for preventing someone getting killed or seriously injured. Management disagreed and are in the process of looking for cheaper alternative arrangements.

## **CDP.**

This item was raised in response to a members query in relation to some concerns he had with what he had been told during an assessment at CDP. In short the assessor hadn't been equipped with the correct knowledge and was therefore assessing individuals wrongly. Your reps made clear to management that they believed this highlighted a failure within the system. During the introduction of CMS and CDP your reps raised concerns around a number of issues which was ignored by management at the time. The tier 2 management although disputing this was a failure of the system did agree to undertake an action to find out exactly what when wrong and why.

## **Breach of Trust.**

This items stems from a number of conflicting statements made by management members from both tier 1 and tier 2 committees and some concerns surrounding what your reps believed was an attempt by management to delay the resolution of an issue raised by your reps. Your reps did ask the management chair to undertake an investigation into these concerns, however it was made clear to management by your reps that they were concerned that a whitewash had taken place. Your reps made clear to management that they have little confidence in managements ability to deal with council business in a way that promotes a trusting relationship between staff and management side.

As a point of clarity this is solely the union reps version of proceedings of the meeting and should no way be considered as agreed by any management member of the Tier 2 council.