CO-DEVELOPMENT
IN THE
PUBLIC SERVICE OF CANADA

Public Service Commission Advisory Council Working Group On Co-Development

CO-DEVELOPMENT
IN THE
PUBLIC SERVICE OF CANADA

Public Service Commission Advisory Council Working Group On Co-Development

Submitted
July 2003

FOREWORD

The Public Service Commission Advisory Council (PSCAC) has decided to share this Report before the passage of Bill C-25, the *Public Service Modernization Act,* because of the widespread interest in understanding what the concept of co-development is and how it might be implemented. The PSCAC recognizes that this Report outlines one possible approach to co-development with clear potential for practical application as a tool in labour relations. We hope that this Report offers a strong starting point for further discussion about co-development initiatives.

The Public Service Commission has received the Report, and is now reviewing it to determine how and where this co-development model and its principles might be used in the Commission's operations and resourcing policy development. While a formal response has not yet been made to the Report, the Commission encourages other organizations and agencies to consider the Working Group's elaboration of the concept of co-development.

We hope this Report will lead to further joint discussion on how co-development can be used to improve human resources management and labour relations in many workplaces.

John Baglow
George Da Pont

Co-chairs, PSCAC
July 2003

This Report from the Working Group on Co-development is distributed by the Public Service Commission Advisory Council (PSCAC). If excerpts from it are used in other publications, it is asked that this Report be appropriately referenced.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Working Group acknowledges the assistance of the following individuals:

Daryl Bean
Member, Advisory Committee on Labour Management Relations in the Federal Public Service

Monique Boudrias
Assistant Deputy Minister, Task Force on Modernizing Human Resources Management in the Public Service

Dan Butler
General Secretary, National Joint Council

Martha Hynna
Member, Advisory Committee on Labour Management Relations in the Federal Public Service

MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP ON CO-DEVELOPMENT / MEMBRES DU GROUPE DE TRAVAIL SUR L'ÉLABORATION CONJOINTE

Co-Chairs / Coprésidents

Défense nationale

Section locale 2228, Fraternité Internationale des ouvriers en électricité

Diane McCusker
National Defence

R.A. (Bob) Taylor
Local 2228, International
Brotherhood of Electrical Workers

Secretary / Secrétaire
Conseil consultatif de la CFP

Brian Lynch
PSC Advisory Council

Members / Membres

Transports Canada

Commission de la fonction publique

Ron Armstrong
Transport Canada

Régis Gaudreault
Public Service Commission

Institut professionnel de la fonction publique du Canada

Défense nationale

Lyette Babin
Professional Institute of the
Public Service of Canada

Anne Marie Giannetti
National Defence

Alliance de la fonction publique du Canada

Conseil des ressources humaines

John Baglow
Public Service Alliance of Canada

Louise Gravel
Human Resources Council

Members / Membres (cont.)

Défense nationale

Transports Canada

Helen Barkley
National Defence

François Marion
Transport Canada

Affaires étrangères et Commerce international

Association des gestionnaires
Financiers de la fonction publique

Peter Caldwell
Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Jean-François Mélançon
Association of Public Service
Financial Administrators

Association des employé(e)s en sciences
sociales

Santé Canada

Claude Danik
Social Science Employees Association

Richard Viau
Health Canada

Transports Canada

Troy Fuller
Transport Canada

Observer / Observateur

Secrétariat du Conseil du Trésor

Jean-Marc Gagnon
Treasury Board Secretariat

PREAMBLE

There are probably as many different ways of doing co-development as subjects and situations to which it can be applied. What is common and crucial is a particular set of attitudes and behaviours anchored by a joint determination to explore solutions to problems through cooperation

…The Working Group on Co-development

After more than a year of effort the Working Group on Co-development was coming to the end of its task. The report was in its final stages, a framework for co-development was clearly defined, and a viable, easy to use approach had been created to help employees, managers and bargaining agents jointly develop policies and solutions that could be tailored to unique situations.

An important part of the process had been defining co-development as:

> *A labour-management relations process, based on voluntary participation, designed to allow the equal participation of the parties to produce a desired product. The product of co-development may be a directive, a policy, a set of procedures, or some other initiative that is jointly owned by the parties but administered by one party - the employer.*

Then, on February 6, 2003, the Honourable Lucienne Robillard, President of the Treasury Board of Canada introduced Bill C-25, the *Public Service Modernization Act (PSMA)*. Section 9 of the *PSMA* labour relations provisions defines co-development as follows:

> *... "co-development of workplace improvements" means the consultation between the parties on workplace issues and their participation in the identification of workplace problems and the development and analysis of solutions to those problems with a view to adopting mutually agreed to solutions.*

And section 10 of these provisions enables bargaining agents and managers to co-develop:

> *The employer and a bargaining agent, or a deputy head and a bargaining agent, may engage in co-development of workplace improvements.*

The Working Group was gratified and encouraged that their work dovetailed seamlessly with the proposed *PSMA* – that the basic direction, conclusions and recommendations were consistent with the new legislation and that there was no need to revisit or modify the recommendations detailed in the following report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE WORKING GROUP ON CO-DEVELOPMENT

A Message from the Working Group

Getting Started

For many of us, the term "co-development" gained initial prominence with the publication in June 2001 of *Working Together in the Public Interest: The Report of the Advisory Committee on Labour Management Relations in the Federal Public Service (*the *"Fryer Report")*. The authors of this report clearly see co-development as an innovative process that complements consultation and collective bargaining but differs in important respects from both. Co-development offers an important opportunity to modernize public service labour relations and human resources management, but what precisely did the Advisory Committee have in mind? What does co-development really look like?

As we began our work, we realized that each of us brought different ideas about what co-development is, or should be to our task. We quickly recognized that there is substantial imprecision in the way we use the term, and in how we discuss other related concepts such as "joint development", "co-determination", "participative management", and "co-management". Although co-development might share qualities with these other processes, we naturally expected that it should have unique attributes of its own.

Discussing definitions thus became a significant part of the task of the Working Group, but not the key. We looked at the way "co-development" and other related terms have been used by organizational researchers and scholars and by popular writers. We explored the heritage of the term in the Public Service and the historical debate in which it appears (*See Appendix A: A Brief History of Co-Development p.25*). We also came to understand at an early stage that fleshing out co-development meant clarifying, to some degree at least, other key terms such as "consultation", "collective bargaining" and "co-management" (*See Definitions, Page 16*).

Important as definitions are, the Working Group reached a strong consensus that it is not necessary to have a perfect definition agreed to by all. The real key is to understand that co-development is a tool, not a philosophy. Co-development, in our view, represents an approach to joint problem solving that the parties may choose to use in many different circumstances, tailoring it to the requirements of each. There are probably as many different ways of doing co-development as subjects and situations to which it can be applied. What is common and crucial is a particular set of attitudes and behaviours anchored by a joint determination to explore solutions to problems through cooperation. These attitudes, behaviours and determination form the basis of the model of co-development we describe in this report.

The Outcomes

The Working Group endeavoured to provide a framework in which co-development can be used as a tool for meaningful employer, employee co-operation. We set out what we believe to be the key attributes of co-development, the cultural environment necessary to foster successful co-development, and a stepwise process model.

During our work we frequently discussed and examined the benefits of a co-development process. The following list is what we perceive these benefits to be, for the employee and bargaining agent and for management.

- ❑ Improved policy and programs because input is received from all parties.
- ❑ Better understanding by employees and managers of the intent and rationale for a policy or a program.
- ❑ Improved labour-management relations, because of the trust the co-development process generates.
- ❑ Opportunity for win-win solutions to workplace problems.
- ❑ Joint accountability for co-developed products result in:
    - "buy-in" from employees and their representatives; and
    - inclusive and creative administration by managers.

The model detailed in this report is designed to serve as a tool with which bargaining agents and management can begin to build the co-operative relationships required by a modern Public Service.

Purpose

Public Service Commission Advisory Council

The Public Service Commission Advisory Council (PSCAC) is a tripartite forum composed of representatives of the Public Service Commission of Canada (PSC), bargaining agents and departments. The purpose of the PSCAC is to provide strategic advice to the PSC on current and emerging staffing issues and to serve as a forum for ongoing discussion of matters of common concern to the parties arising from the *Public Service Employment Act* (*PSEA).*

Working Group on Co-development

In November 2001, the Steering Committee of the PSCAC established a Working Group on Co-development to explore the issue of co-development with special attention to its possible use in a staffing context.

Mandate

The Working Group on Co-development is mandated to study the meaning of the term co-development and how such an approach might be used in the public service, particularly, from a staffing perspective.

Key Questions

In exploring this mandate, the Working Group developed a series of questions to guide its subsequent work.

1. What are the similarities and differences between "co-development", "consultation", "collective bargaining" and "co-management"?

   (*See Table 2: Labour Management Processes – Comparing Consultation, Collective Bargaining, Co-management and Co-development, Page 13*)

2. What are the "key characteristics or attributes" of co-development processes?

   (*See Key Attributes of a Co-development Process, Page 17*)

3. What form could/should a co-development model take?

   (*See A Step-by-Step Model, Page 19 and Figure 1: Stepwise Representation of the Co-development Model, Page 23)*

4. Where is co-development appropriate and where is it not?

   (*See Prerequisites for Success, Page 18 and Step 2 of the Step-by-Step Model, Page 19*)

5. What is required for co-development to succeed and what will make it fail?

   (*See Key Attributes of a Co-development Process, Page 17, Prerequisites for Success, Page 18 and Step 2 of the Step by Step Model, Page 19)*

6. How would co-development work when applied to the staffing regime?

   (*See Using the Step-by-Step Model – A Hypothetical Example, Page 32*)

ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT

The idea of co-development is not new. There has been debate touching on the concept of co-development as far back as 1967 when the original legislative framework for staffing and collective bargaining was established. Since that time, whenever reform of the *PSEA* or the *Public Service Staff Relations Act (PSSRA)* is undertaken, the discussion of collective bargaining, consultation, co-management, participative management and co-development is renewed. The debate has always been complicated by the interchangeable use of these terms and the absence, until recently, of a clearer understanding about the distinctions and similarities between these concepts and processes.

The evolution of modern perceptions and beliefs about co-development began in earnest in June 2001, with the publication of the *Fryer Report*. This report thrust co-development into the spotlight by stating that every subject arising in the workplace is properly a matter for union-management interaction and by stressing the need to formalize the co-development option and extend it to staffing and classification systems.

Members of the Working Group regarded the many previous efforts to define a different process model for joint development of staffing solutions as important precursors to their own work. Whether the term is "co-development" or "joint development", or perhaps some other expression, the Working Group believed that their critical task was to refine attributes of an alternate approach or tool that would allow the parties to interact effectively to resolve staffing issues and other concerns. The co-development model provided in this report was designed to provide this alternate approach.

Appendix A: A Brief History of Co-development provides additional detail on the discussion of co-development over the past several years.

UNDERSTANDING CO-DEVELOPMENT

An important step in demystifying co-development is recognizing that it already exists in the federal Public Service, in some cases successfully so for many years. The following chart is a partial list of examples of co-operative activity compiled by members of the Working Group that illustrate many attributes of co-development. None should, or need to be viewed as definitive. All offer experiences from which we can learn.

Table 1

**Examples and Characteristics of Co-development Initiatives
in the federal Public Service**

Joint Career Transition Committee (JCTC)	**Development of Governance Structure for UCS Process in DND**
- Joint desire and equal power to solve difficult problem of mass displacement of government employees - Full representation of constituencies - Committed management and union representation - Interest in maintaining a process where both sides receive benefit	- Totally supported by Deputy Minister and Chief of Defence Staff and a champion identified by management - Voluntary participation of bargaining agents - Common goal and interest in seeing a new end product - Joint governance & joint action
PSAC/Treasury Board Joint Learning Initiative	**Research Community Advisory Committee**
- Budget negotiated beforehand - Joint development of joint training programs - Joint governance of the process	- Joint identification of issues of interest to union/management - Joint effort to understand the situation & develop recommendations
Public Service Commission Advisory Council	**PSAC/TB Term Employment Study**

- Working Groups, e.g., Accountability, Merit, Mobility and Co-development, etc. co-develop reports and papers for PSC consideration and implementation
- PSCAC Working Group on Recourse and Redress:
   - Listed interests & problems in existing system (multiple recourse mechanisms)
   - No common goal at outset
   - Working group process followed principles of co-development
   - A report and working model were created
	- Profound discontent with existing state
	- Joint fact-finding & problem solving
	- Recommendations were co-developed
	- Clear, joint governance and ownership
	
	National Joint Council
	
	- Provides joint management and trusteeship for health plans, e.g., PSHCP
	- Develops occupational safety and health policies for the Public Service
	- Elements of co-development exist in the development of its directives

DND Scholarship Program

- Common management /union interest in developing program
- Ongoing support of management and unions
- Accountability for funds and people rests with management

A complete description of a notably successful example of co-development is included in Appendix B: A Successful Co-development Initiative – The Joint Career Transition Committee.

Comparing Consultation, Collective Bargaining, Co-management and Co-development

The Working Group used the initiatives listed above, and other examples of initiatives that exhibit attributes of co-development to compare it with consultation, collective bargaining and co-management. The following table sets out similarities and differences that the Working Group noted across eleven dimensions. Some of the distinctions underlying this table may be subjective and debatable. Nonetheless, they demonstrate that co-development, consultation and collective bargaining share important attributes while differing in other key respects.

Although links to co-management may also exist, both management and union members of the Working Group were emphatic that co-management is not a process for developing joint solutions in the context of this report.

Table 2

Labour Management Processes – Comparing Consultation, Collective Bargaining, Co-management, and Co-development

Dimension	Joint Consultation	Collective Bargaining	Co-management	Co-development
1. **What is the basis for participation?**	principally voluntary, but may be required by legislation (e.g., PSEA re: selection standards) or by collective agreement	required by legislation	voluntary required by legislation in special cases (e.g., Occupational Safety and Health)	voluntary proposed endorsement in legislation
2. **How are process rules established?**	mandated by collective agreement, by jointly negotiated terms of reference, or as determined by employer	principally by legislation may be supplemented by jointly agreed procedures	jointly determined may flow from legislative requirements	jointly developed and agreed to by the parties process may be codified in terms of reference, by-laws, or memorandum of agreement
3. **What degree of shared decision-making authority is required?**	little or no shared decision making unless employer voluntarily shares authority	collective agreement requires joint decision, unless imposed by third party or legislation	substantial joint decision making	requires shared decision making to some significant degree

	Dimension	Joint Consultation	Collective Bargaining	Co-management	Co-development
4.	**What is the scope for decision making?**	subject matter may be narrow or broad, but only as agreed by employer	normally defined by legislation establishes terms of employment and some work rules but leaves implementation and management to employer	may be expansive includes terms of employment and work rules and how they are implemented and managed	as agreed by the parties does not include responsibility for implementation and management
5.	**What is the power relationship?**	power imbalance influence of union dependent on power to persuade union possesses limited sanctions – protest or withdraw from process	greater power balance influence of union dependent on bargaining strength and determination potential balancing effect of access to dispute resolution mechanism	potentially maximizes union influence and power balance	power is balanced
6.	**What degree of trust is required of the parties?**	in principle, none, given unilateral decision making to be effective, substantial trust required	in principle, none parties may reach agreement in total absence of trust with trust, quality of process improves	normally, substantial trust required unless decision-making rules oblige co-management	substantial trust required which increases with usage
7.	**Who is accountable for outcomes?**	formally the employer only	joint accountability for collective agreement and, to some degree, for impacts	to some significant extent, joint accountability for impacts	joint accountability for final product management accountability for implementation and ongoing administration

Dimension	Joint Consultation	Collective Bargaining	Co-management	Co-development
8. What is the dominant style of interaction?	may be limited to provision of information, statements of positions or views does not require search for agreement or convergent interests	traditional process driven by exchange of previously established positions – search for compromise alternate models may explore underlying interests – search for shared interests and accommodation	requirement to move beyond positions in order to succeed in managing organization presumes search for agreement and convergent interests, but possible conflicts on specific issues	more co-operative and consensual, emphasizing convergent over divergent interests, but with procedures to manage conflict
9. Is there a dispute resolution process where parties disagree about the outcome?	none	access to legislated dispute resolution procedure(s) by right	depends on agreed rules or voting protocol	rules for resolving impasses developed at outset
10. What are the consequences of "failure"?	may be none in short-term longer-term erosion of relationship	possible escalation to strike – complete breakdown of relationship parties nevertheless are compelled to reach agreement at some point, unless agreement is imposed	given degree of union participation, "failure" can mean organizational crisis	parties revert to other modes of interaction
11. What is the outcome of the process?	unilateral decision, policy or guideline (or no product)	collective agreement	decisions on terms of employment and work rules and decisions on how to implement and manage	agreement on policy, employment terms or work rules may be similar to "collective agreement"

Definitions

For the purposes of this report and with the above comparisons in mind, the Working Group developed four operational definitions.

Collective Bargaining

A labour relations process mandated by law, designed to allow the parties to produce a legal document that defines terms and conditions of work, as well as employment matters identified as negotiable by the relevant labour statute. The product of collective bargaining is an agreement that is jointly owned by the parties, but administered by one party, the employer. Collective bargaining in the federal Public Service may result in an impasse resulting in the use of two dispute resolution processes: binding arbitration or conciliation/strike.

Co-management

A labour relations process where the employer shares authority to establish and implement work processes, directives, policies, and procedures and terms and conditions of work. The product of co-management is a series of agreements on work procedures that is jointly owned and jointly administered by the parties.

Consultation

A labour relations process, primarily voluntary in nature, where the employer engages employee representatives in discussions designed to assist the employer in producing workplace directives, policies and procedures, in resolving other employment matters, or in setting conditions of employment not established by statute or by collective agreement. The product of consultation is solely owned and administered by the employer. The content of the product of consultation is determined in the final analysis solely on the authority of the employer. Consultation does not result in a binding agreement, as the role of one party is simply advisory. There is no mandatory dispute resolution process.

Co-development

A labour-management relations process, based on voluntary participation, designed to allow the equal participation of the parties to produce a desired product. The product of co-development may be a directive, a policy, a set of procedures, or some other initiative that is jointly owned by the parties but administered by one party - the employer.

MAKING CO-DEVELOPMENT WORK

Several steps were taken to create a practical model for co-development. The Working Group revisited their original key questions and used their newly acquired understanding of existing co-development initiatives to document key attributes and prerequisites for successful co-development.

Key Attributes of a Co-development Process

❑ Co-development is based on principles of co-operation rather than competition. Parties considering a co-development process believe that participants working together toward a common objective have an opportunity to produce a better product than one that results from unilateral action.

❑ Co-development is voluntary. The parties work together not because they are compelled to do so, but because they choose to do so.

❑ All parties to a co-development process participate on an equal basis with equal merit, equal opportunity to influence the process and outcomes, and shared ownership of the product. The process of successful co-development increases joint ownership and commitment to both the process and the outcome.

❑ Co-development requires a common understanding of what the parties want to achieve. While the parties may have different views and interests, they agree on the identification of a common issue that they wish to resolve, and on the common objective of reaching an outcome acceptable to all.

❑ All parties are committed to stay with the co-development process until a product is complete, and to resolve impasses through procedures that are discussed and agreed to at the outset.

❑ In a successful co-development initiative, the focus remains continually on the final outcome or product to minimize the possibility of being sidetracked. At the start of the process the emphasis is on identifying the issue, the parties' common and different interests and a specific objective. While the product may take time to develop, the objective, formulated from an in-depth discussion of all issues, remains clear from the beginning.

❑ Actively working to develop trust is essential. Relationships among the parties develop during the process. As trust increases, the parties become more willing to share their interests (beliefs, hopes, expectations, fears) and to work toward a product that will meet the needs of all participants. Because decisions are made by consensus, every participant has the same opportunity to influence the process, feel valued as equal partners and become more committed to reaching a positive outcome. Checking back with each other on a regular basis ensures ongoing engagement and commitment and reinforces trust.

❑ A good co-development process allows participants to take risks. As long as conditions for full participation and continuing commitment to the process and objective are met, and because of the trust that has developed among the parties, errors are more easily tolerated.

❑ The process must be flexible to enable maximum creativity and relationship building. Flexibility also allows participants to be responsive to newly arising circumstances, the needs of the parties and the product being developed.

❑ Participants become advocates for the outcomes because they are involved in making the decisions that lead to a final product. This advocacy results in a strong commitment to promote the product among their respective constituencies and a greater likelihood of buy-in and acceptance during the implementation phase.

When these key attributes exist, a synergy among the participants is created. This underlying force encourages conceptual leaps and new ways of seeing and doing things which in turn enables resolution of complex issues.

Prerequisites for Success

Co-development is not a panacea for all workplace issues. Clearly, most matters that are addressed in collective negotiations will continue to be resolved at the bargaining table. A collective bargaining regime that functions well remains vital for such matters. Consultations between employers, bargaining agents and other stakeholders will also continue. The Working Group nevertheless believes that there will be many opportunities where co-development can complement collective bargaining and consultation, or serve as a voluntary alternative.

Co-development can be considered in the following circumstances:

❑ The parties believe that there is a convergence of interests and a shared goal regarding the problem to be resolved. Prior to launching co-development, the stakeholders share some threshold confidence that their common interests offer a basis for achieving a good outcome through consensual decision making.

❑ All sides share a desire to participate and produce something new. Participants are also willing to set aside predetermined notions of what the end product should be. When the parties hold on to strong, predetermined positions and are not committed to a creative, exploratory process, co-development is unlikely to succeed.

❑ The parties believe that equal participation in all aspects of the process can result in a product that could not have been imagined by one party alone or several parties working in isolation in more traditional forums. Because co-development is essentially an approach based on an interest in solving problems, the parties can only arrive at a successful outcome if they are committed to addressing all of their respective interests.

❑ Executive level commitment in several areas is essential to the process and its results. The participants in a co-development process must feel empowered and supported so that they will commit the time and energy necessary. The participants must be given a mandate that provides sufficient flexibility to explore all options. And they must feel

confident that the outcomes, recommendations and products they develop will be accepted and implemented. Ideally, participants will be given full authority to design a product and have it implemented as designed. As a practical matter, the group's mandate may often be limited to making recommendations. If this is the case, participants need to know that their recommendations will be given the most serious and immediate consideration.

A Step-by-Step Model

Step 1: Identifying the Issue and the Parties

Co-development begins with the identification of an issue and acceptance and understanding of that issue by the interested parties. The issue may arise in a service-wide forum such as the National Joint Council (NJC), at a national labour-management meeting, in regional or local contacts or virtually anywhere. The issue may also be identified in the course of other bilateral or multilateral processes such as consultations or collective negotiations. Whatever its origin, the concerned parties must agree that the issue requires resolution.

Inherent in the identification of the issue is the identification of parties and stakeholders who have an interest in participating in a voluntary process to find a solution to the issue. While some issues will involve only a single bargaining agent and a single management organization, many issues in the Public Service touch several bargaining agents, many departments, and central agencies such as the PSC and the Treasury Board. It is essential that the party or parties who have authority over the issue and the power to sanction a co-development process be directly involved from the beginning. It is also important that all others who have an interest in the issue be encouraged to participate.

In this first step nothing is more important than ensuring the issue has been clearly defined and understood by the parties. Before a final decision to proceed with co-development is made, all interested parties, potential owners of the process, and those with key accountabilities must agree that the real issue is identified.

Step 2: Verifying that Co-development is the Right Process

Once the parties have confirmed that there is a commonly understood issue that requires resolution, they must decide if co-development is the right process. The parties need to address the following questions in making this determination.

Is there some convergence of interests on the issue?

At this stage the parties need to sufficiently explore their respective interests to be confident that there is a basis for progress. While this may be obvious in some situations, in others a preliminary process of exploration is required to uncover the underlying interests of the parties, to identify points of real or potential commonality, and to develop trust. This step may require the services of a skilled facilitator to clarify the issue, and to reveal common and divergent interests. This process demands respect for all points of view and a genuine commitment to understanding all interests at play.

Is there common agreement on the objective and product of the co-development process?

The precise form and shape of the final product will probably not be known at this time. The parties must nonetheless agree on what is to be achieved and accept that a formal end product is required. And, the parties must be committed to achieving that end product through co-operative action.

Is the required support at the Executive level in place?

The need for Executive commitment and an appropriate mandate has already been noted. The Working Group strongly believes that in order for a co-development process to succeed, a champion or champions at the Executive level is required. Senior decision makers must either delegate their decision-making authority to participants in the co-development process or provide a clear and flexible mandate that allows the participants to make recommendations. Champions at the Executive level ensure the legitimacy and authority of the process and help address other factors that might work against achieving an acceptable outcome.

Are the parties committed to the principles of equal participation and consensus decision making?

If not, the co-development process will not work.

Where the above conditions are not met, the probability of successful co-development is low. If the basis for joint co-operation is insufficient it is likely that divergent interests, lack of commitment or lack of Executive support will defeat a voluntary process. In these circumstances, the parties need to determine if a different process might be more appropriate, and in particular if a more robust conflict resolution mechanism may be required.

Step 3: Ensuring Appropriate Representation and Resources

Careful thought must be given to populating the co-development working group. Participants must be representative of their constituencies and must have been selected through appropriate channels within their respective organizations. All stakeholders should be present to ensure the representation of all interests. Participants should hold positions in their organization at levels commensurate with the authority accorded the group and the nature of the outcome expected. They must also be willing and able to communicate with their respective constituencies at critical times within the co-development process, so that the product will reflect the effective consultation of all parties. Together, members of the group should possess the expertise and knowledge required to reach the common objective or be able to bring in the required expertise. Progress is made when adequate capacity and resources are provided to identify, collect, design and carry out the necessary research.

Diversity of perspectives is key. The synergy of those with diverse perspectives aids the creative process. It also allows the group to test participants' assumptions and perceptions as the product is being developed.

Group members must be committed and consistent in their participation. Because the co-development process is based on consensual decision making and succeeds because of the relationships that the participants develop, it is essential that those who agree to participate in the process commit to full involvement. Representatives must fully understand the commitment they are making from the outset and agree to consistent attendance. Participant organizations and, in particular, mandating Executives must support and facilitate this commitment and ensure that the necessary supporting resources are made available.

Step 4: Developing Process Rules

Once the co-development group is in place attention turns to developing and confirming consensual rules for the processes to be used. Process rules should: be documented, agreed to from the outset, and adhere to the principles of equal participation and joint ownership of the process. All parties are accountable for observing the process rules. Subjects to be covered include:

- selection of a chair (or co-chairs) and definition of the chair's role

- scheduling of regular meetings

- the process for setting agendas

- assigning responsibilities for providing information, for arranging necessary supporting resources and for meeting logistics

- keeping records

- how decisions will be made and committed to in writing

- how and when representatives will confer and communicate with their constituencies

- the use of subgroups.

Step 5:   Resolving Impasses

One of the most difficult issues a working group will address is the question of what happens if the participants reach an impasse. In the event of a dispute in collective bargaining, the option of participating in a third party process (mediation, arbitration, conciliation) is normally available or even legally required. In consultation, impasse does not preclude an outcome because the employer retains decision-making power and can develop the end product on its own. Where impasse is reached, any party may withdraw from the consultation process or choose to attempt resolution through a voluntary process that all parties agree to.

After considerable discussion, members of the Working Group concluded that they do not support a model of co-development that includes mandatory third party intervention. Compulsory dispute resolution is incompatible with the voluntary spirit of co-development. Agreeing on how impasses are to be addressed is part and parcel of the co-development process itself and should not be externally imposed. At the outset when process rules are established, participants should commit to working through impasses using whatever means they deem appropriate, provided that there is consensus on these means. Techniques such as third party facilitation and mediation may be appropriate and useful, but it ultimately remains to the parties to resolve issues. Where an impasse cannot be resolved, the real basis for successful co-development may not have existed in the first place.

Step 6:   Doing the Work

Once process rules are established - in fact, co-developed - the actual work of co-development proceeds. The approach taken will depend on the nature of the issue at hand, the number and background of representatives assigned to the process, the supporting resources available, as well as the objective agreed to by the parties. Developing a realistic approach and work plan, including time lines and workflow is essential.

The Working Group believes that a creative co-development process will normally require a number of stages such as:

- detailed fact-finding

- a clarification phase where the issue is further defined or restated and interests re-examined

- identification of a range of possible solutions and options

- interest-based evaluation of the options under consideration.

The process needs to be flexible and inclusive and encourage creativity throughout. Techniques such as brainstorming are encouraged. It will also be vital to ensure that participants remain at the same level of understanding throughout the process. The work of the group cannot move forward unless all participants have a common understanding of the issues and decisions reached along the way.

Testing possible options, first with all participants and then with the constituencies they represent, will always be crucial. The latter will involve a feedback and communication system to each of the constituencies on an ongoing basis. In order to ensure eventual acceptance of and commitment to the end product, these constituencies must be kept informed and consulted as the product is being developed.

The final choice of the option to be developed must respect the decision-making rules agreed at the outset and address all of the interests that have been identified.

Step 7: Completing the Task

The co-development process will normally be complete when the objective agreed to at the outset is achieved and the final product is delivered for approval.

Communications and training plans to support the final product are critically important and may or may not be part of the initial co-development process. These activities may just as appropriately be co-developed by others in a follow-up phase. If this occurs, the underlying requirements for successful co-development continue to apply. Jointly developed communications and training initiatives based on equal participation and shared ownership increase commitment to the product and strengthen the relationships that have been created during the original co-development process.

While successful implementation and administration of the product will be of direct interest and concern to all participants, communications and training plans would not normally be part of the co-development process. As the definition of co-development indicates, responsibility to implement and administer falls within the responsibility and authority of the employer. In some cases, a co-development group may be asked to continue to exist with a mandate to co-develop solutions to specific problems associated with the product as they subsequently arise. In other cases, the parties may choose to initiate a new co-development process where follow-up problems arise or derivative issues are identified.

The following figure depicts a stepwise representation of the co-development model described above. Appendix C shows a hypothetical example using the model to co-develop a departmental area of selection policy.

Stepwise Representation of the Co-development Model

Step 1 – Identifying the Issue and the Parties
•Identification of issue
•Common acceptance and understanding of issue
•Issue may surface from any source
•Agreement that issue requires resolution
•Identification of interested parties and stakeholders

Step 2 – Verifying that co-development is the right process
•Convergence of interest on the issue
•Common agreement on the objective and product of the co-development process
•Necessary Executive level support – Champion
•Commitment to the principles of equal participation and consensus decision-making

Step 3 – Ensuring Appropriate Representation and Resources
•Participants must be representative of their constituents
•Participants must be selected through appropriate organizational channels
•Representation should reflect all interested parties
•Participant level should be commensurate with the group authority and nature of outcome
•Group knowledge and expertise levels should be adequate to accomplish objective
•Required information, expertise and resources should be made readily available
•Participants should reflect a diversity of perspectives
•Participation should be consistent and committed

Step 4 – Developing Process Rules
•Development of written consensual process rules
•Rules must respect the principles of equal participation and joint ownership
•Establishment of impasse resolution process

Step 5 – Resolving Impasses
•Participants must be committed to working through impasses
•Methods of impasse resolution must be consensually developed
•Non-resolution of impasse may indicate inappropriateness of

Step 6 – Doing the Work
•Work approach will be dictated by issue and participants factors
•Development of workplan with timelines and workflow essential
•Detailed fact finding
•Issue clarification phase
•Identification of range of possible solutions and options
•Interest-based evaluation of options
•Flexible, creative, and inclusive approach
•Maintenance of uniform level of understanding
•Testing of possible options with constituents and stakeholders
•Choice of final option must respect original process rules

Step 7 – Completing the Task
•Completion entails meeting objective and delivery of product for approval

CONCLUSION

As shown by the many references to co-development cited in this report, and by the examples found in existing processes and relationships, the concept of co-development is not new. This report has endeavoured to drive from those examples and discussions a useable tool for co-development. This tool, in the form of a model, can be of use in many different labour-management contexts. It also supports the concepts of a learning organization and a participative approach to modern human resource management. And it coincides with the envisioned new culture of the modern Public Service, as found in the preamble to the proposed labour relations provisions of the PSMA, in that:

> "effective labour-management relations represent a cornerstone of good human resource management and that collaborative efforts between the parties, through communications and sustained dialogue, improve the ability of the Public Service to serve and protect the public interest."

A BRIEF HISTORY OF CO-DEVELOPMENT

Publication in June 2001 of *Working Together in the Public Interest: The Report of the Advisory Committee on Labour Management Relations in the Federal Public Service (the final "Fryer Report")* focussed unprecedented attention on the concept of "co-development". The Committee stated:

> *Our basic premise is this: We believe that every subject that arises in the workplace is properly a matter for union-management interaction.*
>
> *Some subjects traditionally matters of management prerogative, such as the distribution of work, can and should be the subject of consultation. Some matters, which are not currently subject to collective bargaining such as the staffing and classification systems, can and should be co-developed by the two parties. Other subjects are, and should remain matters, the terms and conditions of which are determined through collective bargaining.[1]*

The *Fryer Report* sees processes of consultation, collective bargaining and co-development occurring at all levels. Within a given domain of joint activity, management and unions may establish broad parameters at the service-wide level, customize these parameters at the departmental or agency level, and work out precise terms of implementation, as necessary, at the local or workplace level.

The principal departure of the *Fryer Report* is its stress on the need to expand and formalize the co-development option:

> *We believe that now is the time to formalize this process of co-development and, at the same time, extend it to such important employment related matters as the classification and staffing systems within government. Co-development involves both parties undertaking research and presenting background information to feed into the process of developing policies. It involves real give and take, with neither party expecting to achieve all its goals on the subject. It is a process that helps to build trust and that relies on trust to be effective. It can play a major role in ensuring that employees' voices and their preferences are heard and reflected in internal government policies. [2]*

The Report acknowledges that forms of co-development already exist within the Public Service. It notes in particular, the co-development activities of the NJC that have resulted in major achievements such as the creation of the Public Service Health Care Plan Trust. Under its new mandate as the "Forum of Choice" for national co-development initiatives, the NJC is viewed as an important building block in the framework for improved labour management relations in the Public Service. The *Fryer Report* however, sees the process of co-development extending beyond the NJC to individual departments and agencies as well as to workplaces with local union-management consultation committees.

> *While each department and work site is likely to have its own set of issues for co-development, our consultations elicited a number of issues that can serve as a (co-development) starting point:*

---

[1] *Working Together in the Public Interest: The Report of the Advisory Committee on Labour Management Relations in the Federal Public Service* (the final "Fryer Report"), p. 15.

[2] *Ibid,* p. 16.

- *organization of work*
- *work schedules*
- *delivery of quality public services*
- *operational issues*
- *workplace procedures*
- *joint training on workplace issues*
- *technological change and its impacts*
- *EE implementation*
- *flexibility to meet operational and personal needs.* [3]

As much as the *Fryer Report* has spurred current interest in co-development, the term itself is not entirely new - at least in discussions of the staffing system. Parties have for many years debated how employees and their representatives should best participate in decisions about the staffing system. [4] In its most basic form, this debate has contrasted the merits of two competing process models - joint consultation versus collective bargaining. Proponents of joint consultation have argued that it is appropriate that employee views on staffing be sought through their bargaining agents in a co-operative setting, but that the overarching public interest in a merit-based staffing regime argues against extending formal collective bargaining rights into this sphere. Proponents of collective bargaining have, in contrast, argued that traditional joint consultation practices have often been ineffective, and that management and employee interests are better expressed in the setting of negotiations where the parties meet in greater equality.

Evidence of this debate can be traced as far back as the original discussions leading to the establishment of the current legislative framework for staffing and for collective bargaining in the Public Service in 1967, if not earlier. Whenever reform of the *PSEA* or of the *PSSRA* has since been discussed, the debate has reappeared. In more recent years, the debate has evolved to include the possibility of a third option for staffing issues, different in important respects from both joint consultation and collective bargaining. The vocabulary of this search for an alternative has varied. Different observers have used terms such as joint development, co-determination and co-development at different times, sometimes synonymously and sometimes with distinctions in mind. Other concepts such as participative management and co-management each with its own currency and advocates have added to the mix - and to the confusion.

The 1996 *Report of the Consultative Review of Staffing* sponsored by the PSC comprises an extremely important benchmark in the debate. This report asked:

- To what extent and how should employees and their representatives be involved in decisions about the staffing system?

- Is greater co-development of the human resource management regime possible without prejudicing public interest values in the staffing system?

The Report is a brief but impressive document that adeptly summarizes divergent and convergent views on problems in the staffing system and outlines values and directions for staffing reform. The central focus of the report is not co-development per se but rather the need to realign the resourcing system in a fundamental fashion and to embrace new values consistent with a change management agenda. On the debate over the appropriate union-

---

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] See Butler, D., *Consultation v. Negotiation: An Historical perspective on Co-development and Staffing,* unpublished Public Service Commission research report, 1998.

management process for addressing staffing issues, the Report offers the following synopsis of prevailing perspectives:

> *Participants stated that a desired result for the resourcing system would be that it be supported by all stakeholders. This reflected the view that a reason for the lack of trust in the existing system lies in the fact that it is perceived as a system designed exclusively by managers. They wished to see a system that generated more cooperation and less confrontation, both in its daily use and also in efforts to change and improve it when these were needed. The type of consultation now practised by the PSC was not viewed as effective by employee representatives. The improvement that participants suggested was that the resourcing processes be co-developed by management and unions, in consultation with all stakeholders.[5]*

The Report also commends a process by which the parties would together develop their own decision-making mechanisms at various levels of interaction:

> *A general framework for staffing should be jointly developed with employee representatives, at a national level. Departmental level agreements between management and employee representatives should then cover the specific processes to be used, and should govern the possibilities for further co-developed processes at other levels. Ideally, it should be possible to tailor agreements to the needs of specific regions, branches, occupational groups, or any other subset that has a unique set of requirements for its resourcing activity.[6]*

In the fall of 1997, PSC documents contemplated a staffing reform initiative that embraced the concept of "jointly developed" staffing policies:

> *Jointly developed resourcing processes are those which have been created through discussions amongst interested parties and which meet the following requirements:*
>
> - ❑ *Have the support of employee representatives and management.*
>
> - ❑ *Are consistent with PSEA and PSER jurisprudence and national policies.*
>
> - ❑ *Are within the authority delegated to the department head by the PSC and Parliament*
>
> - ❑ *Are consistent with Principle and Values articulated by the PSC to safeguard the Public Interest*
>
> - ❑ *Includes accountability framework for the process followed and for compliance with outcome*
>
> *Each process is designed to meet the circumstances and needs of the situation (issue, relationship, environmental considerations.). A memorandum of understanding (time frame, process, accountability, ADR) should be established beforehand by the parties. Participants are accountable to the body they represent and to the process they have voluntarily agreed to follow in good faith. ADR techniques (Conciliation and Mediation) as well as a facilitator may be integrated into the process to facilitate discussions and avoid confrontation. The PSC may provide guidance as to how a joint-development process may be managed.*

---

[5] *M. Hynna, The Report of the Consultative Review of Staffing,* 1996, pp.19-20.

[6] *Ibid.,* pp.26-7.

The key elements in the PSC's model were described as follows:

- ❑ Joint development involves the "interested parties" in a voluntary discussion process the objective of which is to establish a revised resourcing regime "supported" by employees and management.

- ❑ The contours of the joint development process are to be established in advance and codified in the form of a memorandum of understanding.

- ❑ The process should be non-confrontational and facilitated or mediated as necessary.

- ❑ The product of the process must respect:
     - existing statutory and regulatory authorities,
     - the authority delegated to the deputy head, and
     - public interest values identified by the PSC.

- ❑ The participants are accountable to their principals (not to the PSC) and are expected to comply with the outcome.

A SUCCESSFUL CO-DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE –
THE JOINT CAREER TRANSITION COMMITTEE

One of many successful models of co-development in the Public Service is the JCTC. The JCTC, established in November 1998, is a joint labour-management committee and process to assist employee career transition. It comprises national and regional representatives who contribute to the positive transformation of the federal Public Service and foster the development of a skilled, proud, representative and adaptive workforce. The mandate of the JCTC is to provide career transition services and support in three areas.

- ❑ Learning, training and development.
- ❑ Inter-organizational mobility and placement.
- ❑ Employability.

The JCTC evolved from the Joint Adjustment Committee (JAC) that was established in 1995 to address the downsizing of the Public Service and the resulting workforce adjustment situation. While the employer and the bargaining agents may have had divergent points of view on the question of downsizing there was a clear, identifiable issue (the possible release of a huge number of employees) and a common interest in the welfare of employees. The parties began discussing ways to minimize layoffs. Using the expertise of the industrial adjustment service at Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC) principles were developed to guide the JAC, based on successful models in the private sector. These principles, detailed below, are now used by the JCTC.

Principles:

Joint Labour-Management Process

This joint labour-management process ensures a co-operative effort between equal partners. It requires commitment from all involved departments and unions in order to develop a consensus on managing career transition support services in an evolving Public Service.

Coordinated Effort

This is a co-ordinated effort across the entire federal government - interdepartmental and national and regional and local. Since the people affected are in the best position to manage change, delivery is through locally driven initiatives that involve employees and that are co-ordinated by local and regional union and employer representatives.

Transparent Process

The process is transparent, inclusive and equitable. Services, including the dissemination of accurate and timely information, are offered to all those employees involved in career transition.

Respecting Roles and Existing Expertise

The process operates on the basis of affordability, cost efficiency, and builds on existing public service expertise, respects legislated, departmental and union roles and avoids duplication.

Funding

The Employer ensures that there are adequate and reasonable resources available, as outlined in the Terms of Settlements to support the work of the JCTC and the Joint Regional and Local Transition Committees for the duration of the initiative. It is expected that departments will also generate resources (funds or 'in kind') to complement central funding.

Structure:

The JCTC initiative is governed by a joint national committee and joint regional committees made up of equal numbers of union and management representatives with authority to act on behalf of their respective principals. For example, the national committee comprises seven union representatives (two are regional members), seven representatives from the employer (two are regional members) and other invited resources as required (PSC, Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat (TBS) and The Leadership Network). Every region has at least one career and learning centre, established through partnerships between the JCTC and departments. Many such centres are also service delivery agents for JCTC programs. There are many other examples of regional initiatives in every province.

Key Attributes:

In canvassing both union and management members of the JCTC, the following key attributes of the JAC and JCTC processes were identified:

- ❑ decision making by consensus

- ❑ process carried out at all levels and includes the participation of those most affected by issue and who will ultimately use the product

- ❑ equal numbers of employer and employee representatives, each of whom has the authority and ability to make decisions. Participants need equal opportunity to input and influence - ability to attend all sessions, opportunity of participants to learn about issues and make informed recommendations

- ❑ respect for each other's role and agreeing that parties can work together without losing their authority. Participants must be sensitive to the process of engagement with other participants, which is just as important as, and a necessary precondition to outputs

- ❑ adequate funding and use of expertise.

- ❑ issues creating an impasse were "parked" and members got back to the guiding principles (such as the group's understanding of consensus decision making) and pursued an open honest dialogue in a respectful way, often using expert facilitation. When parties believe in the value of working together, an impasse can be worked through.

Reasons for success:

- ❑ clear issue - welfare of employees

- ❑ commitment to the issue – group never lost sight of their purpose

- ❑ developed guiding principles upon which the committee functioned

- ❑ used existing expertise (private sector model) which advocated equal participation

- ❑ accountability for the process and product

- ❑ issues creating an impasse were "parked" and members got back to the guiding principles (such as the group's understanding of consensus decision making) and pursued an open honest dialogue in a respectful way, often using expert facilitation. When parties believe in the value of working together, an impasse can be worked through.

Benefits of co-development process:

- ❑ parties work with each other, which leads to a better understanding of the issue from all points of view

- ❑ more respect for each other, as parties establish relationships and struggle together to produce a product - long term relationships improve

- ❑ management can become better advocates for employees

- ❑ if multi-level structure, builds trust at the local, regional and national level

- ❑ provides managers with a different way of exercising their authority and accountability.

USING THE STEP – BY – STEP MODEL – A HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLE

Introduction

The PSEA allows the PSC to establish, for competitions and other processes of personnel selection, geographic, organizational and occupational criteria that prospective candidates must meet in order to be eligible for appointment.

The PSC has established a policy framework for selection which provides broad parameters and flexibility to help departments meet their needs and to incorporate the principles of Employment Equity (EE) and mobility. The framework applies to all occupational groups, open and closed competitions, and appointments without competition. For competitions, the policy framework determines who has a right to be considered. For appointments without competition it determines who has a right to appeal. The policy statements indicate that decisions are made within the context of the values, the legislative framework and the principles embodied in delegation agreements.

The PSC has delegated the authority for establishing areas of selection to Deputy Heads and made them accountable to the PSC through the Staffing Delegation and Accountability Agreement (SDAA). Departments may tailor the PSC policy framework to better meet their needs and where necessary establish departmental policies in the context of the principles stipulated in their SDAA.

In the following hypothetical example, the deputy head of a department has decided that there is a need for a tailored departmental policy on area of selection and is open to a co-development approach. The deputy head has therefore set the following task for a co-development working group:

> *Given the demographic profile of the department and the forecasted need for new staff, develop a departmental policy regarding the use of open and closed competitions.*

Using the stepwise model, the process for co-developing this policy could take the following form.

Step 1:   Identifying the Issue and the Parties

Developing the policy as defined by the deputy head begins with identification and discussion of potential issues and challenges. In this instance the working group might deal with the following topics, issues and challenges:

❑ How to appropriately balance the desire for new staff and new ideas while developing current employees.

❑ How to enhance the morale and contribution of current employees while providing a positive environment for new staff.

❑ How to appropriately allow opportunity for mobility within the Public Service while achieving the right balance between retention of corporate memory, knowledge transfer, innovation and fresh perspectives.

❑ Is a single policy for all regions/occupational groups or a more tailored approach desired/required

A critical aspect of this fist step is identifying all parties and stakeholders with an interest in the development of a policy on open and closed competitions. In this instance interested parties might include:

- ❑ bargaining agents with members in the department and departmental management

- ❑ other interested stakeholder groups such as departmental EE committees, departmental youth and manager communities, delegating central agencies, geographically disparate regions and/or units, or any portion of the department that feels it has unique circumstances or challenges in this domain

- ❑ other departments and agencies facing similar challenges.

Step 2: Verifying that Co-development is the Right Process

Establishing a Convergence of Interests

Participants agree that they need:

- ❑ a qualified, non-partisan workforce free of bureaucratic patronage;
- ❑ opportunities for current employees and members;
- ❑ good staff morale;
- ❑ rejuvenation in the Public Service;
- ❑ a healthy work environment;
- ❑ staff mobility; and
- ❑ corporate memory.

Agreeing on the Final Product or Outcome

Participants identify constraints including:

- ❑ laws, regulations, values
- ❑ central agency delegations
- ❑ budget
- ❑ time frame
- ❑ EE or official language targets.

Executive champions (department and bargaining agent) are identified.
Parties commit to principles of participation and to making decisions by consensus.

Step 3: Ensuring Appropriate Representation and Resources

The working group ensures a full complement of appropriate representation and resources using the following checklist.

- ❑ Include officials at the appropriate level of authority for both bargaining agents and management, and representatives of diverse areas, levels and constituencies. For example, representatives from the bargaining agents' national Executive, departmental directors of Human Resources, regional directors, EE representatives, and youth network representatives, etc.

□ Ensure appropriate representation of stakeholders.

□ Ask each participating organization to select their representatives, ensuring appropriate expertise and diversity.

□ Determine roles for participating group members, observers (youth network, middle managers, EE groups etc.), advisors or consultants (e.g. HR specialists, representatives of central agencies etc.)

□ Ensure resources such as the following are in place:

- dedicated time by all participants

- adequate operating funds

- outside experts

- appropriate accommodations and support

- background research.

Step 4: Developing Process Rules

The working group develops and documents consensual rules for the processes they will use to co-develop the new policy. The subjects to be covered include:

□ selection of a chair (or co-chairs) and definition of the chair's role

□ scheduling of regular meetings

□ the process for setting agendas

□ assigning responsibilities for providing information, for arranging necessary supporting resources and for meeting logistics

□ keeping records

□ how decisions will be made and committed to in writing

□ how and when representatives will confer and communicate with their constituencies

□ the use of subgroups.

Step 5: Resolving Impasses

To resolve impasses the group agrees in advance to:

□ continue work when lack of consensus occurs but define the issue clearly and document it in a "parking lot" for later review;

□ explicitly set aside time in a subsequent meeting for review and follow up;

□ invite a third party facilitator or mediator to work with the group (agree on this person in advance);

□ decide if the group can continue in spite of the impasse if facilitation or mediation has failed (the issue is peripheral); and cease co-development work if the unresolved issue is fundamental to the outcomes and the group cannot continue.

Step 6:   Doing the Work

The group will:

- ❑ develop a workplan according to parameters given and agreed to;
- ❑ identify milestones;
- ❑ prepare time lines;
- ❑ build common understanding through fact finding and a review of background materials ;
- ❑ clarify issues;
- ❑ identify a range of options and solutions e.g.:

  - • regular, scheduled open processes for certain occupational groups and/or levels;
  - • opening "closed" competitions nationally or service-wide for certain levels or occupational groups; and
  - • conducting regular reviews of demographics, which then in turn determine whether open, national or restricted closed competitions are held, in specific regions or occupational groups; and
  - • validate options and solutions with all constituents and stakeholders.

Step 7:   Completing the Task

Deliver completed area of selection policy to deputy head for approval.

SHORT FORMS and TERMS USED IN THIS REPORT

Short Forms

EE ....Employment Equity

HRDC...Human Resources Development Canada

JAC ....Joint Adjustment Committee

JCTC...Joint Career Transition Committee

NJC ....National Joint Council

PSC.. Public Service Commission of Canada

PSCAC............................... Public Service Commission Advisory Council

PSEA...*Public Service Employment Act*

PSMA...*Public Service Modernization Act*

PSSRA.. *Public Service Staff Relations Act*

SDAA .... Staffing Delegation and Accountability Agreement

TBS ....Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat

Treasury Board .... Treasury Board of Canada

Terms

Co-development – is a labour-management relations process, based on voluntary participation, designed to allow the equal participation of the parties to produce a desired product. The product of co-development may be a directive, a policy, a set of procedures, or some other initiative that is jointly owned by the parties but administered by one party - the employer.

Collective Bargaining – is a labour relations process mandated by law, designed to allow the parties to produce a legal document that defines terms and conditions of work, as well as employment matters identified as negotiable by the relevant labour statute. The product of collective bargaining is an agreement that is jointly owned by the parties, but administered by one party, the employer. Collective bargaining in the federal Public Service may result in an impasse resulting in the use of two dispute resolution processes: arbitration and conciliation/strike.

Co-management – is a labour relations process where the employer shares authority to establish and implement work processes, directives, policies, and procedures and terms and conditions of work. The product of co-management is a series of agreements on work procedures that is jointly owned and jointly administered by the parties.

Constituents – are individuals and organizations represented by members of a co-development working group.

Consultation – is a labour relations process, primarily voluntary in nature, where the employer engages employee representatives in discussions designed to assist the employer in producing workplace directives, policies and procedures, in resolving other employment matters, or in setting conditions of employment not established by statute or by collective agreement. The product of consultation is solely owned and administered by the employer. The content of the product of consultation is determined in the final analysis solely on the authority of the employer. Consultation does not result in a binding agreement, as the role of one party is simply advisory. There is no mandatory dispute resolution process.

Cooperate – means to work together; unite in producing a result.

Employer – is generally the Treasury Board, but for the purposes of this report, is the body having authority over the product being co-developed.

Interest – is a feeling of wanting to know, see, do, own, share in, or take part in.

Stakeholder – is a person or group having an interest, or stake, in an undertaking, community, etc. with respect to a particular issue.

MEMO / NOTE

File:	83.6.3	**Dossier :**	83.6.3
Date:	August 1, 2003	**Date :**	Le 1er août 2003

Date: August 1, 2003   **Date :** Le 1er août 2003

To: Members, PSCAC   **À :** Membres, CCCFP

Members, PSCAC Working Group on Co-development   Membres, Groupe de travail du CCCFP sur l'élaboration conjointe

From: Dan Butler, General Secretary   **De :** Dan Butler, secrétaire général

Subject: Report on Co-development   **Objet :** Rapport sur l'élaboration conjointe

---

I am very pleased to enclose an advance copy of the printed version of the *Report on Co-development.*

On his return from leave in August, Michael Holt will be working with the PSCAC co-chairs to recommend steps for distributing and marketing this document.

C'est avec plaisir que je vous envoie sous ce pli un exemplaire anticipé du *rapport sur l'élaboration conjointe.*

Dès son retour de congé au mois d'août, Michael Holt travaillera de près avec les coprésidents du CCCFP pour suggérer des méthodes de distribution et de marketing pour ce document.

Le secrétaire general,

_____

Dan Butler
General Secretary