



## ACM (Canberra, Illawarra, Newcastle) & MEAA Enterprise Agreement

### ACM Log of Claims and MEAA Bargaining Committee Proposed Response - Nov 2020

ACM Claim	MEAA Proposed Response
Proposing a three year term.	Considering, subject to overall package
Not proposing to remove or reduce any entitlements enjoyed by employees currently covered by the Current Agreement.	Agreed, but new employees should not be disadvantaged—there should be one set of standards for all
Proposed Agreement is intended to cover employees of Federal Capital Press of Australia Pty Limited, Illawarra Newspaper Holdings Pty Ltd and Newcastle Newspapers Pty Limited, who are engaged in journalism in its literary, artistic and photographic branches and in the gathering of writing or preparing news matters or news commentaries primarily for the Canberra Times, the Illawarra Mercury or the Newcastle Herald, and who fall within the classifications of the Proposed Agreement. It is proposed to exclude managerial employees, editors, editorial assistants, and all other exemptions set out in clauses 4.4 and 4.5 of the Award. This is consistent with the Current Agreement as it applies to Rural Press employees.	Considering, but any excluded positions need to be named, capped and no broader than current exemptions
Consistent with the Current Agreement, proposes to exclude the Award so that all employees are certain and clear about their entitlements and to assist in simple application of those entitlements.	Considering, but agreement needs to be comprehensive
Company believes current agreement is long, unwieldy and not fit for purpose and so proposes to leave things like training generally, authorship, performance appraisals, leave procedures, detailed superannuation provisions, recruitment policies, regulation of home work and salary sacrificing that are dealt with by existing policies to those policies.	We do not support this claim
Proposing to simplify cadet arrangements and training.	Further information and specific proposed changes required
Proposing to remove existing clauses that do not have application to ACM or its employees, such as clauses 17.3, 18, 22, 23, 24.6, 32, 36, 37.16-37.27, 47, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55 and 61	Considering
Proposing a review of Schedules 3, 4, and 5 and EBAM in relation to relevance and look forward to discussing this with you.	Considering
Proposing to include the model consultation and individual flexibility clauses. This represents best practice as endorsed by the Fair Work Commission. These are consistent with the clauses in the Current Agreement, although are simpler and easier to understand (which is our aim). We propose to include the template for example Individual Flexibility Arrangement in the Current Agreement.	Considering, but unclear what precise concerns are about current clauses
Proposing to remove the duplication of steps in the dispute resolution clause and align it more with the model clause. This includes clarifying that employees are not required to continue working where there are safety concerns, and leaving the ability to bring disputes under s 65 and s 76 of the <i>Fair Work Act 2009</i> (Cth) ( <b>Fair Work Act</b> ) to the Fair Work Act itself (ie, avoiding unnecessary duplication).	Require clarification – is ACM's claim to replace current clause with Fair Work Act model clause?

Proposing no pay increase for the first year of the Proposed Agreement. Still considering in detail the position for subsequent years of the Proposed Agreement.	2% per annum
Proposing to remove references to parental leave in the Proposed Agreement as the business policy is much more beneficial to employees.	Beneficial parental leave provisions should be included in agreement
Where leave references in the Proposed Agreement retained, it is proposed to simplify these and avoid unnecessary duplication of the Fair Work Act.	We do not support this claim
Proposing to align the annual leave provisions more with the Award and Fair Work Act including retaining the ability for employees to request to cash out accrued annual leave and the ability to take annual leave in advance of it being accrued, and amending the ability to direct employees to take annual leave with four weeks' notice and during close-downs. These proposed changes will not reduce the amount of annual leave an employee is entitled to accrue.	Require further information
Proposing to remove the restriction on taking annual leave within the first 45 weeks and four days from the annual date of appointment to give employees the benefit of being able to take these forms of leave if they want to.	Agreed in principle subject to proposed wording.
Proposing more simplified wording around hours of work and overtime for eligible employees consistent with Award. This will not remove or reduce any entitlements and will continue the practice of incidental overtime and pre-approval requirement for all overtime.	Current clause(s) work well. Require further information.
Proposing to remove the VDT provisions (which refer back to the initial introduction of computers to the workplace) and regularise a 38-hour week for all employees, as they are incompatible and out of sync with our operations.	Considering
Proposing to retain or "grandfather" current notice and redundancy provisions for current staff so that there is no reduction to entitlements currently enjoyed by those employees. For new employees employed after the commencement of the new Proposed Agreement, proposing to introduce notice and redundancy provisions consistent with the Award and <i>Fair Work Act 2009</i> (Cth).	We do not support this claim
Proposing to include ACM default superannuation fund so that employees are aware of it in case they fail to nominate a choice of fund, and clarify that they have choice of fund.	There should be choice with Media Super as default.
Proposing to align the meal allowance and spectacle allowance entitlement with the Award, while maintaining the higher allowance values under the Current Agreement.	Require further information
Proposing to include a revised casual conversion clause.	Do not support in principle but would need to see proposed clause
Proposing to remove the restriction on which levels casuals can be classified, giving casuals freedom to be engaged at higher levels.	We do not support this claim
Proposing to remove the requirements to have specific percentages in each classification Band.	We do not support this claim

A member meeting will be held via zoom on Tuesday 1 December 2020 at 1pm - <https://meaa.zoom.us/j/99426811170> - to discuss the above.