VOTE N®

TO CUTTING YOUR CONDITIONS - AND THOSE OF YOUR COLLEAGUES

Statement from Alma Torlakovic, Jen Huch-Hoogvliet, Jeremy Heathcote, and Lucy Nicolls - NTEU Fightback USYD

From the very start of this campaign, we've been arguing to reject management's attacks, and escalate until we win. Our detailed chart explaining the ins and outs of the clauses is available on the MTEU Fightback Sydney Uniwebsite. Short version: the more we see of the deal, the more reasons there are to Vote No.

Severe attacks on core conditions

- Casual professional staff shifts of one hour (or even shorter) a single "minimum engagement" can be split into shorter shifts across a single day or multiple days. This scraps a basic Award condition which is usually treated as an absolute minimum standard.
- An accelerated attack on 40:40:20 new wording in the proposed EA says staff are "encouraged" to abandon 40:40:20 where "reasonable". This will be used by management to pressure staff to cut their research fractions.
- Education Focused Roles with punishing workloads increase from 120 in the previous EA to 650 in the proposed new EA. This can be used to replace existing 40:40:20 staff via restructures.
- Scrapping internal advertising for HEO 8 and 9 professional staff a threat to career progression which also lets management hire external head-kickers to drive "culture change".
- A significant cut to real wages An HEO 5 tier 5 worker, paid close to the average female full time wage, will be \$100 per week worse off (compared to inflation) by mid 2024.

The gains in the proposed new EA don't compensate for these attacks

 No enforceable commitment on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment – the clause says only "reasonable and agreed measures" need to be taken by management, not that management "will employ" staff at population parity.

- "Payment for all hours worked" clause for casual academics is <u>not fit for purpose</u>. Casuals will be left in the same position as now either do a substandard job in the hours allocated by management, or do the job students deserve (and that staff want to do) using unpaid time.
- Increased leave entitlements are welcome but don't compensate for the lost conditions. Most of the leave improvements were offered by management early on in negotiations, a sweetener to get their attacks across the line. Unfortunately, this is pretty much what has happened.

Don't fall for the scare campaign – or the bribe!

- **Non-union ballots** have been defeated by the Sydney Uni branch in the past, and can be again.
- The new "intractable disputes" clauses of the Fair Work Act have only just come into operation. The clauses they replace which allowed EAs to be cancelled during bargaining were in law for five years before the first employer case was successful. It's likely to be many months, or even years, before the new clauses are a threat. In the meantime, we can increase our industrial pressure.
- The \$2,000 bribe for voting for these attacks was mentioned five times in the Provost's latest all-staff email. She doesn't mention our HEO 5 tier 5 colleague on the average female wage will lose close to \$20,000 to inflation if the proposed new EA is voted up.

Vote No to letting management cut core conditions – Vote No to giving our colleagues a pay cut – Vote No because unions should be about organing workers to defend conditions, not approving historic attacks – Vote No because we all deserve so much better