



QTU leadership refuse members' call for clear, ambitious demands

From: Tim Arnot [qtufightback@gmail.com](mailto:qtufightback@gmail.com)

Sun 11/08/2024 11:51 PM

## **Overwhelming support throughout the branches for Fightback's motions**

### **Yet the leadership snub their nose to our demands**



Good evening [REDACTED],

This weekend we had our State Council meeting address the EB motions from around the state, and formalise our log of claims. Fightback members on the floor fought for our log of claims to contain clear, ambitious quantifiable demands around pay and conditions that reflect the huge amount of motions carried in branches all around the state. Thanks to your hard work, dozens of branches carried motions for 10+% p.a. pay, double NCT, NCT parity, 15 days' sick leave and more. The graphs above paint a picture of the support for ambitious demands for wages and conditions that members are desperate to see a fightback for.

Unfortunately, the log of claims endorsed by Council contained no such specific demands. While the measures above *could* fall under some of the five interest statements Council voted for, they could just as easily be ignored or refused by the department in negotiation. The format for negotiations the union has adopted is called "Interest- Based Bargaining" and means the union won't fight for specific tangible demands in our log of claims, and is a form of negotiation more suited to Family law than industrial law. Members will no doubt be informed of the five interests by the union.

It's also worth noting that even though our union has adopted Interest-Based Bargaining as their model for EB11 (As they did in EB10), neither the department nor the government have agreed, and there were **NO** branch motions calling for it to be used. Meanwhile, over 30 branches called explicitly for quantifiable demands to be included in our log of claims.

The arguments against adopting clear, quantifiable demands ranged from pro-government to the outright bizarre.

Things like:

- more time isn't workload reduction!
- 10% will mean more students in classes

- we have to think of other government departments - if we win high demands, other departments would raise similar demands (why would that be a problem??)
- 10% would be a "maximum" and if we get it, we'd be outstripped (rather than the minimum we need to start closing the gap between us and other professions)
- we don't know who the government will be, so we can't list everything we're for yet (even though we had to take a vote yesterday to adopt their 5 interest areas)

Raising our demands is not a zero-sum game. We can demand both high wages and workload, and if we're going turn around the crisis in our profession, we need both. While they argued that we have to fight for one or the other, the sum total of their arguments were against both. Sadly this whole approach actually hasn't delivered either workload reduction or improved pay. Just look at EB10 - our pay has fallen behind inflation and there was *\*no\** workload reduction.

It was very revealing that our leadership argued hard, and council voted against, having even a rally outside parliament before the state election. The idea that we'd make public demands on Labor is just beyond the pale for them. This bodes very badly for what will come after the election. Either we will get a Labor government snatching victory from the jaws of defeat, and taking as confirmation of their last woeful agreement, no need to improve our pay or conditions. Or a confident Liberal government that has had no demands or pressure placed upon them.

## **Here's how you can help**

This is not the end. Yesterday, State council wasn't representative of members. But we will have another opportunity in November to raise the demands that rank and file members have pushed hard for.

- All of us will also have our own branch meetings this term and next term to raise our thoughts about the Log of Claims.

- Share this email with your colleagues! Forward it to them, invite them to [sign up to our mailing list](#) and bring them along to your next branch meeting.
- **There will be nominations at the end of the year for State Conference – which will coincide with our EB negotiations and offer! All Fightback supporters should nominate for Conference delegate when the nominations open next term.** And we will have next year's negotiations and the potential for strike action, and so much more to fight for.

In the face of extreme hostility, slander and disingenuous arguments, we will continue to push for what teachers have already voted for and deserve in every avenue within our union. With our union leadership dedicating so much of their resources attacking what members have voted for, they are only undermining themselves, and deepening the divide that exists between rank-and-file members and our leadership. They are proving to more and more members that a fightback is needed, that members need to be more engaged, and that our leaders need to get with the program or get out of the way. It's worth remembering that we are not out-numbered, we are out-organised.

In solidarity,

*Tim Arnot, QTU Fightback*



If you would like to unsubscribe, please reply to this email with UNSUBSCRIBE in the subject.