



JOHN  
ABBOTT  
COLLEGE  
FACULTY  
ASSOCIATION

SYNDICAT  
DES PROFESSEURS  
DU COLLEGE  
JOHN ABBOTT

A MEMBER OF FNEEQ AND CSN

**JACFA GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 2016**

Penfield P-204, 10:00

*Coffee and a light breakfast will be served in the Faculty Lounge from 9 a.m.*

<http://www2.johnabbott.qc.ca/~jacfa/generalAssembly/generalAssembly.htm>

**Adopted Minutes**

**1. Adoption of Agenda**

- a. Peter Varfalvy, Yanick Charbonneau, guests from FNEEQ and members of the negotiation team for the agreements in principle.
- b. Moved by Julien Charest, Seconded by Martin Poirier CARRIED

**2. Adoption of Minutes of the GA of December 16, 2015**

- a. Moved by Ute Buffert, seconded by Stephen Bryce CARRIED

**3. Announcements**

- a. Make up days and strike days forms ASAP for grievances
- b. Jane Hanna – sketches and watercolors – scanned and printed for office

**4. Presentation of Agreements in Principle (Central Table and Sectoral Table)**

Jean-Marc Beausoleil – PPT Presentation

**Question and answer period:**

QUESTION – 94 charges for Cont Ed – where are they coming from?

ANSWER – There is a reduction in 5.2 (column D) – JAC will become ~4.7. There is also a recalculation of the CI (PES goes from 8 to 7). It is a reallocation of resources.

QUESTION – Question of pension. When do we stop accumulating credits?

Currently at 69.

ANSWER stays at 69

QUESTION – Correct me if I am wrong, when you change classification, you transfer laterally, do you not?

ANSWER – you are in rangement 22, we would move to rangement 23. Each has (usually) 17 echelons. We have 18-19-20 for post-secondary. You keep your echelon, but the salary increases.

QUESTION - Is bonus taxable? Why are we waiting until 2019 for the increase?

ANSWER – Taxable, and 2019 because it is the deal we could get.

QUESTION – How does the CI change impact us? Number of students in seats, etc.  
PETER VARFALVY – Prep has change from 1.9 to 1.75 for 4 preps or more. The HP parameter has changed, and the maximum CI has gone to 85. The effect of the current agreement is maintained.

For the PES factor, historical review, where the PES multiplier was changed in amount, and was changed from all numbers to only those over 430. Finally the 203 FTE (previous levels plus), the multiplier above 415 was changed. Only half was need to fund the used FTE, the rest was used as a buffer.

What was agreed at the table was that the 203 (~100 FTE) was a buffer, remove 95FTE to create 55FTE to lower the CI down to 85. The PES was moved from 8 to 7m with no adverse effects on everybody (in simulation). One or 2 less students per section.

Non-perms who are the absolute last on the list are impacted. Even if the non-perms are less than 80, they are considered perm.

CI over 85, can accept to be paid, or refuse and the extra students are changed to a section of a non-perm.

QUESTION – Scholaryty? Relative documents versus official documents. Will this affect our ability to obtain recognition of advanced degrees?

Yanick Charbonneau – employer asked for it, but a PHD teacher who makes a letter for you, the letter is an official document. Only applies if you don't agree with the employer. Is it the day you get the letter, or the day you apply for recognition?  
Unclear.

QUESTION – Retirement – when do the rules apply? Progressive retirement for persons retiring before 2019 are under the old rules, correct?

YES

QUESTION – Question on the Common Front; FNEEQ will get 12.75%; the rest of the common front will get only 5%, is this correct?

ANSWER – The change to rangement 23 increases our amount. The rest of the common front will only get the 5.5% based on 1-1-1 plus the 2.5% of the realignment of the salary scales across the province.

Catherine Greffard :

QUESTION - Clause 8-5.12 – CI, bas de liste pour TC.

ANSWER - John Abbott does not use the CI to calculate FTE, 12 hours per week is FT.

QUESTION - Rangement 23 will be applied unequally – lower and higher echelons will get less than the 2.5%

ANSWER – in order to get the rangement 23 (80 million vs 123 mil) we agreed to “pinch” the salaries at the extreme ends of the scale, in order to get it at all. This has been dragging since 2010, and probably would not have been settled at all.

QUESTION – Dates of pay increases. April 1 vs. July 1.

ANSWER – as of new agreement, April 1 for everybody.

## **5. Vote on Central Table Agreement in Principle**

**VOTE**

BIRT JACFA approves the Central Table Agreement in Principle

QUESTION – Is it really 12% or 7%? I think the 12% is misleading. Not in a negative sense, but it is misleading. The Reshuffling word has come out a few times, maybe 50% of this assembly does not follow this explanation. Cuts to daycare of \$100 million, guess who is financing our increases?

However, the bottom line is a discussion of our rapport de force and maximizing what you can obtain. My impression is that the public was backing us. I did not feel that we did not have to pull the plug on December 15. The negotiation has to link to the mobilization, and we have to tell you how we are doing in the field.

There was a possibility of mobilization after the holidays, and there are 120,000 people in the health care sector who have rejected the offers. We were in solidarity with them, and now we are not.

Telling us this is the best we can do, that there is no better offer, may not be the best thing to do. My point is this: if there is no perspective of an on-going struggle that we have to accept this today. I will put forward a motion to support the healthcare works.

I don't think we evaluated correctly the dynamic of the negotiations.

QUESTION – I don't think it is quite as negative. We have a role to make sure our advances are not at the expense of other workers. Who has voted to accept or refuse these proposals? We entered this in solidarity; we should maintain our support of them.

QUESTION – In agreement with what Paul said. The Executive has done a great job of mobilization. Our vote was higher than Vieux-Montreal. I do not understand how we can accept this with a high margin. It needs to be 52%, 53%.

For the amount of money we lost, for the time we put in, we deserve more. How low are we willing to go in our demands? The opportunity was never given to us. I would have gone to 2% per year.

What do I get for my \$500? We get maybe \$250 after taxes, what do I get: not even a pair of glasses!

The unions voted for the agreement.

Why in 2019? Because we will be negotiating in 2019! Nobody will want to go on strike for more, when we have just received a raise.

Restructuration means we are underpaid, and we will continue to be for 40 months. Hydro is increasing their rates 4% - I will be losing money, I don't get that amount as a raise!

Withdrawal of patronal demands, okay, but what did we get? Doctors get 34% plus 1.5%, we only get the 1.5%.

The way the leaders announced the agreement, there should be a motion of blame towards the president of the CSN, making an announcement on a Sunday afternoon.

ANSWER – The response to demonstrations that was made by the police was aggressive. The tear gas canister in the face of a young lady, the pepper spraying of peaceful demonstrators; this is the government we are fighting against.

PETER VARFALY – Concerning the other Federations: Comite de coordination we have all the negotiation teams of the CSN present. They blocked the central

table until we got 23. This slowed down the negotiations and the other unions were not very happy with us.

The other unions had no perspective as to how to get more (FSSS). They would have to withdraw all complaints of pay equity for the central table to move. FNEEQ had 199 demands that we presented; the FSSS had 14 at the sectoral table.

At the central table (Dec 18) we have a problem, cannot recommend the agreements because of the equity agreement. The FSSS needed to do something new. FNEEQ had lost mobilization (stop strike; rescind motions, no motion to rally to the cause).

Champlain: professionals rescinded their strike, the support staff asked faculty to support them, to prevent the professionals from passing the line.

FSSS still needs to find a way to get back the pay equity complaints, so they don't want to accept the central table demands for themselves. Their GA will start, and they have 135,000 people. They are only being presented the pay-equity scenario.

ANSWER – FNIIQ – agreement, but being used against FSSS

What did we gain? 2010 - \$1 billion, 2015 - \$4billion moved around, paid, etc.

Larger political battle: commercialization of education. The power that we have at the local level, tools we have (academic council, union release, etc.) stops this, and the government wanted to take this away. They did not win, but neither did we.

We did not ask you to stop the strike, because WE were not asked our opinion.

QUESTION – Have been in a common front before, but does it really work for us? I am not sure.

This is more like a Volkswagen diesel, and not a Cadillac, nor a Mazda 3.

We missed out on pay equity, but we are not getting retroactivity to 2003. We are not getting a great deal.

We have a fully funded pension plan that was defended reasonably well. We have not increased our salaries. Bombardier accepted 1.5 per year for 3 years. We are getting less.

Do we have the mobilization to go back and get more? That is the question. Where are the other groups in the Common Front? Maybe we have to hold our

nose in order to accept this, but we have not heard enough from you about where the other

Violaine Ares – Call the question (hold for response to the previous question)

Yannic Charbonneau – we got where we got because of the CF, but at the end it is also because of the CF. CSQ and FTQ said it was enough. FIIQ had an agreement alone. FSSS and FAE have no agreement. If we refuse, we go back with only part of the CF.

Do we go back to a CF in the future? It is more negotiation between the members of the CF than with the government. This is why they deal with FIIQ against FSSS. Their agreement was conditional on asking the FIIQ to go public, and ask the FSSS to drop their pay equity requests.

Secunder to call the question: Maureen Cuish

Motion Carries

## 6. Vote on Sectoral Table Agreement in Principle

**VOTE**

BIRT JACFA approves the Sectoral Table Agreement in Principle

Move to put a time limit on each speaker: Frank Lovasco, no seunder

Call the question – Violaine Ares, Frank Lovasco

Motion Carries

Returning Officer: Alex Panassenko, Scrutineers: Bruce Tracy, Renata Deptula

	Central Table		Sectoral Table	
<b>For</b>	161	86.1%	168	89.8%
<b>Against</b>	21	11.2%	13	7.0%
<b>Spoiled</b>	5	2.7%	6	3.2%
<b>Total</b>	187	100%	187	100%

PAUL JONES – Motion to amend agenda – new motions – Secunder Gary McHugh  
Decrees in 1982, we continued the battle and stayed on strike, and even though the FAS settled, we continued even though they had left the common front. We should not stop our solidarity towards the hospital workers.

MOTION – BIRT the JACFA Executive convene the Mobilization Committee to develop a strategy of support for the public sector workers (FSSS) and high-school and elementary teachers, in the event they reject the agreements in principle.

Moved by Paul Jones, Seconded by Pierre Massé (PHEC)      **MOTION CARRIES**

**7. Adjournment**

**Stephen Bryce**