

JACFA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
May 2, 2013
Penfield 204

01. Adoption of Agenda

Motion to approve Karl Raudsepp, Tia Nymark.

Carried.

1. Announcements

Two JACFA executive members will not seek re-election on May 15, 2013.

Faculty Theater Night May 8th.

Roy Fu (HUMANITIES/PHILOSOPHY/RELIGION): Peace Jam at 7pm in H-101; benefits for Peace Studies students.

2. Allocation 2013/14

Alex gave an update on the allocation project since final CRT meeting on April 17th. The Executive met with Admin to discuss their reactions to the imposition of Volet II. Concerns about flaws in the consultation process were raised. Admin did not feel it would be productive to revisit Volet II cuts. Since the project was imposed by Administration without an agreement with JACFA, it must still conform to the Collective Agreement. Alex spoke about some problems with the allocation project, including no release for departments to participate in program activities, release to do work in only one semester for a workload that lasts the entire year, and unallocated multidisciplinary (Methods) sections, to name three. There is another issue regarding the creation of posts using Methods sections. Admin says it's their job to push forward and make difficult and unpopular decisions. At end of the year we will get a year (2013-14) 'bilan' with an updated account of the surplus. We anticipate that despite cuts this year, we are still over-allocating resources; there will thus be more cuts coming in the next academic

Ute Beffert (JACFA): spoke about discussions with Donna Yates regarding new policy of paying non-permanent teachers by CI, rather than teaching hours. The executive's position is that it is a problematic way to proceed and will not produce the cost savings Admin suggests. It will in effect create two classes of teachers, 1) non-permanent teachers who have to worry about their CI and thus enrollment (particularly in specially protected smaller sections); and 2) permanent teachers can then teach without concern for CI. Nothing has been decided yet, but JACFA executive suggests we take sufficient time to study the potential impacts.

Roger Haughey (Humanities/Philosophy/Religion): Admin's rationale for imposition of the allocation project was that they had negotiated in good faith with JACFA executive, so decisions should stand. Further asked Alex to highlight some of the changes Admin made to the allocation project since final CRT.

Alex Panassenko (JACFA): One change had to do with allocation in Volet I of INCA sections; the other was JACFA's release—Admin gave JACFA exec an additional 1.0 FTE.

Debbie Lunny (Humanities/Philosophy/Religion): But didn't certain programs who were upset with Volet II cuts have some of their release restored?

Alex Panassenko (JACFA): Liberal Arts, Double Dec and Arts and Sciences had their release restored in Volet II. So the Admin's concern about "pitting faculty against each other" has already happened. Clarified that JACFA sought to have cuts restored, but leave gains as they were because there were departments who received more resources who had been waiting for them for quite a while.

Thierry Neubert (History-HEPS): Happy that LA, DD, A&S got their release restored. Asked about Donna's assertion at the last CRT on April 17 that we can sometimes be off in our projections by as many as 10 FTEs? If so, with a surplus of only 18 FTEs, we can deplete that in only a couple of years.

Alex Panassenko (JACFA): Because allocation is projected for the next year during the winter semester, we cannot know how many students will actually enroll. In the past few years, we've over-projected by as many as 10 FTEs. This is problematic.

Bill Russell (History-HEPS): Admin doesn't care whether teachers are pitted against each other. They have imposed the allocation project and are saying that they are now the bosses; they can do what they want, regardless of what faculty say. The challenge will be what will we faculty now do about that.

Ed Holland (Anthropology): I was dismayed by the lobbying that took place for Volet II release. I also have a problem with our faculty association advocating for gains in certain departments with losses in others; that's where faculty are pitted against each other. Since I have not heard the criteria by which these decisions were made, it doesn't appear fair.

Suzanne Black (Chemistry): I disagree with the last two statements that we or other departments lobbied JACFA executive to get the resources we need. We elect our JACFA reps to advocate in the best interests of the collective, not just any single department. That in having done so, JACFA exec is then accused of acting in an underhanded way is unfair.

Ed Holland (Anthropology): My previous statement was misrepresented. I didn't say JACFA exec acted in an underhanded way only that they did so in a closed session without a clear representation of the criteria by which these decisions were made.

Roger Haughey (Humanities/Philosophy/Religion): As a chair the last two years, the JACFA executive never sought my input; I only heard details of what was going to happen from Admin.

Deb Lunny (Humanities/Philosophy/Religion): Ed, the way you are speaking assumes that everything was fair and equitable before the Volet II allocation process began. There may have been departments who were under-allocated. Another idea to consider is rotating cuts. Just because you took a hit this year shouldn't mean that you'll have to be cut again the following year. Departments that received full allocation in one year would be top of the list for the following year to accept cuts.

Sharon Rozen-Aspler (Anthropology/Sociology): Where do we go from here? For the first time in 42 years the Admin imposed an allocation project. Is the faculty prepared to follow the allocation project (a legal document) as it is imposed upon us? If we are not released for program participation, then maybe we shouldn't participate.

Mark Ewanchyna (Engineering Technologies): If you propose having certain program reps not attend meetings, it won't make much difference. In my program we rarely see participation in our program committee meetings.

Sean Hughes (Chemistry): Does an increase in student enrollment in Pathways generate additional resources?

Alex Panassenko (JACFA): There is a formula (a linear equation) to determine this and it goes into Volet I (teaching); but the increase is negligible.

Susan Regan (Publication Design & Hypermedia): Is the JACFA exec considering ways to give additional allocation for students with special needs, as is done at the primary and secondary levels.

Ute Beffert (JACFA): There are discussions for this at FNEEQ, but this is only at a very initial stage.

Yves Saint-Pierre (English): Can we look into getting a couple of microphones so that everyone can be heard?

Marcia Kovitz (Sociology): One of the first concepts I teach in my courses is resistance. I don't hear any of that. All I hear is that we are planning to roll over and play dead. Resistance is the only way to go. If Jim Leeke were still here, this would have never happened.

Mark Ewanchyna (Energy Tech): At the expense of being unpopular, I think cuts to Volet II were a good idea. I don't see anything that is too painful for anyone. It's hard for us to know the amount of work that each department or program is doing with their Volet II release.

Marcia Kovitz (Sociology): I am working many more hours than I am paid for. We need to sit down and consult with all faculty to find out who's doing what and how to allocate in the future.

3. Looking Forward

We are looking for ways to solicit ideas from all members for future directions. In a time of cuts, JACFA is facing the prospects of having 2.0 FTEs. We then need to decide whether to restructure our executive and how we allocate the release. On the other hand, we may want to consider whether we want to buy the release (approximately .72 FTEs) so that we are operating at full strength. This would not result in increased union dues. However, if in the future the JACFA executive release goes down to 1.0 FTEs, then we would have to consider a raise in union dues from the current rate of 1.6% of salary.

Richard Masters (JACFA) presented an excel sheet with information about our strike fund, money generated from union dues and so on. This is one option (purchasing release); another is

to revise our constitution to include 5 executive members with an overall reduction in release. Even with purchasing release time, we project a strike fund of approximately \$190,000.

Remi Cardinal (Business Admin): How much release do the union executives at other CEGEPs have?

Richard Masters (JACFA): They have 1.0 FTEs and then buy additional release from union dues.

Roger Haughey. (Humanities/Philosophy/Religion): In terms of having democratic processes, I would be in favor of having 7 executive members each with a slight reduction in release.

Marie-Claire (Biology): Donna Yates made it very clear on at least two occasions at CRT that unless JACFA and the Admin come to an agreement, there will be no additional allocation and the release time for JACFA exec. is to be reduced.

Murray Bronet (Chemistry): I'm not sure I completely understand this idea of buying release time from union dues; but isn't this a slippery slope? Aren't we going in a direction where the Administration will know that they can cut JACFA's release and that we will buy it back? So won't they simply decide to cut it?

Richard Masters (JACFA): This is a Collective Agreement issue; across the *réseau* all CEGEP union executives have 1.0 FTE release.

Karl Raudsepp (Music): Can we negotiate for an increase with the next Collective Agreement?

Ute Beffert (JACFA): We can try, but if we ask for something more, we'll have to give something back.

Alex Panassenko (JACFA): Admin of different colleges gather and discuss what is happening on their campuses; seems reasonable that our DG is informed by what others are doing

Roger Haughey (Humanities/Philosophy/Religion): I would support buying back the release, even if it meant a raise in union dues.

Kevin Davis (Math): An arrangement whereby the union executive release is dependent upon coming to an agreement with the Admin. is by definition a conflict of interest.

Richard Masters (JACFA): it is a relatively small amount, approximately 2% of salary.

Marcia Kovitz (Sociology): I support the idea of our union buying its own release; to take a position of resistance.

Deb Lunny (Humanities/Philosophy/Religion): We need to be careful about how we discuss these "cuts"—they are not imposed by the government; instead they are a way to manage our surplus so that we are not continuing to draw down our savings. I also advocate resistance; there needs to be consequences. If the Admin drops our union down to 2.0 FTEs, then we faculty won't attend Convocation.

Remi Cardinal (Business Administration): We have a \$240 Billion deficit in the provincial budget. We will be seeing more cuts in the future; we need to be prepared.

Ed Holland. (Anthropology): As an act of resistance, I would advocate that we pay for a full union executive from our union dues; and I wouldn't mind having members' dues raised in order to pay for it. Further, I would suggest we buy 2 FTEs and give one to the JACFA executive, the other to restore cuts to Volet II.

Laughter...

JACFA Constitution/Syndical Council

It has been more than 20 years since we've revised our Constitution; in light of the changes and concerns we are seeing, we think it makes sense that we take a look at it and see what changes we might want to make.

Maureen McQuish (English): What about going down to six members of the JACFA executive?

Mark McGuire (JACFA) and Julien Charest (JACFA): spoke of Syndical Council and presented comparative research from other Anglophone and Francophone colleges no questions were asked.

4. SIPD Survey Results

SIPD agreement with Administration is at a standstill. We had been meeting on a monthly basis (JACFA exec and Admin) but after the last CRT meeting; Ginette Sheehy cancelled the remaining meetings without an explanation.

Alex Panassenko (JACFA): In the statement from the admin at the last CRT, it was highlighted that the Admin intends to manage all college finances and surpluses, including international student fund. By this and other comments made by Admin, we understand that they have the SIPD fund in their sights to fill gaps in funding at the college, including IT equipment, renovation budget, a new lounge, etc.

Alex Panassenko (JACFA): then gave the results of the surveys.

184 respondents.

What do you prefer we collectively do with this surplus

First choice

<u>Option</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Choose College IT	29	16%
Renovations	2	1%
International Office	5	3%
IT (as before)	86	47%
Supplement PD	10	5%
Hire teachers	29	16%
Other	19	10%
No response	2	1%

Seconde choice

<u>Option</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Choose College IT	33	18%
Renovations	8	4%
International Office	3	2%
IT (as before)	41	23%
Supplement PD	45	25%
Hire teachers	28	15%
Other	18	10%
No response	6	3%

Should we continue having these “Off the books” International Students which generate this surplus?

Option	No.	%
Continue	105	58%
Stop	15	8%
Other	28	15%
No opinion	32	18%
No response	2	1%

Question 1 Other suggestion		Question 2: 2 nd choice suggestions	
Suggestion for use of INCA funds	# Responses	Suggestion for use of INCA funds 2 nd choice	# Responses
Volet II funding	6	Volet II funding	2
Personal expenses	6	Personal expenses (Laptops etc.)	6
College IT updates	2	College IT updates	2
Let Departments decide/ Tutoring Centers	2	Billboard for Desjardins	1
Parking	1	Parking/Bus pass	2
I don't know	1	Classroom supplies	1
Total	18	Keep with first choice	3
		Total	15

Should we continue this arrangement

Only if it does not hinder local student success	3
Only if it benefits the teachers (If college agrees to return the funds to teachers, same agreement as last time, allocate resources etc.)	18
Only if there is support given so these students are successful (Admission tests, tutoring etc.)	4
For the cultural benefits	4
Only if these students receive credit in their country	1
Increase homestay family support	1

Sean Hughes (Chemistry): Could we buy the JACFA release out of INCA surplus?

Alex Panassenko (JACFA): We would have to come to an agreement with the Admin to do so; seems doubtful. The Admin says it is concerned about fostering jealousy among staff members who would not receive a similar fund.

Ed Holland. (Anthropology): Other support staff, also work to create this surplus, they should also receive a benefit. It's unfair that we would work for free to boost the college's surplus. I would advocate using the SIPD for supplemental professional development. If they don't allocate the surplus to faculty, I will not submit marks for the INCA students, meet them in office hours, and so on. Resistance...

Murray Bronet (Chemistry): Is purchasing computers off the table because of the status of a taxable benefit?

Alex Panassenko (JACFA): College apparently received two legal opinions, one said yes it's a taxable agreement; the other said no, it's not. The college put more credibility in the opinion that it's not a taxable benefit. In the end, we will ask the Admin for the options that our faculty are asking for. The survey results and these consultations will guide us toward the decision.

Doug Brown (English): It's not accurate to say teachers have been working for free to teach INCAs. In fact there has been allocation to departments like Math, Physics and English; but it is true that Social Sciences and Tech Programs, for the most part, have not received any allocation. So any agreement might take this into account.

Kevin Davis (Math): Do INCAs take the place of Quebec students we don't enroll due to the presence of INCAS on campus?

Alex Panassenko (JACFA): The government gives a 'devis' that dictates how many Quebec students we can admit each year; there is a certain margin, but if we go beyond it too far, there can be serious fines. In previous years, JAC, Dawson and Vanier have been allowed to accept an additional 150 students. But the answer is *No*; INCAS do not prevent Quebec students from enrolling at the college.

Alex Panassenko (JACFA): In Math we've had as many as 90 INCAS in our classes; typical enrollment is 30-35, so this has meant an additional three sections of allocation. INCAS, are not registered students, they are not regular students, so JAC faculty said we won't teach them. Admin said, yes, you have to. Faculty then said we'll speak with the Ministry, and then we came to an agreement to teach them but that the surplus would be disbursed to teachers.

Sergio Fratarcangeli (Math): We should have a timeline for a decision.

Chris Tromp (Physics): Another concern is that with the additional number of INCA students in classes, Quebec students are having a diminished quality of education. Any surplus generated from INCA enrollment should go to allocation.

Deb Lunny (Humanities/Philosophy/Religion): I'm confused about how we arrived at the figure (\$1200 per teacher). Is that amount generated from teachers teaching INCAS? Or is that drawn from the support staff's efforts?

Alex Panassenko (JACFA): These resources are generated from teaching.

Deb Lunny (Humanities/Philosophy/Religion): If the Admin does not agree to, using the surplus to pay for technology, then we should put it toward allocation.

Susan Regan (Publication Design & Hypermedia): I would miss having German students in my classes, but if we were to move toward refusing to teach them, that would give us a stronger moral position.

5. JACFA Committee Roles and Responsibilities

Roger Haughey (Humanities/Philosophy/Religion): I would like clarification of the roles and responsibilities of all JACFA committees. Would it be possible to have that prior to the next General Assembly? I sit on the PACC, for example; there's also the Plagiarism Appeal Committee; does JACFA appoint or elect those which are not included in the election package sent to all members?

UTE Beffert (JACFA): We will put something together for the next GA

Wendi Hadd moved to adjourn; Ed Holland seconded. Meeting adjourned at 8pm.