

JACFA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
January 29, 2003
P-204 at 5:30

01. Adoption of the Agenda

Moved by Pierre Gauthier; seconded by Steve Orlov.
Passed unanimously.

02. Adoption of the Minutes

Moved by Steve Bryce; seconded by Bill Tierney.
Passed unanimously with 2 abstentions.

03. Announcements

Peter Solonsznyj asked that General Assembly members sign a petition to support pay equity negotiations for public sector workers.

1. Salary Structure

VOTE

Motion: Be it resolved that JACFA accept the Agreement-in-Principle relating to the recognition of professional services rendered by Cegep teachers and the application of a new salary structure starting in 2003-2004. – FNEEQ motion

Peter Solonsznyj reported that the FNEEQ-Government Agreement-in- Principle is:

1) NOT a new collective agreement. FNEEQ will soon be depositing our demands for the next contract. In the new collective agreement, the revised pay scales will apply and all faculty will get the same percentage increase to their salary.

2) NOT a “pay equity” settlement. College teachers are a “mixed” job category, with no predominance of either male or female teachers. Therefore, the pay equity law does not apply to us.

New Salary Scales

However, since 1967, we have had the same pay structure as primary/secondary school teachers. They are a predominantly female job category covered by the pay equity law. In May 2002, their union federation, FSE-CSQ agreed to a new salary structure. Peter presented an overhead that outlined the CSQ single salary scale that will be phased in over the next three years, starting in fall 2003. Talks between FNEEQ and the Treasury Board started in October 2002 in light of the FSE-CSQ agreement. On Dec. 18, 2002, the Treasury Board made a formal proposal to FNEEQ, FAC and FEC. On December 22, an Agreement-in-Principle was reached by FNEEQ and the Treasury Board.

We are now in the ratification process. FNEEQ requires a double majority, that is 18/35 unions AND a majority of all members voting in favour of the Agreement-in-Principle.

Peter presented overheads comparing the current collective agreement and the proposed single salary scale. This scale is the “FSE” scale plus levels for teachers with master’s and doctoral degrees. No one will be paid less than primary/secondary school teachers, so it’s a good deal for us. There will be substantial increases for the majority of our members (scholarship 17, 18). There will be faster access to higher salaries for all teachers moving up the scales. A separate level for Ph.D.s will be maintained and protected for pension calculations. This deal also includes salary recognition for the first time for a master’s degree, which will cost

the government \$10 million annually. Overall \$38 million will be added to the salary mass of our teachers. Scholary increases on the way up the scale will raise pay levels.

On or before June 29, 2003, the analysis of all job categories will produce a new job classification system. The minimum additional adjustment that primary/secondary school teachers will receive is 1.68%. Our agreement specifies that our pay scales are the same as primary and secondary, with the three extra levels. Therefore, nobody gets cut; scales up to the old 19-15 will be adjusted. This amount could be higher, depending on the evaluation of the questionnaires. This will add \$10-12 million to the salary mass of our teachers.

Professional Services Rendered

This letter of agreement for “professional services rendered” was negotiated with the Treasury Board. From the beginning of these talks, the Treasury Board made it clear that we would be required to sign a letter on services rendered, similar to primary/secondary school teachers. The letter on “professional services rendered” outlines activities that teachers already perform. The letter also clearly states that these activities will be performed “without increasing the workload of teachers.” The letter outlines pedagogical activities in four areas: 1) Learning Assistance, 2) Tutoring/Encadrement, 3) Pedagogical Development, and 4) Professional Assistance. The 173 hours of activities performed annually will be accomplished within hours of availability. The letter specifically respects departmental and program rights, teacher availability, workload (Volets 1-2-3), allocation, and individual workload calculation. The departments will submit projects and the College will approve and then send an individual letter to each teacher each semester. Each teacher will submit an annual report, “evaluating the impact of the project and making recommendations,” which will be attached to the department’s annual report. The teacher’s annual report cannot be used for an evaluation of the teacher. Peter likened the letter of professional services rendered to the SASS projects that we agreed several years ago in order to save jobs.

Peter reported that the JACFA Executive unanimously recommends acceptance of the FNEEQ motion. The *Regroupement Cegep* also strongly voted in favour of recommending this motion to its general assemblies.

Michel Milot reported that he also attended the *Regroupement Cegep* meeting and listened to the arguments for and against the new salary scales and letter on professional services rendered, but none of the arguments against the Treasury Board proposal could overcome the money offer. Some unions were worried about 173 hours, as it appears to be an increase in teacher workload or an attack on our professional autonomy. However, Michel pointed out that it is the departments who will establish and assign projects, which will be done through the usual departmental procedures according to a teacher’s own interests. Michel challenged the general assembly to find him one teacher who does not do four hours per week of pedagogical activities including office hours, preparation for class and extra-curricular activities, tutoring activities, program meetings, committee meetings, open hours, mentoring, meeting with weaker students, Performa courses, etc.

The Chair announced that members could now ask clarification questions. After these questions are answered, debate will begin.

Rick Stojack stated that he is part of the 20% who will not benefit from this agreement; therefore he wanted an interpretation of the statement “if any” pertaining to salary increases on the overhead. Peter answered that currently virtually all public sector workers have a 2% increase and that our salary increase will be negotiated at the central table so the increase will

be across the board. Also, the Government must examine the inflation rate, etc. and we often benefit from the well fought demands of poorly paid public sector workers, such as nurses and hospital workers.

Aniko Hill asked if the \$66,878 is the limit for level 20. Peter responded that the unions asked for increases for everybody, but the Treasury Board said no.

Paul Jones asked what the professionals at JAC think about this deal. He was concerned about the discrepancy between what a teacher with a master's degree earns in elementary/secondary school and what is proposed for Cegep teachers. The CSQ has accepted that a teacher with a master's in primary/secondary will make less than a teacher with a master's in Cegep. The professionals were initially concerned that the 173 hours meant that we would be taking their jobs away. Recruitment was in the initial letter of agreement but was taken out, as it is not in our collective agreement. Peter stated that he is not sure of the reaction of primary/secondary school teachers, but that they voted in favour of the current scale.

Judith Thibault stated that she is in favour of the new salary structure, but is worried about losing her professional autonomy. Peter responded that the letter does not increase our workload and that the only new item in our contract will be the filing of an annual report. He also pointed out that it does not have to be an individual project; a department can submit a project about the operation of CAF, for instance, and that this will cover all its teachers. The government is giving \$50 million to us so they need a rationale to sell this pay raise to the public. JACFA does not see an increase in workload. SASS was added to our collective agreement and many thought that it would increase our workload, but it has not been the case.

Daniel Gatien asked how the old salaries map to the new ones. Peter suggested that he look at the scales in the latest issue of the JACFA News and reminded the General Assembly that the single salary scale is only for full implementation at the end of three years (2005-2006).

Ed Palumbo wanted to know if the 173 hours could be translated into specific tasks such as teaching or tutoring assigned by the College. Peter answered no and that JACFA will come up with a guide on how to fill out the report. Ed also asked if this agreement would lead to deans supervising or policing these activities. Peter stated that it is difficult to predict the future, but he does not foresee any new loopholes.

Patrick Burger asked for clarification on how we move through the new salary scales.

Murray Napier stated that he fears that the bureaucrats may interpret the agreement differently than we do, as happened with the reforms. He then asked if the four categories are "over and above" what we already do. Peter reported that the major discussions of the four days of negotiating the letter ended with an agreement that each teacher's annual report cannot be used for teacher evaluation. The College will verify if everybody has completed his or her report and then file it. Peter compared our letter to that of the primary/secondary teachers and noted that they agreed to five more hours of availability. We do not have to provide any more availability.

Sandra Stephenson asked to call the question. The Chair stated that clarification questions were not yet finished and that debate had not yet taken place.

George Ostojic asked if 18 applies to those teachers who got their master's degrees outside of the province. Peter said yes.

Bill Russell asked, if we get this raise, will our future strategy for negotiating our collective agreement include asking for more money for Ph.D.s. Peter responded that no, unless we receive a new mandate, the increase will apply to everybody the same way. Peter also noted that, on the point of fairness, the one size fits all approach of a percentage increase results in a larger increase at the top of the scale.

June Beverly asked for an explanation of "master's in a related topic." Peter responded that a master's in education would be accepted. However, other disciplines than the one is teaching in will require interpretation; there will be disputes over this issue.

Chantal Pelletier asked if there was a difference between a master's with a thesis or course work. Peter stated that the government values them equally.

As there were no further questions, the Chair announced that debate could begin. Paul Jones expressed his concern that this proposal is too good to be true and that we should all be on guard. He also stated that it is elitist to break away from primary and secondary teachers. In contrast, university professors do not account for their research hours. The administration could read this letter of agreement as a way to try to open the door wider than it really is. He does not believe that the PQ is buying votes, as we are not critical to their winning the provincial election. He has never seen a negotiation that was a one-way gift. The government may hire experts to measure us. He asked if the money incentive is enough to counterbalance this trade-off, as we are giving up a little autonomy for finally getting closer to the salaries we deserve.

**Les Dickie called the question; Peter Henbury seconded.
The question was called.**

**Ruth Taylor, Ryan Young, Robert Seely, and Mike Turner volunteered as scrutineers.
The chair announced the results of the vote: 125 in favour; 8 against, 3 spoiled ballots.**

The chair called for a motion to destroy the ballots. Pierre Gauthier; seconded by Ruth Taylor.

Ruth Taylor asked to adjourn; Ryan Young seconded.