

## **JACFA GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**May 13, 2003**

**P-204 at 5:30**

JACFA Elections for the JACFA Executive, Academic Council Representatives, and FPDC Representatives began at 6 p.m.

The Chair announced that Daniel Gosselin would be serving as the new elections officer.

Gosselin announced that he had received one nomination for JACFA President: Barbara DeLorenzi. He then asked for nominations from the floor. None were received. John Sheshko asked to close the nominations; seconded by Vivianne Silver.

Gosselin announced that he had received six nominations for the six positions of the JACFA directors: Stephen Bryce, Pierre Gauthier, Jim Leeke, Michel Milot, Peter Solonysznyj, and Faye Trecartin. He then asked for nominations from the floor. None were received. Frank Lo Vasco asked to close the nominations; seconded by Chantal Pelletier.

Gosselin announced that he had received nominations for 11 permanent Academic Council members: Violaine Ares, Stephen Bryce, Pierre Gauthier, Rekha Iyer, Cheryl Jenkins, Christopher Lester, Bertram A. Somers, Abe Sosnowicz, Sandra Stephenson, James Vanstone, and Carl Witchel. He then asked for nominations from the floor. None were received. Claude Benoit asked to close the nominations; seconded by Judith Thibault.

Gosselin announced that we need four alternates for Academic Council. Ruth Taylor nominated Chantal Pelletier, who accepted the nomination. Stephen Bryce nominated Ruth Taylor, who accepted the nomination. Stephen Bryce asked to close the nominations; seconded by Abe Sosnowicz.

Gosselin announced that he had received four nominations for the five positions on the Faculty Professional Development Committee (FPDC): Anna-Mae Barrett, Suzanne Black, Jan Szumski, and James Vanstone. He then asked for nominations from the floor. Endre Farkas nominated Ryan Young, who accepted the nomination. Ruth Taylor asked to close the nominations; seconded by Michel Milot.

### **AGENDA**

#### **01. Adoption of the Agenda**

Moved by Ruth Taylor; seconded by Ed Holland.

Passed unanimously.

#### **02. Adoption of the Minutes**

Moved by Stephen Bryce; seconded by Pierre Gauthier.

Passed unanimously with four abstentions.

#### **03. Announcements**

Michel Milot announced that the ballot box for the FTAA ballot box was up front for people to contribute their opinion. Milot thanked those who had already filled a ballot out.

Roger Haughey suggested that a working group be set up to develop a certificate in North-South Relations. Judith Thibault added that Peace Studies could adopt the certificate.

**1. Financial Motions**

**(a) Vin d'honneur at Convocation, 2003 - \$1000.**

**VOTE**

*Motion: Be it resolved that JACFA make a donation of \$1000 to assist the payment for the vin d'honneur at Convocation, 2003 and that suitable credit be given to JACFA on the convocation program as in previous years. – Moved by C. Lester, seconded by P. Green-Milberg*

**The motion was passed with two abstentions.**

**(b) Contribution to a Union in a Labour Conflict - \$500.**

**VOTE**

*Motion: Be it resolved that JACFA give its full support to the Association of Graduate Students Employed at McGill, (AGSEM-TA) FNEEQ-CSN, in their struggle to obtain a satisfactory collective agreement, and provide them with a contribution of \$500 to this end. – Executive motion*

Peter Solonysznyj explained that McGill's teaching assistants had been on strike at the end of April for ten days. An agreement was reached May 1 with 94% approval. Daniel Gosselin asked why the Executive set the contribution at \$500. Peter responded that it is a standard amount that JACFA donates to express solidarity with FNEEQ unions in conflict.

Marcia Kovitz called the question; seconded by Daniel Gosselin. The question was called with a two-thirds majority.

**The motion was passed with one abstention.**

**2. Negotiation Demand for 2% Pay Increase**

**VOTE**

*Motion: Be it resolved that the following become part of our salary demands for the current round of negotiations:*

*Increase each annual pay scale and pay rate of Cegep teachers by 2% for the first year of our collective agreement, without concessions, beginning with the first day of the 2003-2004 academic year, and this without prejudice to our demands concerning salary parameters for 2003. – FNEEQ Motion*

Peter reported that the last collective agreement expired June 30, 2002. FNEEQ consulted members on a one-year contract extension for all public sector workers. We rejected it along with FAC and the Nurses union. The reason for this rejection was to begin sector table negotiations on workload issues. This spring, FNEEQ and the Treasury Board reached an agreement on salary structure, which occurred as the result of a massive job evaluation study required by pay equity legislation. There is an important clause in the agreement that gives Cegep teachers three more salary levels than primary and secondary school teachers. We will receive a 1.68% increase, but it could be higher if primary and secondary teachers get an adjustment based on the pay equity study. The process is supposed to be finished by the end of June. The motion expresses our demand to harmonize with other unions. Virtually every other public sector union has the 2%, so we are out of sync; therefore it is difficult to make the same

demands at the central table. We want the 2% with no concessions in order to start on a level playing field. This demand does not insist on retroactivity, so that it will be more appealing to the bureaucrats. The government may say yes. Even though we are not a large group, but we can be difficult at the end of the negotiating process.

Aniko Hill asked why FNEEQ is not interested in asking that the 2% be retroactive to 2002? Peter responded that we received our last increase in Fall 2002 under the last contract. The government is in the middle of resolving pay equity and therefore not likely to respond positively to a retroactive demand. Peter noted that the issue of moving up the date for pay raises will be part of next negotiation process.

Marcia Kovitz stated that we did get 2.5% last August. Peter agreed but pointed out that it was part of our last contract—the 2% in question was above and beyond that amount. Marcia asked if the inflation rate is 4%, why are we receiving such small pay raises. Peter stated that when the government proposed its offer, the inflation rate was 2-3%. Many unions were more interested in pay equity settlements and took the 2%. Marcia asked about the teachers with Ph.D.s, who will not receive an increase under the salary structure agreement. Peter responded that JACFA voted strongly in favour of the agreement and that a 2% increase is proportionally higher for a Ph.D., than for a teacher without one.

Judith Thibeault wanted to know why we initially wanted the 2% and then didn't want it. Peter said that JACFA always wanted the 2% and voted in favour of the demand, but we were in the minority at FNEEQ.

**The motion was passed with 41 in favour and one abstention.**

### **3. Computer Purchase**

### **REPORT**

Michel Milot reported that last March our ten-year old laptop passed on, so we needed to purchase a new one. Usually any purchase over \$500 needs approval at a general assembly. It did not, however, seem worthwhile to hold a general assembly to approve one purchase. In the meantime, Milot was offered a used laptop for only \$900. Since the laptop was only a year old, fully loaded with software and worth over \$2,000, JACFA decided to purchase it before it was bought by somebody else. Ruth Taylor proposed that we consider a motion that would allow the Executive to spend more than \$500 without consulting the general assembly; the Chair noted that the Executive would take this idea into consideration. Daniel Gosselin moved to accept the purchase of the computer; seconded by Bob Collins.

**The purchase of the computer laptop was approved with one opposed and one abstention.**

### **4. Insurance**

### **REPORT**

Stephen Bryce reported that the sample of respondents to the insurance survey was representative of the faculty. The survey showed that faculty did not want to pay for coverage for "lifestyle" drugs, such as Viagra. The faculty was split on increasing coverage to cover vision care. Unless two or three people on a family plan need glasses, the increase in rates is not worthwhile. Thirty-six faculty indicated that wanted dental coverage, which is the highest that Stephen has seen; however, this number was not high enough to change our current policy without further consultation. Most respondents were satisfied with Maritime's processing of claims. Stephen noted that a drug card would eliminate paper work, but our rates may go up as more people will be automatically submitting claims. All the insurance companies are moving towards the drug card, so it won't be long before we will be forced to adopt this method for

processing claims. Stephen reported that 9% of our members have been having problems getting reimbursed for lab tests. All but one refusal have been overturned. The majority of our members (58%) stated that our coverage is satisfactory. Stephen also noted that while the FNEEQ plan costs a little less, our policy provides much better coverage. Stephen stated that the Executive is quite willing to let Continuing Education teachers join our plan, but once they find out how much it costs, they may not be interested in joining. It cannot be optional under the Quebec drug law. LTD coverage is getting more expensive and fewer faculty members are choosing coverage, so our insurance company is looking to increase our rates. On the FNEEQ plan, LTD coverage is compulsory at permanence. We currently tie life insurance to LTD coverage and most faculty members indicated that they should remain linked.

Peter Solonysznyj asked how many faculty have LTD coverage. Stephen responded 280. Peter also wanted to know if rates will drop if LTD is made compulsory. Stephen said that the faculty now covered are mostly over 50 so if younger members join, rates will go down.

Helen Ellis asked about the mono-parental coverage for one child. She is penalized because she has two children and has to purchase family coverage and finds \$156 for two children expensive. Stephen agreed that this situation needs to be reexamined. He agreed that mono-parental insurance that only covers one child is expensive, especially compared to the couple's rate.

Daniel Gosselin stated that he doesn't like the drug card because he likes to send everything at once and get a big cheque. Stephen responded that having a drug card does not mean members cannot submit paperwork themselves.

Ryan Young expressed his surprise that our policy does not cover dental and glasses. He also noted that our policy should encourage alternative therapies as they are not supported by our medical system. Stephen responded that we have to balance our benefits against our claims. We have tried a dental plan in the past, but it must keep a majority of faculty to be viable. Ryan said he was not aware that this coverage is so expensive.

Frank Lo Vasco asked when our policy will expire and wanted to know if negotiations were ongoing. Stephen responded that it will expire in January 2004, and we receive a renewal offer in October 2003. Our broker is worried about the mergers within the insurance industry and that companies are focused on profits rather than new membership. Our broker has another insurance company in mind, but they may be merged. We can pull out of our current policy with 30-days notice.

Deirdre King asked the members to look at rates we are charged for children and how inexpensive they are in terms of disbursements. Stephen agreed that children do not increase the cost of our plan. Stephen responded that in our 2002 renewal, we tried to rebalance our policy by bringing down family and mono-parental rates while increasing single rates. Stephen said that we will definitely look at this issue, but it may be a zero-sum game: if something goes down, something else must go up.

Roger Haughey stated that we've been tailoring our policy and maybe it is time to look at the whole policy with a fresh eye.

Helen Ellis reported that she made a claim and then the insurance company charged her for the cost of the query. She thinks that we should switch to another company.

Stephen asked to see the note about the query. Cheryl Jenkins reported that she has queried claims and has never been charged to do so.

**Motion to adjourn proposed by Cheryl Jenkins; seconded by Anna-Mae Barrett. Adopted.**