



JACFA General Assembly
9: 30 a.m. December 19, 2012
Penfield 204

The meeting was called to order by the President, Faye Trecartin, at 9:38 a.m.

01. Adoption of Agenda

It was moved by Ed Holland and seconded by Ronald Schachter to adopt the agenda. **Adopted as presented.**

02. Adoption of Minutes

It was moved by Andrew Cuk and seconded by Maureen Godfrey to adopt the minutes of the August 23, 2012 JACFA general assembly. **Adopted as presented.**

03. Announcements

Sergio Fratarcangeli reported that the John Abbott Board of Governors at its December 3 meeting approved a sizable donation from Desjardins. He explained that there are two problems: (1) process – it was a surprise agenda item added at the start of the meeting that was voted that night after a one-hour discussion, allowing no consultation; and (2) secrecy – the item was dealt with *in camera*, and the donation contract requires that its provisions be kept secret. He believes that this violates the Foundation's donation policy which calls for transparency. Bill Russell, the other faculty Board rep, agreed and noted that the JACFA Executive is working on this issue. Paul Chablo asked if donations such as this to a public cegep require government approval. Jim Vanstone replied that the donation is to the JAC Foundation, which avoids Ministry scrutiny. Mark McGuire asked if we can know the specific terms. Sergio replied that no, board members are bound by the agreement's confidentiality clause, and in any case, the printed copies of the agreement were taken back at the end of the meeting. Jim Anderson reported that as a Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue city councillor, he was aware that John Abbott had asked permission to erect a Desjardins billboard on highway 20, but that the original proposal was refused. However, after some modifications, it was finally accepted by the city. Paul Jones said that corporations are always trying to get into educational system to access and sell to students. He noted that the Ministry intervened to prevent this at the primary/secondary levels. Perhaps this should be extended to cegeps? The PQ loves that sort of stuff! Sergio noted that the terms of the agreement may be acceptable to many teachers; to him the process is the main problem here. Ed Holland noted that there's a historical angle here -- McDonald bought a neighbouring farm to take down a billboard that was set up near the College!

Daniel Gosselin reported that FNEEQ is conducting a survey about recruitment difficulties for teachers: chairs/departments please respond!

Daniel also noted that the Ministry is organizing a Higher Education Summit – FNEEQ is asking its unions' members to participate actively on the Facebook page or in the citizen forums (there will be one in English in Montreal in January or February). Ute Beffert noted that FNEEQ reports that Ministry is taking notice of what is said online and is commenting on them at the preparatory meetings.

Mark McGuire reported that Bill C-11, the Copyright Modernization Act, was passed in June and includes "fair use" provisions for education if legitimate purchased copies are used. Elaine Reimer-Pare noted that a policy for all cegeps is being developed. No public performance rights will be required anymore.

1. Financial Motion - CSN Christmas Basket Campaign - \$300

Motion: Be it resolved that JACFA donate \$300 to the CSN Christmas Basket Campaign - Executive Motion

Richard Masters (JACFA Treasurer) – noted that the longstanding CSN Christmas Baskets Campaign helps union members and their families who are on strike/lockout during the holidays. **Motion approved with one abstention.**

2. Evaluation of Teaching Online

- Whereas evaluation of teaching is part of College Policy no. 12;
- Whereas the present method of evaluation of teaching is costly and time-consuming;
- Whereas the technology exists to perform evaluation of teaching online;
- Whereas the feedback from the pilot projects about online evaluation was positive;

Motion: Be it therefore resolved that JACFA accept that the evaluation of teaching survey may be administered online provided that:

- a) all evaluations in a course section be done simultaneously on campus during regular class time under the supervision of a College employee; and*
- b) all information collected remain confidential as specified in Policy no.12*

- Executive Motion

Daniel Gosselin (chair and faculty rep on the Quality Education Committee which oversees the Evaluation of Teaching process) – noted that at present OPSCAN sheets and hand-written comments are used, which then have to be typed-in by TEPA employees. This is expensive and time consuming. Last summer a pilot project was carried out where students were taken to a computer lab during class to do the evaluations. This makes the data entry much easier and less expensive, ensures that it remains a guided process and reaffirms confidentiality.

Karl Raudsepp asked how this would be carried out, as there are no computer labs available for all of the teachers and class times. Daniel replied that this is up to the administration to arrange. They may bring computers into the classroom instead. Andy Cuk questioned how evaluations could be abused. He favours on-line assessments, not classroom ones. John Serrati finds the whole process Big Brotherish – online assessments have been around for years, what are we afraid of? Doug Brown noted that openness to abuse exists in classroom settings as well. He asked if this would also apply to voluntary evaluations. Frank Lo Vasco reported that this took less than 10 minutes at the start of his class in the pilot project and he was strongly in favour... Stephen Bryce noted that for new teachers, the results of these evaluations in the first three semesters can result in the loss of a teacher's hiring priority, so we want to ensure that the process is taken seriously by students, not done while also checking their Facebook and communicating with other students. Doing the evaluations in class in a supervised setting is important. Roy Fu questioned the seriousness of students' comments if the evaluations were made outside of the classroom. Technology itself may result in disembodied communication. He suggested that we be cautious about continuing down this road. Ed Holland stated that he is not too worried about this, but agreed that group rather than individual responses are possible if evaluations are done online. Karen Hickey noted that the maturity level of our students is also an issue for online evaluations. Maureen Godfrey is concerned about the understanding of the evaluation by students; if there's no in-person, verbal instructions before, this could harm the process. She noted as well that alcohol is a depressant! Daniel Gosselin noted that the intention is to maintain the current supervised structure and to monitor how the

change works -- let's see how it goes. Roxane Millette would like to see both – official evaluations in class, optional outside class. Paul Jones believes that the tendency to move everything online is bad (but can't prove this). Context influences output. He suggested taking it one step at a time, and evaluate the results. Roy Fu asked if this was really a pilot project? Daniel replied that no, the pilot project was last summer. Richard Masters noted that more written comments were received when the evaluation was done on computer than on paper.

Eric Laferriere moved, seconded by Doug Brown, to call the question (**Motion carried**).

There were 69 in favour, 3 opposed, and 6 abstentions. **Motion carried.**

3. Save the Lounge!

Julien Charest reported that at the “town hall” meeting called by the administration last June, the College proposed moving the Faculty Lounge from its present location (H-101) to a windowless space on the first floor of the Stewart Hall residence, in order to move the Communications Department into the current lounge space. This was not well received by those present, but we have not heard from the administration about any changes to their plans. JACFA's position is to keep the lounge where it is with its current amenities, and we have launched a petition calling for this. Some faculty have questioned what is taking so long? We have been trying to work with JACPA and JACASPA, as the lounge is open to all staff. They are also now distributing the petition to their members.

Roy Fu asked what the plan is for the next stage? Julien replied that various options, including a sit in, have been discussed, but before we make any plans we want to get a reply from the administration. Ryan Young asked if the new space might not be better? Stephen Bryce – replied that from what we know, it is the only handicapped-access apartment in the residence. JACFA questions whether it is a good idea to have the lounge in the student residence and in such an off-the-track location. Roger Maclean questioned why the Communications department needs such a large and central space. Ed Holland suggested that we offer to trade the current lounge for the Board Room in Stewart Hall instead. Wendi Hadd asked how students in the residence would feel about having faculty wandering around in their living space? Abe Sosnowicz noted that JACFA invested \$30-40 thousand in setting up the lounge in its current location – can we get it back? Doug Brown – suggested moving Communications in the residence instead? Christine Davet noted that there are only 3 people in Communications Dept. -- numbers speak for themselves. Roy Fu suggested that we also work with SUJAC on this issue. Faye Trecartin noted that this will be ongoing issue and asked **everyone to please sign the petition!**

4. Volet 2 - Department and Program Release

Daniel Gosselin noted that at the Labour Relations Committee (CRT) last year a working group was set up to make recommendations on how volet 2 (department and program) releases might be re-allocated. He reported that the administration has questioned the total amount of the release (2.6 FTEs more than is generated), the purpose of the releases (especially for participation in program activities) and wants to free up the Column D (5.2 FTE) release for more special projects rather than program assessments. The working group has conducted a survey and met twice. Stephen Bryce, another faculty representative on the working group, reported that it is not yet clear where this is going, but collapsing chair and program release is being considered, as the survey showed this is

already happening in many departments. Roger Haughey – asked if this would mean a change in structure of program committees? Doug Brown asked if the local agreement on the program approach had been signed yet (no, it has not). Roy Fu asked what the roadmap is beyond this? Daniel Gosselin noted that the allocation project is renegotiated every year. James Kane asked if there would be a separate CRT to discuss volet 2 apart from the allocation meetings. Yes, it will be done before the project. Bruce Tracy stated that he approves of the idea of collapsing chair and program release. Would this affect posts? Alex Panassenko replied that it would not, as the only program release excluded is for evaluation and development. Suzanne Black asked of what total release the 2.6 FTEs were overallocated? Alex replied that the total for volet 2 was between 27 and 28 FTEs. Penny Stewart suggested that a program assembly model be adopted rather than program committees. Kevin Davis asked if, as the administration has suggested, program evaluation release is shifted into volet 2 from Column D, posts could be reduced? Yes it could... Daniel concluded the discussion, noting that this is ongoing and that a report would be given and the Labour Relations Committee consulted before a decision is made.

5. ContEd Arbitration Decision

Alex Panassenko reported on an arbitration decision regarding the hiring priority of ContEd teachers. He noted that our practice was that they had a “right to be considered”. In an arbitration case at Outaouais, the administration argued for a procedure similar to our practice (but including the right to an interview). The union won the arbitration, arguing that any teacher with 3 years of seniority, whether in regular day-division or ContEd, should have an automatic hiring priority as long as they met the hiring criteria. We learned about this ruling in late September and met the administration in October to discuss what would College do. We made it clear that we must represent interests of our ContEd teachers as well as our day-division teachers. We also met with the departments most directly affected (there are teachers with up to 14 years seniority in ContEd, mostly in Business, Computer Science and Nursing), as the potential for bumping exists. The College now says it will enforce the decision. From FNEEQ, we hear that different colleges are doing different things... The article in the collective decision is open to interpretation in different ways; a different arbitrator might take a different view. Eric Laferrière asked what is the hiring procedure in ContEd as opposed to the day division? Alex replied that in the day division, there are three teachers and 2 administrators (usually one Dean and one from HR). In ContEd hiring is done by the administration, but the day-division department has the right to have a representative participate in the process. This works differently in some departments however. We would like to have the same hiring committees in both, which is the practice in many colleges. Bruce Tracy asked how many teachers have 3 years of seniority in ContEd? He also noted that in his experience, the hiring process is not very rigorous process in ContEd. Stephen Bryce replied that there are many teachers with more than three years of experience in a few disciplines where ContEd’s various programs operate. Paul Jones noted that FNEEQ’s position (but always the first to be abandoned in the negotiations) is to integrate ContEd and the day division. The arbitration decision is consistent with this approach – can this not be applied retroactively, recognizing acquired rights and avoiding bumping (e.g. a transition period)? Stephen replied that the problem is that this was not the result of negotiations, in which such a protocol might be included, but an arbitration decision – the ruling states that these rights already exist. Suzanne Black asked if this would have an impact in other disciplines. Alex replied that it is very unusual for ContEd teachers in other disciplines to acquire three years of seniority, and a teacher

cannot transfer it from one discipline to another unless they are hired in it. Roger Haughey noted that HPR was told that they would be hiring for two times more sections of ContEd than previously, and that there is often not a big enough window to properly hire teachers. Could the window of postings be expanded? Doug Brown agreed that the same hiring committee should be used in day division and in ContEd, as is the practice usually in English. Cathy Dutton noted that ContEd runs many sections in Computer Science – who approves their course outlines? How do they acquire seniority? There is lots of hiring done, often last minute. Using the day-division committee would mean lots of work for the department... She noted that one qualified ContEd candidate applied for a day-division job but withdrew their application for Winter 2013. Alex noted that the calculation of seniority is different (by CI in day division, 1 year = 450 hours teaching in ContEd and all hourly teaching). Chris Chadillon noted that this decision will make it even harder hard to recruit people – “come work for us...” but then get bumped. Claudiu Scotnotis stated that the administration is saying we made a mistake over the last 30 years, now the arbitration decision has corrected that mistake – no one is taking responsibility, the consequences are all on nonpermanent teachers. James Kane noted that this has put lots of people in a tough position – it could result in some teachers in his department bumping into Methods. Paul Jones stated that while he could understand concerns about bumping, this was a similar debate as to the rights of *chargé-es de cours* in university. He believes we need to give ContEd teachers a chance, need to integrate them while respecting everyone’s rights.

The general assembly thanked Faye for her 11 years of service on the JACFA Executive and ten years as President.

Alain André moved that the general assembly adjourn in order for the Elections Meeting to take place at 11:29 a.m. **Motion carried.**

Elections Meeting

The Elections Meeting was called to order by the Elections Officer, Jean-Michel Sotiron, at 11:30 a.m.

Jean-Michel noted that there were two by-elections to fill two posts on the JACFA Executive – one for President due to the resignation of Faye Trecartin, and one for Director (member of the Executive) due to the resignation of Ute Beffert.

He asked for three volunteers to serve as scrutineers to assist him in the collection and counting of the vote. Jim Anderson, Faye Trecartin and Chris Chadillon volunteered.

For the position of JACFA President, there was one nomination received by the close of nominations on Friday, December 14 at 4 p.m., for Ute Beffert of the Nursing Department.

As there was only one nomination, **Ute Beffert was declared acclaimed as JACFA President.**

For the position of JACFA Director, two nominations were received by the close of nominations on December 14. In the order they were received, they were for Mark McGuire of the Humanities/Philosophy/Religion Department and for Doug Brown of the English Department.

Jean-Michel noted that under Roberts Rules of Order, there can be no campaigning at the meeting, but asked the two candidates to stand and identify themselves to the assembly and to formally accept their nominations.

The ballots were then distributed and collected by the scrutineers, and the meeting was suspended for the counting of the vote.

When the meeting resumed, Jean-Michel announced that **Mark McGuire was elected as Director of JACFA.**

It was moved by Murray Bronet and seconded by Eileen Kerwin Jones that the ballots be destroyed. **Motion carried.**

It was moved by Doris Miller to adjourn the Elections meeting. **Motion carried.**