



JOHN  
ABBOTT  
COLLEGE  
FACULTY  
ASSOCIATION

SYNDICAT  
DES PROFESSEURS  
DU COLLEGE  
JOHN ABBOTT  
A MEMBER OF FNEEQ AND CSN

**JACFA GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2014  
5:30, P-204**

**APPROVED MINUTES**

- 01. Adoption of Agenda (60 members in attendance)**  
Moved by Tanya Rowell-Katzemba, Seconded by Ed Hudson. Carried
- 02. Adoption of Minutes (February 26, 2014)**  
Moved by Stephen Bryce, Seconded by Alain André Carried
- 03. Announcements**

**1. SIPD/INCA fund Update**

**Alex Panassenko**

Alex gave a report on various proposals and discussions the JACFA Exec has had with Administration. Principles: 1) Fairness and equity, 2) College Development, 3) generation of long-term effects. The thrust of the Admin's proposal is to develop the International Office. Part of this is to give release to teachers to develop programs that bring more international students to the College. Another piece is "student mobility fund," whereby students with financial need could have opportunities to study abroad. Finally, the academic component is promoting internationalization of the curriculum.

Roy Fu indicated that JACFA executive does not support this proposal because our members have been very clear about wanting to see the INCA Fund disbursed for an SIPD II (professional development and IT support at teacher's discretion) OR to allocate to hire teachers. Further, the International Office has a surplus that it could put to use in supporting this initiative rather than take money from the INCA fund..

Historical context: previously we deposited \$75,000/year into the Surplus because of enrollment by INCA students. Because the number of German students has declined significantly, the amount deposited is approximately \$15,000/year.

Ed Holland: With the SIPD allocation, individual teachers could choose to allocate their portion to International Studies. That's how it should be this time, too. This is our money.

Stephen Bryce: We've waited a long time for something to happen on SIPD, but it's clear this DG is not willing to come to an agreement. I suggest we wait until the new DG comes and we try again.

Alex Panassenko: That's part of our strategy. If we can't come to an agreement, maybe we won't teach INCA students anymore. But this may not be the best timing for that given that we are headed into Allocation season.

Paul Jones: We need to remind people that this surplus was generated by work that teachers did in the past in an "overload" situation; for this reason we need to separate this out from what we may/may not do in the future.

Deb Lunny: I have a question about the legal status of this fund. Can the Admin really not disburse this money that we earned through teaching?

Alex Panassenko: This fund arose from a grievance with the College about accepting and having us teach International students (at the expense of local students).

Stephen Bryce: We were paid our salary. The allocation generated by International students did not generate additional hiring, that's what is different.

Clea Notar: I do not support using the INCA fund to fund International Studies. Why would we continue to teach International Students when we are not paid for it?

Christine Jacobs: When Ginette made her tour of departments, it was clear to my department (ILT) that this fund and international students were her priority but we countered by saying that we don't even have the resources to support these international students (e.g., language support). I think there's merit in waiting until Ginette retires.

Jim Anderson: I agree with the previous speaker that we won't make much headway with this DG and ought to consider waiting this out. I have also seen as chair of Police Tech numerous instances of the College having teachers work without compensation. There is a money grab going on with Ginette. Perhaps the new DG will be conciliatory.

Cindy Edwards: I think the INCA fund could be used to support the Writing Centre since it delivers collective benefits to the College for students without strong English language skills. I am not confident that we'll get another SIPD agreement; for this reason, I think we should allocate the surplus for teaching resources. I don't think we should give any of our surplus funds to the Administration when they aren't willing to use any of their funds for their project.

Alex Panassenko: I just want to reiterate that all teachers were paid for the teaching they did. There was a different allocation for the INCA students whereby they were technically kept "off the books" in terms of allocation and instead we generated a surplus fund. Further, there have been some informal talks between deans and chairpersons about potentially accepting fewer domestic students next year even though applications are at the same levels as previous years. My suspicion is that this is an effort to replace domestic students with INCA students. I intend to speak about this at tomorrow's CRT meeting.

Paul Jones: In essence, this issue is where the Admin is vulnerable. Taxpayers are not being remunerated for the money that comes into a Quebec public college from admitting INCA students.

Murray Bronet: I'm not prepared to stop teaching INCA students, but we have to ask ourselves what is it that we're doing by admitting/teaching INCA students?

Mark McGuire: Another proposal that we've discussed is to have a palette of options (IT purchases, supplemental professional development funding) similar to SIPD and let faculty decide how to spend their money. It's also important to clarify how the waters are muddied with the Administration's current proposal: Ginette sees International studies as a profit centre, whereas Gary and Erich are interested in "internationalizing the curriculum." I think we ought to consider a broader discussion about whether we wish to renew the agreement to teach INCA students and whether the original SIPD should be replicated.

Stephen Bryce: We should revive the grievance and push for allocation of these resources. We should question the original creation of the fund.

Wendy Hadd: What exactly is "internationalizing the curriculum"? Why is it suddenly such a priority? It wasn't on the 5.2 priorities nor is it on the Strategic Plan.

Ed Holland: It seems ridiculous that the Admin is saying, "We'll give you your money but take half of it." This is our money, not theirs.

Paul Jones: I don't want any Quebec student funding the enrollment of an international student by not being here. I am in full support of having international students on campus.

Cindy Edwards: We have an ethical issue here and we need to enter into this discussion with our eyes wide open so that this is not international students taking seats away from Canadian students.

Deb Lunny: I would not be in favor of using the money to grow the international studies program.

Amin Khalili (Physics): The first SIPD fund was a maximum of \$1200/person. Any funds that were not disbursed, did they go back into the INCA fund?

Alex Panassenko: Yes.

Marcia Kovitz: Is there a motion on the floor on this item? I would like to see one. For me, it would be that either the money is given to teachers or returned to allocation:

Proposed Motion

**BIRT that the INCA funds either be used for general teaching allocation and/or disbursed to teachers for use at their discretion.**

Andrew Cuk: I'm not sure that we need a motion to give the executive a motion that would tie their hands in future negotiations with the Administration.

Marcia Kovitz: I withdraw the motion.

Alex Panassenko: No agreement will be negotiated or signed on the INCA fund without coming back to the General Assembly for discussion and agreement.

Ed Holland: We shouldn't get into the details of how to use the money because we still need the Admin to recognize that this is teacher's money.

Jeff Brown: Today we went into the INCA meeting with the Admin with the position that our GA gave us last time: SIPD II or Allocation. The Admin is going to send all teachers their proposal with a cover letter outlining the history of the INCA. You can take a look and then decide on your own.

## **2. Peer tutoring funding Update/Discussion**

**Roy Fu**

Roy Fu: A report was given on Peer Tutoring at the last GA, and it's available in the minutes from the meeting on the website. But there are a few developments, including that during the 5.2 allocation process some cuts have been proposed by the deans. You'll remember that at the January Peer Tutoring meeting the deans said that there may be some slight adjustments and rationalizations, but no significant changes to the status quo. If there were to be any changes, the deans indicated they would hold another meeting on Peer Tutoring to discuss and decide on any proposed changes.

JACFA's position is that if coordinators don't have adequate resources for Peer Tutoring, then the centres will not be in operation next academic year.

Doris Miller: Is the Admin still planning to phase out departmental funds being used to pay peer tutors and instead pay a new administrator?

Kevin Davis (Math): Science chairs spoke with Gary and said that it was not a good idea to take money away from students and give it to an administrator. Gary agreed to keep the departmental funds available.

Roy Fu: The executive has been working on some possible motions on Peer Tutoring that we would like your feedback on.

Mary-Claire Rioux (Biology): With these proposed cuts, the releases according to CI points (rather than by section) simply do not work. Release is supposed to enable you to have some time freed up to do the project (e.g., 5.2 projects or Peer Tutoring), not work harder. We spoke to Gary and conveyed to him that if we were given one of these releases, we would give it back and not coordinate Peer Tutoring.

Stephen Bryce: Unless we have release in Volet 2 It's not our job to support students in other teachers' classes. Our job is to teach students enrolled in the classes that are on our workload and schedule.

Marcia Kovitz: The rationale (gendered) coming from Admin is that teachers will continue to do the work of Peer Tutoring without support.

Tia Nymark: Has the administration consulted with departments about their proposed cuts?

Roy Fu: No.

Mark McGuire: When we asked this question, the deans said that some departments may be aware of some proposed cuts because they discussed them at program committee meetings. The deans' position is that 5.2 release should be allocated to supporting new peer tutoring initiatives only, not "maintaining" existing Peer Tutoring Centres.

Roy Fu: I have two motions for your consideration.

**1. BIRT JACFA reminds its members that in the absence of adequate, dedicated funding for peer tutoring coordination, teachers are not obliged to do that work.**

**2. BIRT JACFA supports the continued use of departmental funds to pay students for peer tutoring.**

Discussion of the motions as amended.

**1. BIRT JACFA reminds its members that in the absence of adequate, dedicated funding for peer tutoring coordination, teachers are not obliged to do that work.**

Moved by Ed Holland, Seconded by Jane Hannah.

Andy Cuk: I would like the motion to be amended so that we remove the part about JACFA reminding members since we are members.

**1A. BIRT in the absence of adequate, dedicated funding for peer tutoring coordination, JACFA affirms that teachers are not obliged to do that work.**

Moved by Andy Cuk, Seconded by Wendi Hadd

Wendi Hadd: I am not comfortable with the clause "not obliged to do that work" because teachers could wind up being coerced; and then some teachers may do the work of peer tutoring coordination whereas others may not. I would like it to be more forceful.

Ed Holland: We as individual teachers do not have the power to tell our colleagues what to do; for that reason we should say instead "...should not be obliged..."

Murray Bronet: I'm not sure what this motion is intended to do and who is the intended audience.

Roy Fu: It's for the administration and to all our members.

Murray Bronet: I'm from Chemistry and we have an extensive peer tutoring centre without any allocation; so if we go with this motion, are we going to be told that we're making the rest of the teachers look bad? For this reason, I think the motion is self-evident and therefore not necessary.

Ed Hudson: I agree with Murray.

Amin Khalili: In Physics we do what Chemistry does. I have coordinated Peer Tutoring without 5.2 release.

Monica Napier (Visual Arts): It might be useful to make a distinction between "being obliged" and "being expected" to do Peer Tutoring coordination.

Mark McGuire: We must recognize that there are no one-size fits all solution for peer tutoring. Also, that we on the JACFA executive have to consider these questions with the collective good in mind, not the simply the particular interests of any one department. Some departments need release for peer coordination; others get by with TEPA funding; still others receive and ask for nothing. But for those who are saying they need these resources, we at JACFA need to give them as many tools at their and our disposal to support them.

Roy Fu: The intention is not to make any departments feel guilty. It instead gives the tools and the leverage to departments who are saying that they need those resources to coordinate peer tutoring.

Debby Lunny: We can have the motion say that, "...teachers cannot be obliged..." This way if the Admin imposes these cuts without our consent, we won't simply roll over and accept it.

Stephen Bryce: Teachers do a lot of work that goes unrecognized and uncompensated. But for something that is ongoing work that won't go away, we need to find the resources to support teachers to do this work. Otherwise, teachers shouldn't have to do it.

Tia Nymark: Can Admin take away resources (TEPA and 5.2) and still make teachers coordinate Peer Tutoring Centres?

Roy: No.

All those in favor of the Amended Motion (1A); Carried unanimously; 5 abstentions.

**2. BIRT JACFA supports the continued use of departmental funds to pay students for peer tutoring.**

Moved by Deborah Lunny, Seconded by Wendi Hadd

Group voted unanimously to table the second motion on Peer Tutoring.

3. Executive Motion (Tabled):

**BIRT that if there is not agreement on the allocation project for 2014-2015, JACFA may coordinate a work to rule campaign, including but not limited to a study day to coincide with the A14 JAC Welcome Back Breakfast.**

Roy Fu: I would like to remind the assembly that the administration knows that they can not agree to the allocation project without any serious consequences for them, just as they did last year. We have an intuitive sense that this is part of the administration's strategy with this year's allocation project. For this reason, we would like to suggest that we have some leverage and put some pressure on the administration to ensure that we do come to an agreement. We think this could give us some solid footing beneath us as we head into allocation.

Jim Anderson: Threatening the Admin not to attend the Welcome Back breakfast is laughable; a slap in the face with a cream puff. In principle I'm in favor of some kind of job action and wish I had a more constructive alternative to offer.

Paul Jones: I agree that this option (breakfast boycott) is a bit wimpy; but I would support some kind of job action. We have a big general assembly in May and could vote for something significant at that time in light of where we are with Allocation.

I suggest that we amend the motion to strike out the clause about the Welcome Back breakfast.

**BIRT that if there is not agreement on the allocation project for 2014-2015, JACFA will coordinate a work to rule campaign.**

Moved by Paul Jones, Seconded by Ed Holland.

Doris Miller: I wish to sub-amend the motion, "JACFA may..." rather than "JACFA will..."

Moved by Doris Miller, seconded by Roxane Millette.

Defeated

Stephen Bryce: I suggest we table this motion until our next General Assembly at which time we will have a clearer idea of where we stand with the Allocation project. We may not need the motion.

Motion is tabled until the next General Assembly. One abstention.

Tabled

Alex Panassenko: If we see that the Admin is moving in a particular direction over the next few weeks with the Allocation project (e.g., no agreement) then we can call another one-item General Assembly to move and debate a motion.

Deborah Lunny: This motion was on the agenda, everyone had a chance to read it; if it was important to them, they would have attended tonight's Assembly. I don't think it's legitimate to invoke those who did not attend and say, "We can't vote on this today because not everyone is here."

---

Motion to adjourn by Alex Panassenko, seconded by Doris Miller.

Meeting adjourned.