

JACFA General Assembly Minutes
5:30 p.m. February 20 2013
Penfield 204

The meeting was called to order at 5:44 p.m. by the President who welcomed all members.

01. Approval of Agenda,

Recorder: Stephen Bryce

Motion to move agenda item 6 to the top of the agenda
by Maria Mamfredis; seconded by Eric Laferriere.

Defeated.

Adoption of agenda moved by Ed Holland, seconded by Suzanne Black.

Carried.

02. Adoption of Minutes

Ed Holland moved adoption of Minutes of 18 December 2013;
seconded by Julien Charest.

Carried.

03. Announcements

Congratulations to Bill Russell for acclamation to Board of Governors for his 2nd term.

Alex channelling Paul Jones – presented postcards in support of Sage-femmes in their negotiation.

Research Ethics Board (REB) – executive is seeking three faculty to serve on the REB by Thursday.

Library Renovation Committee – executive is seeking two faculty to serve on the LRC by Thursday.

SIPD meeting between executive and Admin next Wednesday –Director General will make a proposal.

1. Financial Motions VOTE

Faculty Lecture Series / Simon Kevan Lecture Series - \$500.

Motion: Be it resolved that JACFA contribute \$500 to the 2012-2013 Faculty Lecture Series / Simon Kevan Lecture Series

– Moved by Roy Fu, Seconded by Sandra Stephenson

Carried.

2. Financial Motions VOTE

Athletics Department / CCAA Basketball National Championships - \$500.

Motion: Be it resolved that JACFA support the upcoming CCAA Basketball National Championships, to be held on March 14 to 16, 2012 at John Abbott College, by contributing \$500 towards tournament costs. In return, All faculty will be allowed free entry to all games.

- Moved by Joel Fitleberg, Seconded by Mike Homsy

Carried.

3. 2012-2013 Academic Calendar VOTE

- Whereas the 2012-2013 Academic Calendar has only four working days for marking instead of five as required in our collective agreement;
- Whereas there are six calendar days (two non-working) between the last exam and the grades deadline;
- Whereas the departments that have exams scheduled on the last day of the exam period do not object to shortening the marking period;

Motion: Be it therefore resolved that:

- 1) JACFA agree to accept the 2012-2013 Academic Calendar as it has been adopted, with four working days for marking;
- 2) The JACFA Executive be mandated to make an agreement with the College to this effect.
Executive Motion

Alex P noted this was just brought to our attention yesterday – it slipped through the cracks. Jim Vanstone spoke against motion – HEPS has exam on Thursday. Sandra S. – amendment accepted Michael Lautman Maria – how much? Susan Young – many tasks need to be done before summer school registration begins. Kevin Davis. Who are the “parties”? union/admin Sean – can exam schedule be adjusted? Isn’t it still tentative? Alex – team grading is early. Neil Duffy – Bio has asked for exam to be moved to Friday afternoon already. Jim – Hist. accepts but is not happy, does not agree with union dictating working conditions. Ed H. Union negotiates our working conditions in the collective agreement. Eric/Maria called the question. Carried on main motion – 3 opposed 4 abstentions

4. Financial Statement 2011-2012 [See JACFA Website]

Motion:

Be it resolved that the 2011-2012 JACFA Financial Statement be adopted as presented. - Executive Motion

Alex presented. 13 month year shortened by comparison.

Revenues – mostly union dues collected from faculty. Moved out, T-bill into an account that pays a little more interest. Total \$485,090.58.

Disbursements – Paid mostly to CSN, FNEEQ, CcMm – these amounts represent a fixed % of dues based upon the number of faculty at the college.

Net \$21,674.96 added to our surplus (strike fund). R. Fu -- S. Bryce – T. Neubert – is it a fixed 80%?

Motion to accept the financial statement

Carried.

5. Religious Holidays VOTE

- Whereas the College graciously allows teachers to take religious holidays without a deduction from their sick day bank;
- Whereas student success is jeopardized as classes are usually cancelled because the College does not pay for *suppléance*;
- Whereas the cost to replace these teachers currently costs less than \$10,000.00 per year;
- Whereas the *suppléance* budget is four to five FTEs (full-time equivalent salaries) annually;

Motion: Be it resolved that JACFA and the Administration be mandated to negotiate that paid suppléance for classes cancelled due to religious holidays be included in its renewal of the suppléance policy.

- Moved by Suzanne Black, seconded by Michael Lautman

Suzanne Black explained her rationale for the motion: As chair she has to sign absence reports when sick days are in fact being used so that *suppléance* is available. Effect is primarily upon students in multi-section courses because they miss days of instruction as they prepare for common exams. This motion will ensure they have a paid replacement teacher.

Ed Holland – we should use *suppléance* to replace them.

Kevin Davis – what is our surplus? 18 FTEs

Michael L. – tired of being “sick” on religious holidays. He’s not asking to be paid; but wants to be sure that a replacement for him will be.

Neil D. This is not a new situation, makes chairs uncomfortable to file absence reports for “sick” teachers who are observing religious holidays.

Sandra Stephenson– Christian holidays are the real problem—why do we only recognize them as official?

Ed Holland – The official holidays are not Christian, but are now secular holidays.

Strike “graciously” – friendly amendment.

Alex P. –concern that this constitutes double-dipping

Ed Holland – Believes this is not double dipping.

Sean Hughes called the question.

Bill Russell – this is about the students, we’ve got the money, we can do this. Called the question.

Motion

Carried with 4 abstentions.

6. Allocation Project New Recorder: Mark

Stephen presented the project (Volets I, II and II) and how programs calculate allocation in FTEs (“Full Time Equivalents”). Total resources generated for “classroom” teaching is 380.633 FTEs in Volet 1. Additional resources are allocated for Volet 2, 3 and column D. The total amount is 408.989 FTEs. Because JAC has a substantial surplus (approximately 18 FTEs at present), the College has not had to worry too much about these numbers.

How we spend these resources: 412.238 FTEs

We therefore have a deficit of 3.29 FTEs (We generate 408.989 FTEs and allocate 412.238). Five years ago our surplus was 28-29 FTEs; today it’s approximately 18 FTEs. Beginning last year JACFA and the Administration agreed to review all Volet II resources and see whether we might make adjustments to respond to this deficit. A survey was taken from all programs to see the amount and complexity of work being done by coordinators. The goal was to ensure that we had sufficient resources (e.g., coordinator release) to support the amount of work being done. Stephen summarized proposed Volet II Changes (HANDOUT given to all faculty with AGENDA) [Appendix I]. Some departments will have resources cut; some will have resources added, others remain status quo in terms of chair and program release. These changes were made in light of concrete information gathered during the program surveys. Stephen mentioned cases of inefficient use of resources such as having four Gen Ed program reps attend meetings where Gen Ed concerns were not being discussed. The proposed net cut is - 1.871 FTE. This will address less than half of the deficit of 3.29 FTEs in the Volet II allocation.

Stephen encouraged members to review the proposal and offer their feedback to JACFA and the deans. Comments were then offered from the floor:

Eric Laferriere (HPR, Liberal Arts): Appreciates there are difficult decisions to make but believes that convincing evidence for cutting release for small programs like Liberal Arts has not been given. He worries that because LA is a small and quiet program, it is thus a relatively easy target. The proposed cuts will constitute 25% of LA total release. Program chairs are “astounded” by these proposed cuts. He finds it difficult to deliver a solid program with such reduced resources. Recruiting students will no longer be supported; chairs will then have to do this on a volunteer basis.

Ed Holland (Anthropology): He is not sure this is the venue to discuss the details of each program and their resource needs. In principle agrees with the process but realizes these cuts are difficult. He suggests that, the JACFA GA and the particular chairs and faculty who have showed up this evening, may not be representative. He suggests a more systematic approach.

Bill Russell (HEPS): Finds it hard to accept that release for academic council, and particularly Jim Vanstone's chair release, will be cut after all the work he has done since 1976.

Wendy Hadd (Sociology): We don't have any information or accurate numbers or a transparent accounting of the formulas used to calculate these proposed changes. What kind of release did programs have? What will they have after these cuts? It's hard to make sense of these cuts; suspects that they are not the result of thoughtful consideration but instead lobbying by chairs.

Doug Brown (English): Reiterates concerns raised by Wendy Hadd. Seems clear to him that it is Gen Ed programs and Certificates that are receiving the greatest share of the cuts. These cuts will impoverish faculty and student life.

Sharon Rozen-Aspler, (Soc/Anthro): Release time is time off from teaching to work harder; supports community service so she supports this. But has real concerns about how much the work for these programs spills over into summer break (e.g., Honors Science students she worked with) to the point that she eventually had to stop.

Roy Fu (HPR): Feels he is getting conflicting messages from Stephen's presentation. One that they are cuts of a general nature; yet at the same time they are directed at certain programs. Comment about Gen Ed not being on the agenda, thus Gen Ed chairs need not attend, for ex. Roy's conviction is that you cannot simply bracket out the meetings that are and are not relevant for Gen Ed chairs to attend. Three categories: cuts, additions, and status quo. Roy can see why there might be rationales for supplementing resources and tightening the belt; but how do you determine which programs have the perfect allocation at present?

Maria (HPR/Liberal Arts): Wanted to reiterate concerns Eric L. mentioned; and also appreciates work that has been done into this consultation process, but also wanted to express her conviction, that a focus upon balancing the books is misguided. Programs unite the students, create the life of the college. By focusing upon balancing the books, we fail to realize how important programs are in shaping the life of the college. Also expressed concerns about bringing chairs together and divvying up the limited resources available due to unfairness. Small programs can suffer and lose students without the College being overly concerned because overall the college is full. There needs to be a recognition that what is at stake here is that without these resources small programs will need to decide whether chairs are willing to keep doing the work they are doing?

Deb Lunny (HPR): What is JACFA's analysis of the deeper motivations behind these proposed cuts? Also, can you clarify what is the decision-making process? What role will JACFA executive and the faculty play in making these decisions?

Sandra Stephenson (HPR): Feels let down by her union when she sees these cuts and considers the direction the college is going.

Cindy Edwards (English): Wonders if she is the only person in the room who questions the relevance of allocation going to certain things like 502s whereas resources to more core activities and programs are being cut. Asked for clarification for the fundamental basis on which these decisions are being made? We only received the numbers this morning—feels similar to Sandra S. ("let down"). As a chair of the largest Gen Ed department, feels this is further evidence of a turning away from General Education and allocating further resources to sciences and professional program.

Thierry Neubert (HEPS): Also felt disappointed that he didn't receive these numbers until this morning. Sympathizes with comments made by program chairs, particularly small programs, and the sense that the important, good work we are doing is largely volunteer work because the release time does not match up with the amount of work that is needed. Since he also does volunteer work, which is fine; but to further cut what are already very limited resources feels like a slap in the face.

Ed Holland (Anthropology): Wanted to clarify that he is not asking for a meeting where people sit down and divvy up resources. Expressed frustration at bean counting where program deans calculate number of hours spent in a meeting plus prep time to determine how much release is needed. In fact, that does not capture the full amount of work and effort needed. What is really needed is for faculty to sit down with our union executive and figure out how many academic resources are needed to do the important work that we do collectively. We the faculty are the union; we need to have accurate numbers in order to assess these proposed cuts and demand the sufficient resources needed.

Doug Brown (English): This will cause further impoverishment of the academic life of the college.

Stephen Bryce: I've heard a lot of good information and arguments. What can I say? It's not the case that small programs are being specifically targeted; larger programs are also facing cuts. We need to recognize that allocation is a zero-sum game. When you add something in one category, you have to take it away from somewhere else. We currently have a surplus, we should fight to keep it; if we run it down, we will face the prospects of eventually having to lay off teachers because we won't have the resources. That is what will happen if we run down the surplus each year by 3 or 4 FTEs. It's simply not sustainable, especially if we anticipate a dip in enrollment predicted by demographers in the short and medium term. As for the late transmission of the numbers, we only received them from the Administration on Monday afternoon at 4pm. This is a lengthy and complex process that began over a year ago. It cannot be rushed. We got the numbers to you when we could. We are facing cuts, it's not easy, there is no magic formula for chair release (it's been tried in the past, but it hasn't worked). In fact, JACFA has had to talk down proposed increases in other programs (which would mean cuts elsewhere).

Alex Panassenko: Clarified the process. Two years ago the administration came to CRT with a proposal to cut chair release across the board. JACFA responded by saying that we needed to look at all of the release across the board to see how these cuts might be spread out. JACFA has been involved and tried to bring in our own views and concerns, so that we can head off the Admin's imposed cuts; but in the end, unfortunately, it is the administration that can make the decision if we are not successful in reaching an agreement at CRT. That's the unfortunate reality.

Thierry Neubert (HEPS): Where did the surplus originally come from?

Stephen Bryce: It started in the 1970s, and continued to be built up over years. We didn't give any program release until about 10 years ago (2002 or so), but since then we have allocated the surplus to support the program approach, to decrease the number of students per class in Economics, for example. We made this decision to put a lot of resources into programs to invest and develop them. But if you ask other colleges how many resources they have for programs, you'll find out they likely have none.

Ed Holland (Anthropology): Requested more detailed numbers to justify the allocation, whether cuts, additions or status quo. Rather have it in the open with the data so we can see whether it's fair and equitable; the data that has been given does not enable us to fully and accurately assess what is being done. Stressed the need for a collective process whereby all the numbers are presented so that we can see the rationale for certain cuts.

Robbyn Sellers (Anthro/Soc): Shared Ed H's concerns. As a new chair, expressed surprise at the many tasks assigned to a chair. Felt that if the rationale for the cuts was based on information given on the surveys, then that is unfair.

Roy Fu (HPR): Felt as though his question about the deliberate targeting of Gen Ed programs was not answered. Roy expressed concern, that, in general, Gen Ed is being perceived as a nuisance and obstacle for students to graduate, rather than a core component, of a college education. Fears that with these cuts and absence of Gen Ed chairs at important meetings would further marginalize Gen Ed.

Eric Laferriere (HPR/LA): Can we have the allocation data so that we can assess these proposed cuts?

Stephen Bryce: It's on our website. See Annex III of the allocation project.

Wendy Hadd (Sociology): it's complicated, we spent the last couple days trying to figure the numbers out, but we couldn't. In order to assess whether these cuts are fair and reasonable, we need to see the numbers.

Deb Lunny (HPR): Can you put up the numbers from JACFA's webpage?

Alex projected the numbers from the allocation process available from JACFA's homepage.

Cindy Edwards (English): Using the surplus to fill in some of the gaps—how long can that be sustained? It sounds as though we do need to bring it down some, but we cannot do it on a long-term basis. What is the surplus used for? Is this a situation where we need to use it? How do we decide that we can use the surplus on a temporary basis for this, but not that? The information that was requested by the administration gathered hastily is now being used by the union to justify these cuts to program. When Cindy spoke with her dean, she was shown some numbers and given a formula and along with a rationale for why certain programs and departments receive more resources, others less so. I think you are hearing broadly from the assembly that we want more information; also that we might need to use the surplus temporarily until we figure out how to handle these new realities.

Geoffrey Brown (Pre-Hospital): I'm new, so many things to learn; doing new things that I didn't know were my job. Only attended one CRT. I'm confused and overwhelmed. How can the information given you about chairs' roles be used to make these cuts when they are not so well informed?

Maria Mamfredis (HPR/LA): How seriously was the information given on these forms? Eric L. and I sat down and wrote the letter, gave the information about the work we do for the program...but there remain things which are confusing. Is it the case that we only have these choices? Cut, add, and balance the numbers? Isn't it a logical fallacy to think these are our only options? Might we reconsider other possibilities such as taking some resources from other envelopes such as 5.2 release, suppleance, and so on? To open up the possibilities about what we want to do with our resources given the priorities that we establish collectively. Maybe we need to go back to the administration and let them know that a majority of us disagree with these proposed changes.

Sandra Stephenson (HPR): It discomforts me to know that the administration does not have to negotiate with us. That may be what it says on paper, but in practice the college needs us as teachers; if the union takes a position that the administration does not need to negotiate with us, that in effect chops us off at the knees.

Stephen Bryce: We might suggest the Gen Ed departments decide amongst themselves how to allocate the resources. It's not up to us to decide what departments do with the release. Fortunately, the envelope that provides for teaching resources (Volet I) cannot be touched by the administration in the context of these cuts; though that is what they would like to do. It's the support staff that is bearing the brunt of these cuts. For us, they are looking to cut program release in Volet II.

Cindy Edwards (English): Are you saying that the union has done everything it can to ensure the changes are distributed fairly and equitably?

Stephen Bryce: We will, as all faculty and chairs will, participate in CRT meetings this spring where these decisions will be talked about and made. It could be the case that resources from 5.2 release could be put in this Volet II to cover the shortfalls.

Cindy Edwards (English): Have you heard a clear message from the assembly that we want greater clarification on these numbers? And that we want you to do everything you can to ensure we get the resources we need for Volet II.

Thierry Neubert (HEPS): If we go status quo, we'll eat through the surplus in about 5 ½ years. If we accept these cuts, we'll do so in about 9 years. So essentially we are asking to buy ourselves some time to figure out a long term solution.

Ute Beffert: We are hearing your concerns and questions and requests for greater clarity in how we are making our decisions; also compare where you are now and where you will be. The cuts are coming, whether we are involved in making them or not. But by us being involved helping decide where to make the cuts in the most equitable way is the only way we can participate. We cannot delay or avoid this anymore—it has been more than two years in the works. Perhaps what we can do is come up with another proposal altogether.

Maria (HPR): if we approach the administration and request extra allocation from 5.2 but frame it in terms of the strategic plan, would that be an effective strategy?

Stephen Bryce: that sounds like a good approach to me.

8:19pm a motion to adjourn was made by Kevin Davis (Math); seconded by Eric. Passed unanimously.

Appendix I

VOLET II Proposed Changes Summary

Dept/Prog +		Dept/Prog –		Dept/Prog no change	
Dental	+0.125	PhysEd	*-0.020	Biology	0.000
Nursing	+0.125	PHEC	-0.125	Nutrition	0.000
Chemistry	+0.125	Honours Science	-0.125	Mathematics	0.000
Physics	+0.125	Pathways	-0.125	BioPharma	0.000
Methods	+0.125	Psychology	-0.125	Energy	0.000
		Soc./Anth.	-0.125	Police	0.000
		ILT	-0.125	Business	0.000
		Fine Arts	-0.100	PDHT	0.000
		Theatre	-0.125	Computer Science	0.000
		French	-0.125	Creative Arts	0.000
		English	-0.167	HEPS	0.000
		Arts&Science	-0.167	Correctional	0.000
		HPR	-0.167	Certificates	0.000
		Liberal Arts	-0.125		
		Double DEC	-0.125		
		Honours Social	-0.125		
		Languages	-0.125		
		CALL 502	-0.125		
		Geosciences	-0.125		
		Academic Council	-0.125		
<hr/> TOTAL +0.625		-2.496		0.000	