

JACFA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, May 12, 2010

PENFIELD 204

9:30 a.m.

Elections at 11:30 a.m.

MINUTES

Faye Trecartin, JAFCA President, called the meeting to order.

01. Adoption of Agenda

Moved by *Abe Sosnowicz*

Seconded by *Pierre Gauthier*

MOTION CARRIED

02. Adoption of Minutes

Moved by *Stephen Bryce*

Seconded by *Claude Benoit*

MOTION CARRIED with six (6) abstentions

03. Announcements

Abe Sosnowicz announced that the Academic Council's Teaching and Learning Environments Committee is looking for members. He will try to accommodate teachers' schedules if they want to be on the committee. The committee will address the issue of teaching and learning environments which is important at this time because of the new science building and the renovations. Those interested should contact Abe by the end of month or by the beginning of the next semester at the latest.

Mark Maguire: How many members are you looking for?

Jim Vanstone: The committee will have twelve (12) members.

Abe Sosnowicz: Our desire is to have a faculty majority on the committee.

Andy Cuk: Please send out a reminder e-mail.

Faye Trecartin announced that Louise Samoisette is here with the cheques not yet picked up for the insurance premium rebates. You may pick up your cheque from her at the end of the meeting.

1. Financial Motions

VOTE

(a) JAC Golf Tournament - \$125.00

Motion: Be it resolved that JAFCA donate \$125.00 towards the 2010 Annual JAC Golf Tournament

- Moved by Frank Lo Vasco, seconded by Neil Duffy

Frank Lo Vasco: I would like to invite everyone to this great event that brings everyone from the college together, staff, faculty, and administration.

Ed Holland: I would like to say that I am opposed to the golf tournament. We are concerned with the environment. Golf courses are a horror for the environment, especially in the third world where water is scarce. Golf courses mean the subjugation of third world people. I would invite you to call everyone to oppose it, Frank!

MOTION CARRIED with five (5) opposed and ten (10) abstentions.

(b) Ruth Taylor Memorial - \$400.00

Motion: Be it resolved that JACFA donate \$400.00 towards the project to move the lilac and trees currently in the Hochelaga Oval to a location in the lower oval opposite Continuing Education. The project will include benches and a plaque commemorating the contributions made to the College community by the late Ruth Taylor. - Moved by Abe Sosnowicz, seconded by Penny Ross

Abe Sosnowicz: Ruth Taylor served the college well. She was a dedicated teacher and participated in so much at the college but sadly she died at an early age. We would like to pay tribute to her with a bench and lilacs. We would like to move lilacs from the location where the construction of the science building will happen. We want to commemorate her many contributions to the college community with a plaque on a bench in a quiet outdoor space surrounded by lilacs, with a view of the lake. This would be a fitting tribute to a fine militant.

Ed Holland: I would like to support this motion. Ruth was one of my first students ever and she was impressive back then. Her favorite teacher was Bert Young who also has a memorial tree. It is a fitting tribute to a former student and faculty member of the college.

Christine Jacobs: This is a good idea but why don't we just make it a memorial garden dedicated to whoever passes away. I am uncomfortable with reserving it for one or two people. Also, who will pay for it?

Abe Sosnowicz: The College. It will cost around \$ 6000. This is not intended to exclude anyone. We could always add more benches.

Bruce Tracey: Where is most of the cost coming from?

Abe Sosnowicz: Most of the cost is to manufacture the plaque. The rest is for the bench. Most of the cost will be taken up by the college.

Paul Jones: Could we make a friendly amendment to allow others to be added later to the memorial?

Abe Sosnowicz: No problem, but it has to start with one name. We need to start at some point. I think that this is more inclusive as a process.

Ed Holland: The moving of the lilacs has been part of the design plan of the new building. This is not an extra expense.

Anna Mae Barrett: I think this is a fitting remembrance.

Faye Trecartin: Please add to end of the motion "and others who we may want to commemorate at a later date."

MOTION CARRIED *unanimously.*

2. Group Insurance

VOTE

Stephen Bryce: FNEEQ's policy with *La Capitale* is one where the company just administers the plan for a set fee, at no risk to the company. All risk is taken on by FNEEQ. But the benefit of this is that we also get the surpluses. In December 2008 the three insurance plans (health, life and long-term disability) had \$2.8 million in surplus. Ten new unions, including the FAC unions, joined the plans during 2009. The FAC unions did not share their union's assets with us or contribute to the surpluses, so FNEEQ decided to disburse its surplus to members as of December 31, 2008. Rebates are proportional to the premiums you paid for life, medical, and disability on that date.

The share of John Abbott teachers exceeded \$600 000. This surplus is not just for people with health insurance. LTD and life insurance account for about 2/3 of the surplus. This is one of the benefits of having a large group plan.

Anna Mae Barrett: I know a recent retiree. Is she eligible?

Stephen Bryce: If they were working on December 31, 2008, there is a cheque. Check with Louise.

Stephen Bryce: FNEEQ is doing a survey on insurance for retirees in conjunction with the *Association des retraitées et retraités de l'enseignement de la FNEEQ*. They are debating whether to switch from a group retirees plan to the individual plan that *La Capitale* has – the one that surviving spouses and dependants are offered after a teacher dies. The main issue is that there would be a complete loss of control over what's in the plan if it goes to one owned by *La Capitale*. It has lot less travel insurance, too. The JACFA Executive does not recommend this change. While retirees under 65 would see their rates drop somewhat, those over 65 would pay more for less benefits. The survey will be sent out to retirees and current teachers over 55 years of age.

Now for the main thing on the agenda today: proposed changes to insurance coverage. The *Regroupement des syndicats adhérents* (RSA) is where all FNEEQ unions who participate in the insurance plan (all public cegeps and many private schools) meet each year. Before the most recent meeting, all unions were asked if they wanted to make any changes (we submitted the changes we proposed at our May 2008 General Assembly). The insurance committee reviewed the proposed changes and asked *La Capitale* to provide estimates of the cost of each one. The RSA voted to recommend four changes to local unions.

The Chair suggested that the items be treated *ad seriatim*.

- *Increasing the coverage per visit maximum for health care professionals from \$30 to \$35 while maintaining the current annual maximum of \$400. Naturopaths remain limited to two visits per year.*
 - *The estimated annual additional cost is \$8.50 for individual, \$22.96 for family, \$14.45 for monoparental and \$17.00 for couple categories respectively.*

Stephen Bryce reported that the general feeling at the RSA meeting was that this is not much, but there were also concerns about increasing in premiums. A compromise was struck which is reflected in the motion as it is written on today's General Assembly agenda.

Andy Cuk: Is there a reason why naturopath coverage is treated differently?

Stephen Bryce: The FNEEQ insurance committee believes that naturopath coverage was being used as a "back door" to get massages paid for, so this change was made two years ago.

MOTION CARRIED with 34 in favour; 2 opposed; 7 abstentions.

- *Adding massage therapy to physiotherapy coverage (\$35 per visit, \$400 annual maximum combined).*
 - *The estimated annual additional cost is \$26.36 for individual, \$71.13 for family, \$44.49 for monoparental and \$52.43 for couple categories respectively.*

Stephen Bryce noted that massage therapy was the most controversial item at the RSA. The compromise proposed was to create a combined physical therapy category including massage. This issue was discussed by the JACFA Executive, and it does not have a unanimous position, but a majority feels that massage therapy should not be added. Under our former JACFA plan massage was included, and the cost was much more than what *La Capitale* has estimated for FNEEQ.

June Riley: I really think that message therapy is important. I have to go a lot, and they help me much more than physio. I am here to speak in favor of coverage because massages are expensive.

Roger Haughey: I would speak in favour too. The reason I voted to change plans was because this one includes massage. Is our insurance for promoting wellness or triage?

Roy Fu: There is a cost issue. My question is what drug costs will be. What was the process to come up with these recommendations? When can the membership come up with its own recommendations? Should there be surveys? We need to revisit these things as much as we can.

Stephen Bryce: Local unions do have discussions about recommendations, as we did in May 2008. We have done two or three surveys about insurance, most recently in 2006. It may be time to do another next year.

Christine Jacobs: The dichotomy between prevention and treatment is not there. It prevents future damage.

Paul Jones: This is a discussion about what we shouldn't have. We don't even have dental plan. ("Yes, we do!" people called out.) Ok, it is just too expensive. One, do you need a referral from a doctor for a massage?

Stephen Bryce: No. *La Capitale* has not found in its experience that it makes any difference in claims, so it is not keen to try to police this.

Paul Jones: Two, Is there a professional accreditation?

Stephen Bryce: No, there is no single recognized professional association according to *La Capitale*.

Paul Jones: Is there not a massage aspect to physiotherapy?

June Riley: They are two completely different things. The massage does much more than physio but it is quite a cost.

Ute Beffert: As a health professional, I recommend voting for it. There are multiple benefits.

Bruce Tracy: My concern is the cost. There is no professional control of who and when people get it and who administers it. As part of the family plan, costs are going up and up. Is this a projected cost?

Stephen Bryce: This is what *La Capitale* will charge next year, based on their former experience in other plans. It would then become part of our "experience". I believe based on our previous experience that *La Capitale's* estimates are too low. As our former insurance broker noted to me, teachers sure do check out what coverage they have available to them!

Mark McGuire: We have colleagues of all ages who get massages. In the past we have had many colleagues who have had babies who have found this helpful to the mother and the child. There seems to be a lot of scrutiny of who and when. We don't scrutinize the pharma companies, though. We need a more balanced discussion.

Andy Cuk: I have had the experience that there is an official receipt.

Gordon Spicer: Who is mandated with controlling the cost of plan? Who makes the decisions about cost and treatment? It seems like a one shot deal when these options come up. I don't understand the process.

Stephen Bryce: The process is FNEEQ elects an insurance committee to deal with *La Capitale*. They present recommendations to representatives from all the local unions at the RSA. The local unions reps consult with their members then come back to the RSA to vote on the recommendations. I am the delegate for JACFA. As such, I voted to recommend that we consult our members on this change, even though I do not support it. I will take your feedback and concerns back to the meeting and vote accordingly.

Karl Raudseep: How long are we locked in to the changes?

Stephen Bryce: FNEEQ renews its plan annually on January 1. It can make changes at that time. But JACFA has to go with what FNEEQ collectively and democratically decides. That's the process we are doing now for the January 1, 2011 renewal.

Jim Leeke: The problem with insurance cost is that we pay 100% of our costs. The college pays nothing. This would add roughly 3% to the cost. With all the additions we may be facing almost a 10 or 12% increase next year. We have to pay for more coverage. I am going to vote against it from the point of view of cost – it's a cost benefit analysis. The plan is already expensive.

Roy Fu: The consultation issue is up again. At what point do we consider pharma to be too expensive and then have to repackage?

Stephen Bryce: First, we voted last year to make a change in the plan to reduce drug coverage -- it is not accurate that FNEEQ never talks about drug costs. In fact, last year the FNEEQ RSA voted a unanimous motion condemning the pharmaceutical industry for its excessive profits last year. Secondly, there is only a certain amount of choice that we have over this. We are legally required to offer drug coverage (among others) and it must not be less than what the province offers in its plan.

Paul Jones: This issue is very complex and needs to be transparent. Can we make the documentation available so we can look at and see the details of the plan?

Stephen Bryce: Information on the plan is posted on the JACFA website. The contract itself is available for anyone to consult in the JACFA office.

Sharon Rutherford: Can I call a vote?

MOTION DEFEATED with 15 in favour; 23 opposed; 10 abstentions

- *In travel cancellation insurance, adding coverage up to \$5000 per insured person if a travel service supplier goes bankrupt.*
 - *There is no additional annual cost for this as La Capitale will recover the costs elsewhere.*

Stephen Bryce: The travel cancellation insurance which we currently have doesn't offer coverage if an airline or travel agent goes bankrupt. It won't cost anything more to have this coverage, as the travel carriers are insured, and *La Capitale* will get the money back from them. So we said great.

Ed Holland: Why are they so quick to say yes? I don't trust insurance companies.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

- *Adding 80% reimbursement for echocardiograms, scans and MRIs up to \$500 per year.*
 - *The estimated annual additional cost is \$5.95 for individual, \$16.72 for family, \$10.49 for monoparental and \$12.19 for couple categories respectively.*

Stephen Bryce: Access to MRIs and other scans are a big issue in and around Montreal. Four years ago, FNEEQ took a principled stand that the Quebec public health sector should provide them, not private clinics. This obviously has not worked. I asked and this will not be interpreted as covering digital mammograms. Currently, only regular mammograms are covered by medicare.

Bill Russell: I think that the government should cover it, philosophically speaking. But faced with an emergency, we would pay out of pocket. I would be strongly in favor of it.

William Richardson: I agree with Bill. But this is a token coverage. They are expensive.

Roy Fu: This is an issue of private versus collective interests. The impact is larger with a group mandate.

Roger Haughey: I will vote in favour. Even though the provincial government does not officially cover digital mammograms, in reality they do if you make the request.

Paul Jones: I will vote in favour. But there is also the problem of over-diagnosis of these tests.

Ute Beffert: Regarding what Roy said about collective interests, the more we pay for privately, the more we are leaning towards a private system.

MOTION CARRIED with 26 in favour; 10 opposed; 11 abstentions.

Motion: Be it resolved that JAFCA ask FNEEQ to add digital mammograms to this coverage until they are clearly covered by medicare.

- Moved by Stephen Bryce, seconded by Paul Jones

MOTION CARRIED unanimously with 46 in favour; 1 abstention.

3. FNEEQ Negotiations Report and Action Plan

DISCUSSION

Bruce Toombs: I would like to introduce myself as a member of the FNEEQ Negotiation Committee.

Stephen Bryce: Our goal was to negotiate a collective agreement by the end of March. In the meantime, we were supposed to have a nego blitz but then there were not too many meetings.

Bruce Toombs: To clarify, the management has to call us to the table.

Stephen Bryce: Negotiations are divided. First, there is the central table. This is for things negotiated for the entire public sector such as salaries, parental rights, etc. We are represented there by the CSN. This is going fairly well except for the issue of salaries. Pension and parental rights issues have been settled. The government's salary offer of 5% over 5 years is still on table. No deal can be completed until there are also agreements in the each sector of the public service. And the sectoral tables are blocked. After three weeks of no meetings, our employers' representatives presented us with an amended global offer in April. FNEEQ has prepared a counter-offer. The consultation period on this offer ends Friday. So Bruce is here to listen to our concerns and answer any questions.

[See distributed document "An Offer and a Counteroffer" for further details on the items below.]

Item 1: They want more "accountability" so they have greatly expanded the things that are officially listed as duties for departments, program committees, their coordinators and teachers. FNEEQ's counter proposal crossed out a whole page of added duties for item 1.

Item 2: They want to reduce job security. We want to stick with current rules.

Item 3. We want a change in the enrollment verification date. We won a grievance on this at Ahuntsic. We do lots of work for students who then drop out of class. They should be counted as part of our work load. The compromise we are proposing is that the snapshot of our enrollment should happen on day 10 of classes. This would add about 7 to 8 teachers at Abbott.

Item 4 is about increasing chair release to what is in the FAC contract.

Item 5: They have said nothing about changing the salary scale at either end.

We want to get rid of first three levels in the salary scale, which is not that expensive of a demand. The top of the scale is more expensive. With pay equity they squashed the top three levels closer together. Our counter proposal is to go back to the old 3% increments between the scales.

Item 6: Because work at the union is more complex, we are proposing more union release.

Bruce Toombs: When the colleges start to confront the administrations suddenly they reduce release amounts that they are entitled.

Stephen Bryce: Here we find that the administration always tries to hold union release over our heads to get other things at the CRT allocation meetings.

Item 7: We think that the cost of arbitration should be shared.

Item 8: We proposed a 10% increase in teaching resources, meaning smaller class sizes and fewer preps. They have offered us 275 FTEs, mostly coming in at the end of the contract. This doesn't really reduce the workload. Our counteroffer is 620 FTEs.

Item 9: There is no mention of the work-family balance in our employers' global offer.

Item 10: There are many issues that won't be resolved quickly such as special needs and continuing education. These need to be referred to parity committees with clear mandates, enough resources to solve the problems, and deadlines.

Currently non-perms are competing to accumulate seniority faster within the year to maintain their hiring priority. We want to fix hiring priorities at the beginning of each year. Anyone hired after this should get priority based on their date of hiring. Also *suppléance* should not be included in seniority calculations.

Bruce Toombs: Often a teacher working fulltime gets passed in seniority because someone else takes on *suppléance* or a ContEd course. This has created lots of tension at larger colleges.

Doug Brown: There shouldn't be any seniority accruing for replacement work?

Bruce Toombs: Not for short term, which depends on availability. However, if a teacher does two weeks or more of replacement it would count, as a contract would have to be given.

Roger Haughey: What is the price tag for these demands? Which elements of the ten issues are strongest?

Bruce Toombs: The government does not allocate in terms of dollars, but in teachers. Our demands equal 800 more teachers. We told the government on day 1 of the negotiations that our number one priority is substantial additions to volet 1 (teaching) – we would not settle without this. There have not been any additional teaching resources in 20 years, and our workload has increased by about 20 or 30% over that time. Not being offered more teaching resources would be a reason for a strike. I want to bring an issue to the table today -- federal transfers. We now think that it is unlikely that we will settle this spring. This means that negotiations will continue into the fall. The other side is saying they don't have 800 FTEs because of the budget deficit. But the federal government has put federal transfers towards special projects, but only 10% has gone to teachers, and none of that to reducing class sizes or preps. FNEEQ helped the *Fédération des Cégeps* to get this money. The overall ratio for expenditures in the cegep system is 70% to teaching and 30 % to everything else. They give teaching just 10%. We want to get this up to at least 40% of federal transfers for teaching, the primary mission of the cegep system. This is roughly 400 FTEs. The money is already there. This is not new money. This takes us into the ballpark of our demands.

Secondly, the projected decrease in enrollments in the coming years could lead to cutting 1800 teachers. The government would save money with a cut back in enrolments. As our demands are related to workloads, in reality it may simply mean that these reductions would be less than projected. We at the table are only as strong as our members make us against the other side. The other side specifically looks to see how strong our mobilizations are. This fall we will be asking you to take measures. This is a confrontation of power, not of reasonable actors. Keep in mind that ours are not unreasonable demands. It is a matter of time when it comes to being better teachers. So more FTEs are need for more time. The demands are reasonable and attainable! [Applause.]

Stephen Bryce: This Friday there is a province-wide action that the support staff will participate in. We suggest that teachers come out for this, even though classes will be over. There has been a suggestion of boycotting the "Welcome Back" breakfast or Open House. On one day during the first or second week of classes, another proposal is to start classes 15 minutes late. Any more creative ideas are welcome.

Mark Maguire: Since public perception is important, would it not be better not to disrupt the Open House and then discuss it with parents?

Doris Miller: There is a big public relations opportunity here since we are not asking much and it will benefit students. We need a news story.

Faye Trecartin: Before we close the meeting, we would like to extend a special thanks to Anna Mae Barrett from Nursing, who has been a member of the FPDC committee for a very long time, and who is retiring this summer.

Abe Sosnowicz moved to close the meeting.

MOTION CARRIED

ELECTIONS

The JACFA Elections Officer, David Desjardins, took over the meeting.

For the position of **President of JACFA**, there was one nomination: Faye Trecartin (English).

Faye Trecartin was acclaimed as President of JACFA

For the position of **JACFA Directors**, there were six nominations for the six positions:

- a. Ute Beffert (Nursing)
- b. Stephen Bryce (Geography)
- c. Daniel Gosselin (Français)
- d. Jim Leeke (Political Science)
- e. Edward Osowski (History)
- f. Alex Panassenko (Mathematics)

The nominees were acclaimed as JACFA Directors.

For the 11 vacancies on **Academic Council**, there were 12 nominations submitted:

1. Bertram Somers
2. Lawrence Szigeti
3. Paul Jones
4. Abe Sosnowicz
5. Ute Beffert
6. Jean Paul Parkhill
7. Alice Mcleod
8. Stephen Bryce
9. Suzanne black
10. Daniel Gosselin
11. James Vanstone
12. Bruce Tracy

Gregory Mulcair and Jessica Burpee volunteered to serve as scrutineers. Ballots were distributed, collected and counted and the Elections Officer declared the following teachers elected:

1. Lawrence Szigeti
2. Paul Jones
3. Abe Sosnowicz
4. Ute Beffert
5. Jean Paul Parkhill
6. Alice Mcleod
7. Stephen Bryce
8. Suzanne black
9. Daniel Gosselin
10. James Vanstone
11. Bruce Tracy

Academic Council Permanent Substitutes – There were four vacancies and two nominations submitted. From the floor, the following nominations were made:

1. Violaine Arès
2. Tania Peres
3. Bertram Somers, nominated by Stephen Bryce; seconded by Jim Vanstone (conditional upon acceptance)
4. Jessica Vandervort, nominated by Jim Vanstone; seconded by Stephen Bryce

Faculty Professional Development Committee - 5 representatives

1. Pierre Dussol
2. John Serrati
3. James Vanstone
4. Alice McLeod
5. Caroline Viger

JACFA Financial Review Committee - 3 members

1. Rémi Cardinal
2. Christine Jacobs
3. Gordon Spicer

College Sustainability Committee – One nomination was received for the three representatives

1. David Hill
2. Jessica Burpee (nominated by Stephen Bryce, seconded by Faye Trecartin)
3. Ryan Young (nominated by himself, seconded by Faye Trecartin).