

2015 COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

list of sectoral

demands



Draft

for consultation within general assemblies

fneeq 
CSN

This list of sectoral demands was elaborated by the FNEEQ negotiating and mobilization committee and by the delegates of the *Regroupement CÉGEP*

August 26, 2014



**Fédération nationale des enseignantes
et des enseignants du Québec**

1601 De Lorimier Ave.
Montréal, Québec H2K 4M5
Telephone: 514 598-2241
Toll-free: 1 877 312-2241

www.fneeq.qc.ca
www.facebook.com/FneeqCSN
www.twitter.com/FneeqCSN

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
Theme 1 – Job precarity	5
Continuing education	5
Tenure and job creation	6
Working conditions.....	7
Theme 2 – Teaching load and resources	9
Resource allocation	9
Students with disabilities.....	9
Addition of teaching resources.....	10
Calculation of teaching load	12
Research	12
Internationalization	13
Theme 3 – Organization of work	14
Union recognition and administrative transparency	14
Teleteaching and distance education.....	15
Family-work-training balance	16
Parental rights	16
Disability	16
Professional development.....	17
Other demands relating to work organization	17
Theme 4 – Professional autonomy.....	19
Role of academic bodies.....	19
Intellectual property and academic freedom.....	19
Recognition of acquired competencies	20
Quality assurance and accreditation	20
Professional expertise of teachers	21
Other demands relating to professional autonomy	22
Theme 5 – Remuneration	23
Payment of salary	23
Overtime.....	23
Years of schooling.....	24
Remuneration for master’s and doctoral degree holders.....	25
Bonuses and salary scales.....	25
Starting salary	26
Theme 6 – Other demands	27
Glossary of acronyms used in this document	28

INTRODUCTION

This list of sectoral demands is the fruit of collaboration and grassroots consultation arising from last winter's *Regroupement CÉGEP* tour of 46 unions. This tour allowed us to pinpoint key local problems and challenges, draw a general portrait of the state of the college system and better focus in on the demands needed to address these issues. The results of FNEEQ's committee work provided additional fodder for this analysis of the situation in the college network.

The demands in this list are presented in a format designed to give greater overall coherence to the different positions as well as to facilitate consultation within the general assemblies. Each theme and subtheme identified for negotiation is first contextualized and outlined in an introductory section, then broken down into a series of formal demands presented in box format. These demands, while relatively specific, have also been left sufficiently broad so as to avoid restricting our discussions to locked-in positions with little room for adjustment. Once the general assemblies have wrapped up their consultations early this fall, the *Regroupement CÉGEP* will adopt the sectoral demands that are to be tabled at the end of October 2014, in accordance with the *Act respecting the process of negotiation of the collective agreements in the public and parapublic sectors*.

Our demands obviously concern our working conditions, given that the subjects of negotiation are part of our collective agreement. Yet the scope of these demands goes well beyond that, reflecting our wider goal to ensure the protection and development of our college system. Those who question its relevance forget that CEGEPs have been responsible for democratizing higher education and opening up pre-university and technical training by ensuring a common general education for all—not to mention that they make a key social, cultural and economic contribution to all regions of Quebec. Thus, through our demands, what we are also advancing is a more humanistic and more equitable vision of Quebec society.

THEME I – JOB PRECARIETY

Job security is one of the key themes of the upcoming rounds of bargaining talks for all members of the Common Front. At present, only 48% of wage-earners in the public sector hold a regular full-time position.¹ The situation is no better in the college sector, where 40% of professors in regular education—and virtually 100% of them in continuing education—are faced with job precarity. This means that more than half of all CEGEP professors have no job security!

The situation is undeniably most critical in continuing education, where the organizational structure is entirely based on contingent employment. Better development of this sector could only be of benefit to Quebec, where adult enrolment in continuing education is far lower than in other provinces and countries.

Continuing education

One of the mandates the national meeting committee (CNR)² was given during this last collective agreement period was to analyze the current role of teachers in continuing education. The results of this analysis speak for themselves: professors in continuing education not only perform virtually identical duties to those in regular education, but nearly half of them actually teach in the regular stream as well. In addition to the duties currently recognized under the collective agreement—namely course preparation and delivery and the grading of work and examinations—teaching in continuing education demands student support and supervision, program coordination and team meetings, notably with colleagues teaching in the same discipline.

These findings need to be taken into consideration and better job conditions established for professors in continuing education. This requires, among other things, that workload be calculated on the basis of individual teaching load (CI) for those teaching in both sectors, teaching in a diploma of college studies (DEC) program in continuing education or teaching full-time in the continuing education sector (1.1). For all others, improved working conditions can take the form of access to certain benefits and better recognition of the work performed (1.2 and 1.5).

Moreover, in order to promote greater cohesion between regular and continuing education programs, continuing education professors must be affiliated with departments (1.3) and selected in the same way as are professors in the regular education stream (1.4).

¹ François L'Écuyer, "Négociations du secteur public, les consultations sont lancées," *Perspectives CSN*, Online, <http://www.csn.qc.ca/web/perspectives/46/secteur-public#.U585iXc-2ZB> (page viewed June 16, 2014).

² The national meeting committee (CNR) is made up of representatives of the college management negotiating committee (CPNC) and FNEEQ.

1.1 Calculate in CI, up to a full-time load, the work performed in continuing education by the following professors and add resources accordingly:

- those teaching in both continuing and regular education;
- those teaching in a DEC program in continuing education;
- those teaching full-time in continuing education.

1.2 Recognize student support and supervision in the workload and remuneration of course lecturers in continuing education.

1.3 Affiliate continuing education professors with a department and a program committee based on their discipline and remunerate them accordingly.

1.4 Apply the provisions pertaining to teacher selection in regular education to the continuing education sector.

1.5 Give course lecturers in continuing education access to the same leaves, sick day banks and professional development as non-tenured professors in regular education.

Tenure and job creation

Reducing precarity also means addressing long-term job insecurity. Far too often, professors will have 10, 15, even 20 years of seniority and still have no possibility of achieving permanence, or tenure. Access to tenure needs to be facilitated; at the very least, those who have been in a position of long-term precarity must be given access to many of the benefits enjoyed by tenured faculty. Sometimes colleges refuse to open up jobs in disciplines that include complementary, multidisciplinary, pluridisciplinary or cross-disciplinary courses, even when these courses are offered year after year (1.6).

Some professors spend years working in a college without ever gaining access to tenure, often because they are either teaching on a part-time basis, have a replacement teaching load or are teaching full-time without a formal position. These professors must be given easier access to tenure and be able to benefit from the job security measures and certain of the leaves currently reserved for tenured faculty (1.7).

A number of adjustments also need to be made to our collective agreement with respect to the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP) and access to tenure. Professors should not be refused access to permanence during their parental leave, at least not while they are receiving QPIP benefits (1.8).

1.6 Specify that all courses taught must serve to create jobs in the disciplines in which they are given.

1.7 Extend job security measures to non-tenured professors with multiple years of employment in a CEGEP by, among other things, allowing them to acquire tenure after five (5) consecutive years of full-time work.

1.8 Ensure that the taking of preventive retirement or parental leave does not delay acquisition of tenure during the collection of QPIP benefits.

Working conditions

As precarity is an unavoidable reality of entry-level teaching, non-tenured professors must at the very least be assured of decent working conditions, which is all too often not the case. For example, a non-tenured professor on disability does not enjoy the same rights as a tenured colleague on disability, which can lead to such problems as the non-recognition of hiring priority and the refusal to grant tenure (1.11). Work-work reconciliation also has to be simplified for non-tenured professors who cumulate several contracts and lectureships, and do so by teaching simultaneously in different CEGEPs in the hope of attaining the equivalent of a full-time load (1.13). Contingent professors must also be granted access to certain leaves when they are given a teaching load (1.12).

The matter of the signing of contracts by non-tenured professors must also be revisited. This process remains fraught with problems, notably in terms of delays, standard hiring requirements, the right to refuse a contract and the assignment of hiring priority (1.9).

With respect to the assignment of hiring priority, more specifically, some confusion remains as to the difference between the seniority list and hiring priority rankings, as well as to the standing of certain categories of teachers, namely those who have not yet acquired any seniority, those in continuing education and those who are teaching on a full-time basis. The provisions need to be clarified and corrected, where necessary, to facilitate the management of work organization (1.10). Lastly, departments must also have a say on the standard requirements for hiring and on the solutions to be put in place—with the agreement of the union, of course—in the event of recruitment difficulties (1.14).

- 1.9 Improve the provisions regarding the contracting of non-tenured professors.**
- 1.10 Revise the hiring priority rankings for greater clarity and coherence.**
- 1.11 Review the conditions applicable to non-tenured professors on disability, notably in terms of the acquisition of tenure.**
- 1.12 Facilitate access to leaves and temporary assignments for non-tenured teachers.**
- 1.13 Facilitate work-work reconciliation for contingent teachers cumulating several teaching loads.**
- 1.14 Ensure the standard requirements for hiring a professor and conditions under which these requirements can be waived are laid out in an agreement with the union.**

THEME 2 – TEACHING LOAD AND RESOURCES

In the last round of negotiations—after more than 10 years of fighting for recognition of our workload, the nature of which is clearly outlined in the 2008 parity report *Enseigner au collégial... Portrait de la profession*—we were able to obtain an additional 430 full-time equivalents (FTEs) for the college sector, 403 of them for teaching. The impact of this gain on our workload has yet to be fully assessed as the final portion of these additional resources, which account for a little more than a fifth of the new FTEs, are being introduced in this 2014-2015 academic year. Notwithstanding the outcome of the assessment, certain specific needs raised during the general assembly tour and others arising from the work of the collective agreement committees have to be taken into consideration.

Resource allocation

Since the introduction in 2000-2001 of the funding formula based on program-slopes, the method for allocating resources for teaching is no longer in line with the actual workload carried out by professors in the college network. This has created a gap between the funding received by colleges and what is needed to deliver the education offered. In order to limit the impact of this gap on resource allocation at both the local and provincial levels, a funding formula is needed that is more in tune with college obligations and teacher workloads (2.1). This formula should also ensure better funding of colleges struggling with low-enrolment programs. The minimum faculty threshold guaranteed under Appendix I-9 must also be updated and made easier to audit, and national arbitration should be made available at the request of either party in the event of a grievance (2.2).

2.1. Tie the allocation of teaching resources to individual workload (CI) parameters.

2.2. Update the guarantees in Appendix I-9 and modify them to facilitate auditing. Provide for access to national arbitration at the request of either national party.

Students with disabilities

The number of students with disabilities (SWD) in the college system has risen significantly, nearly doubling in percentage—up from 3% to 6%—since 2011. The union tour revealed that, in some CEGEPs, SWDs account for more than 10% of the student population. Support and evaluation of these students can have a major incidence on the teacher's workload, as clearly revealed in a joint study conducted by FNEEQ and the CPNC for the national meeting committee. For many years, the ministry has recognized the impact of the rising SWD population on the workload of primary and secondary school teachers, and some universities have now adjusted their teaching

contracts to reflect this new reality. It only makes sense that these impacts should also be taken into account in the workload of teachers at the college level (2.3).

In order to promote the success of students with disabilities, professors must be given access to information concerning the functional limitations of SWDs in their class, while still protecting the confidentiality of this information (2.4).

Furthermore, the establishment and implementation of reasonable accommodations must be the subject of a departmental notice given that it is the role of professors to serve as experts in their discipline and of departments to ensure the quality of teaching for the courses under their responsibility (2.4).

2.3. Modify the CI to account for specific pedagogical activities required for SWDs and add resources accordingly.

2.4. Ensure that professors are advised prior to the start of the semester, or as early as possible, of the functional limitations of the SWDs enrolled in their class and see to it that departments agree with reasonable accommodation measures.

Addition of teaching resources

The last significant addition of resources for fieldwork and workshop coordination, and for travel time to and from these activities, dates back to the 1989-1991 collective agreement. Since then, fieldwork has grown considerably across the system and, at present, only half of travel time required for such activities is taken into account in the CI calculation. These values need to be made current (2.5, 2.6). Moreover, the increase in departmental responsibilities for ongoing training and recognition of acquired competencies (RAC) more than justifies bringing the resource allocation for departmental coordination provided for under clause 8-5.04 up from 5.5 to 6.0 FTEs (2.5). Additionally, as colleges generally tend to allocate insufficient resources to program development, implementation and evaluation, the release time granted to professors for these duties is far less than what is actually needed to do the work (2.7).

Many colleges and campuses within the CEGEP network have also grown substantially since the time when the resource allocation in Appendix I-2 was established. The values for these teaching units therefore need to be brought up to date as well (2.8).

Moreover, the ministry is projecting a significant drop in enrolment at some colleges, campuses and training centres over the next few years. In order to maintain the availability of a diversity of study programs across Quebec, consideration must be given to such solutions as increasing funding to study programs, including to those with fewer than 10 students enrolled in the first year (2.9).

Lastly, ever since the ministry abolished the withdrawal date, professors have been doing unrecognized work between the start of each semester and the attendance confirmation dates on September 20, for the fall semester, and February 15, for winter (2.10).

2.5. Add resources for the coordination of fieldwork and workshops.

2.6. Recognize the full amount of travel time in the calculation of Cld and add resources accordingly.

2.7. Add resources for participation in program development, implementation and evaluation.

2.8. Increase the values in Appendix I-2 for teaching units that have experienced growth.

2.9. Resolve the problems associated with small cohorts and declining enrolment in colleges and training centres.³

2.10. Determine the teaching resources for a given year on the basis of the student population as at the 10th day of each academic semester.

³ This demand concerns all administrative units: colleges, education centres, campuses, pavilions, etc.

Calculation of teaching load

Our collective agreement allows for part-time professors to obtain full-time equivalency once they have reached 80 units of CI but grants no additional remuneration until they have surpassed 88 units. This annual variation of 10% is too high and needs to be clawed back (2.11).

Moreover, our collective agreement makes no mention of the value that a leave or an absence represents in CI units. Clarification is needed to avoid inequitable treatment between colleagues in different departments, or between colleagues in the same department from one semester to the next (2.12).

2.11. Reduce the maximum CI value.

2.12. Specify how a leave of absence is calculated as a percentage of workload, including for professors on release, and add resources accordingly.

Research

Research at the college level raises a number of questions that need addressing, including its link to private enterprise. The union tour clearly showed that research practices vary considerably from one college or college technology transfer centre (CCTT) to the next. The collective agreement should set guidelines for providing concrete recognition to those engaged in research activities, notably in terms of schedule accommodations, release, hiring priority rankings and seniority.

2.13. Set the terms relating to research activities and the appropriate working conditions for those engaged in research activities.

Internationalization

International activities are becoming increasingly prevalent in CEGEPs and—as with research—this has given rise to a number of issues. Many colleges rely on internationalization to attract students from Quebec and abroad. Professors are the ones who make this internationalization possible: they welcome and support foreign students, provide guidance to Quebec students abroad via courses or fieldwork, and sometimes even give courses in foreign institutions. Thought must be given not only to the place internationalization should hold in our CEGEPs, but also to how we should address the lack of guidelines on this subject in our collective agreement.

2.14. Define the appropriate working conditions for professors involved in the international activities of CEGEPs, both in Quebec and abroad.

THEME 3 – ORGANIZATION OF WORK

During the union tour, a number of aspects of work organization were identified as major irritants, be it due to new developments like teleteaching or to the difficult situation in which some labour organizations currently find themselves.

Many unions have been coming up against a lack of administrative transparency in the past few years, particularly in relation to the monitoring of teaching resources. The battle for union recognition is now in the news more than ever before in Quebec and must be waged as fervently within our CEGEPs, as certain unfortunate events have recently shown.

Union recognition and administrative transparency

The work of local unions is essential to defending the interests of members. But to succeed, this requires adequate resources on the one hand and unhindered access to various information and data on the other (3.1).

One of the responsibilities of unions is to monitor the resources allocated for teaching. Determining how exactly colleges are spending these resources without the benefit of adequate data is no easy task. It is therefore essential that the information provided by a college to a union be clear and transparent (3.2, 3.3) in order to allow for a comprehensive analysis of such things as resource allocation. Another problem that needs to be addressed is the practice of double accounting, whereby colleges count the same workload twice in their report on resource allocation. This occurs in the case of sick leave, for example, when the person on leave and his or her replacement are both counted on the teachers' payroll (3.4).

Union recognition also implies a clear confirmation of the union's prerogative to name the professors who are to sit on commissions, councils and other committees or bodies (3.3).

3.1 Increase the minimum number of full-time professors or equivalents allocated for internal union functions to 1% of the college's total FTEs, with a minimum threshold of 1 FTE, and provide special terms for very small teaching units. If the union allocation is not fully used in any given year, the unused portion is added to the following year's allocation.

3.2 Specify the information to be provided by colleges and ensure that it is sufficiently detailed and supplied in editable electronic format.

- 3.3 Specify that the union is to name any professor who sits on a committee, council, commission, etc. of the college, as well as on any subcommittee, working group, etc. thereof, and is to receive all documents relating to these bodies.**
- 3.4 Eliminate the practice of double accounting.**

Teleteaching and distance education

Teleteaching and distance education bring up a number of issues that need to be broached in our bargaining talks, particularly in light of the Demers Report⁴ recommendation that this form of teaching be developed to counter the effects of the demographic decline and preserve the availability of quality college education in every region of Quebec.

First off, the development of distance education must be circumscribed to ensure, for example, that its rollout does not trigger layoffs and that it is not extended to programs benefiting from special funding for small cohorts (3.5). Secondly, where it is established, it must be recognized that distance education demands additional work in terms of course preparation, laboratory teaching, departmental coordination and student support and supervision given that the professor is required to travel to meet these students several times each semester (3.6).

- 3.5 Frame the development of distance education and teleteaching.**
- 3.6 Take distance education and teleteaching into account in the teaching workload and add resources accordingly.**

⁴ January 2014. *Rapport d'étape du chantier sur l'offre de formation au collégial*. Online.
http://www.fneeq.qc.ca/fr/accueil/Sommet-enseignement-superieur/2014-01_rRapportEtapeGuyDemers_chantier_odfc.pdf

Family-work-training balance

The collective agreement contains few measures for promoting balance among family-work-training. The following demand is aimed primarily at creating the conditions necessary for this reconciliation and at ensuring that colleges make schedule accommodations for those professors who are parents or caregivers, who are pursuing their studies or professional development or who have contracts in more than one college.

3.7 Strengthen the family-work-training reconciliation measures in the collective agreement by establishing clearer parameters, notably with regard to schedule accommodations for professors.

Parental rights

Last spring, the *Regroupement CÉGEP* rallied behind the proposal to make salary a key issue at the central bargaining table in the upcoming round of negotiations. As parental rights are also negotiated at the central table, the sectoral demands concerning these rights can only be related to harmonizing our collective agreement with existing laws and frameworks based on our specific organization of work, notably with regard to the deferral of vacation leave and to adoption leave.

3.8 Better harmonize the parental rights provided for in the main clause and in the collective agreement to reflect the organization of work specific to CEGEP professors.

Disability

The organization of work in college education also exposes certain problems relating to disability, notably with respect to deferral of vacation leave, return to work and gradual return to work. In the last two cases, the issue mainly involves the arbitrary nature of the decisions and the need to establish terms and conditions for the return to work of professors on disability (3.9, 3.10). Also needed is a comprehensive review of the relationship between work and health, which could be conducted by a parity committee and its findings used to help improve working conditions (3.11).

- 3.9 Allow the vacation leave of professors on disability to be deferred to end of the disability period.**
- 3.10 Improve the provisions concerning the conditions for return and gradual return to work of professors on disability.**
- 3.11 Set up a committee composed of the national parties with a mandate to conduct an in-depth analysis into the issue of occupational health.**

Professional development

The funding allocated to colleges and to the provincial fund for professional development has remained unchanged since the 2005 collective agreement, so for nearly 10 years. Given that the cost of training has continued to rise and that needs have in no way diminished, this funding clearly needs to be adjusted upwards.

- 3.12 Facilitate access to professional development through better funding.**

Other demands relating to work organization

Additional corrections need be made to the collective agreement, notably with regard to temporary assignments. A professor can be temporarily assigned to another job, in management, for example, for an indeterminate period (3.13). Yet a professor on unpaid leave is limited to a maximum period of two years (3.14). These situations must be rectified by tightening up the rules in the first case and by relaxing them in the second.

Appendix III-1 governs certain elements of the collective agreement for professors at the *Centre québécois de formation aéronautique* (CQFA). Some of these seem inequitable, particularly in relation to clauses 8-3.03 and 8-3.06, by restricting the conditions under which availability is practiced at the CQFA (3.15).

Appendix I-8, which provides for one additional hour of student support per week to promote success and reduce the costs associated with the retaking of failed courses, is obsolete given that professors already perform this duty (3.19).

Some tenured professors perform teaching functions in continuing education on top of their full-time workload in regular education, a practice that discourages fair work apportionment and contributes to precarity (3.17).

Due to budgetary and organizational constraints, an increasing number of college administrations are pressuring professors to limit the use of substitution and rely more on replacement by course swapping, which is creating a number of problematic situations (3.18).

Lastly, our collective agreement says nothing about organization of work in relation to gradual retirement. The absence of guidelines on this matter is generally detrimental (3.16).

3.13 Limit the total maximum term of temporary assignments.

3.14 Provide for teachers to have access to a minimum of two (2) years of unpaid leave per five (5) year period.

3.15 Apply clauses 8-3.03 and 8-3.06 of the collective agreement concerning availability to professors of the Centre québécois de formation aéronautique.

3.16 Define the terms and conditions of gradual retirement.

3.17 Provide for tighter mechanisms to curb double employment in order to ensure a better apportionment of the work.

3.18 Encourage the use of substitution from the coûts de convention and limit recourse to replacement by course swapping.

3.19 Abolish Appendix I-8

THEME 4 – PROFESSIONAL AUTONOMY

In recent years, the professional autonomy of professors has been challenged in various ways by college administrations. Some have tried to do so by limiting the scope of academic bodies, the rules governing intellectual property or academic freedom. Others are continuing to refuse to recognize the expertise of teachers. The quality assurance processes that CEGEPs are putting in place despite our opposition are creating a heavy administrative burden that deflects from the core mission of education and runs counter to any aim of improving the quality of teaching.

Role of academic bodies

During the union tour, many expressed the concern that their colleges have been trying to restrict the decision-making role of the academic bodies in which professors participate (departments, program committees, etc.). Some colleges, for example, appear more intent on informing than on consulting the departments, and when they do consult, they appear to give little consideration to departmental positions.

4.1 Clarify the role of academic bodies (departments, program committees, academic councils, educational boards) in the college decision-making process, as provided for in the collective agreement, and strengthen the representation of professors within these bodies.

Intellectual property and academic freedom

The new realities arising from the rollout of distance education and the increase in college activities recognizing acquired competencies require that certain specifications be added to the collective agreement regarding the intellectual property of the professors concerned (4.2).

The same holds true for the issues of academic freedom and freedom of opinion, which some colleges have been trying to limit by, most notably, regulating the use of digital platforms (4.3).

- 4.2 Guarantee protection of the intellectual property of professors relating to all teaching, examination and other educational materials produced, particularly in regard to the recognition of acquired competencies and teleteaching.**
- 4.3 Recognize the academic freedom and freedom of opinion of CEGEP professors.**

Recognition of acquired competencies

With respect to the recognition of required competencies (RAC), it is urgent that the role of professors as content specialists be clearly specified given that they are the only ones with the disciplinary expertise to carry out the activities of teaching per se, including the determination of whether or not a competency has been acquired (4.4). This requires the inclusion of RAC-related duties in departmental functions and teaching workloads and the addition of necessary resources (4.5). The goal of these measures is to standardize the practices that, at present, vary considerably from one CEGEP to the next and even from one program to the next within a single CEGEP. This is also important for safeguarding the quality of the diplomas obtained by students, whatever their academic path.

- 4.4 Specify that only professors can act as “content specialists” based on their disciplinary expertise.**
- 4.5 Include duties associated with the recognition of acquired competencies, including the determination of subject content and selection of content specialists, in departmental functions and teaching workloads and add resources accordingly.**

Quality assurance and accreditation

Quality is at the very heart of the work we do as professors. The collective agreement provides us with mechanisms for ensuring that quality, notably through departments and program committees, and it is precisely via these mechanisms—and not bureaucratic routes—that the quality of college education must be assured (4.6).

Similarly, on the provincial level, the quality of study programs should be evaluated by provincial program coordination bodies in accordance with the ministry’s program review and revision process (4.7).

4.6 Specify that departments are responsible for assuring the quality of education and program committees are responsible for assuring the quality of programs.

4.7 Establish provincial program and disciplinary coordination bodies to replace external accreditation agencies and the *Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial* (CEEC) and add resources accordingly.

Professional expertise of teachers

In the same vein as the demands relating to RAC, the collective agreement needs to more formally lay out the professional expertise of teachers (4.8). All teaching activities that lead to graduation must be carried out by teachers and in accordance with the conditions provided for in the collective agreement.

The use of subcontractors is a major concern in the public sector. To that end, clause 10-1.10 of the collective agreement needs to be strengthened to counteract this practice (4.9).

4.8 Make clear that only professors may perform all of the teaching activities that lead to graduation.

4.9 Specify that a college is required to reach an agreement with the union in the Labour Relations Committee (LRC) before assigning to a third party any academic, administrative or educational functions or activities under the responsibility of the accreditation unit.

Other demands relating to professional autonomy

The vocabulary used in our collective agreement must not only be as precise and concise as possible, it must also reflect the public nature of the institutions in which we teach.

4.10 Replace the term “clientele” by “student population” and clarify the designations of college study centre, subcentre, point of service, etc.

THEME 5 – REMUNERATION

Remuneration is a key factor for drawing and retaining staff, and college professors are no exception. In this area, however, a number of situations specific to CEGEP teachers are posing a problem.

Payment of salary

The issue of the 27th pay instalment remains an irritant. We are paid for 260 workdays per year even though an academic year can have 260, 261 or 262 days. Every 11 years or so, this results in a situation whereby our pay is divided into 27 rather than 26 equal instalments. We should be receiving identical remuneration for every day of work regardless of the number of days in the academic year.

5.1. Eliminate the problems associated with the payment of salary and particularly those involving the 27th pay instalment.

Overtime

Professors are often called upon by colleges to work on statutory holidays or during their annual vacation period. Over time, the interpretation of clause 6-1.07 governing such situations has changed. The negotiated version of this clause must be clarified to ensure that professors are paid the daily rate for each day worked, regardless of the number of hours they work (5.2).

Moreover, overtime during the semester can add considerably to a professor's workload without providing any real significant salary benefits in return. The following demand aims to ensure a better balance and better apportionment of the work: when overtime is required of a full-time professor during the course of a semester due to recruitment difficulties, this additional work shall, at the professor's request, be converted to a CI release and deferrable to a later semester (5.3).

- 5.2. Clarify in clause 6-1.07 that the daily remuneration for statutory holidays and vacation periods is one two-hundred-and-sixtieth (1/260) of annual salary, regardless of the number of hours worked.**
- 5.3. Compensate all work performed by full-time professors on top of their normal workload at the usual course lecturers' rate or in the form of a CI credit that can be carried over to the following semester or to the following year.**

Years of schooling

The evaluation of schooling guide used by the ministry and colleges to establish a professor's level of schooling and recognized diplomas for the purposes of determining remuneration has changed substantially over time and, little by little, the rules have multiplied to include what now number several thousand. A full revamping of this guide would allow all of the rules to be revised and brought up to date. This would also be a good opportunity to ask for an upgrade of the outdated computerized system the ministry uses to manage the files on schooling (5.4).

To rectify certain recurrent problems, the collective agreement must make explicit that the documents relevant to the evaluation of schooling must include a professor's overall schooling and not just that which relates to the discipline he or she teaches. Moreover, colleges must inform professors of the receipt of each document, of its incidence and, where applicable, of the need to supply any additional documentation (5.5).

- 5.4. Update the evaluation of schooling guide and associated IT tools.**
- 5.5. Amend the terms for the transmission of schooling-related documents between professors and the college or the CNR.**

Remuneration for master's and doctoral degree holders

Professors with master's and doctoral degrees have access to supplementary pay steps once they've reached the top of the salary scale provided they meet the following criteria: for a master's holder, the degree must be in the discipline they are teaching, or in a related discipline, and be "useful to teaching"; doctoral degree holders, for their part, must have cumulated 19 years of schooling. The relevance of these conditions and fact that the salary increases only apply late in a professor's career require revisiting. Moreover, the wage differentials between steps 17, 18, 19, and 20 are only 1.63%, far less than the 4.5% differentials between the other steps.

5.6. Improve remuneration for professors holding a master's or doctoral degree.

Bonuses and salary scales

Professors at the *Centre québécois de formation en aéronautique* (CQFA) have a separate salary scale, which is laid out in Appendix III-1 of the collective agreement. This scale contains rules that need to be updated, notably with regard to movement through the scale and access to class IV (5.7). Appendix III-1 also sets remuneration for overtime work at an hourly rate inferior to that of continuing education (5.8).

The *École des pêches et de l'aquaculture du Québec* (ÉPAQ) has recently started requiring that some professors hold a marine certificate. Since their colleagues at the *Institut maritime du Québec* receive a salary bonus for having this certificate, it is only fair that the same condition be extended to ÉPAQ professors (5.9).

5.7. Update the conditions for movement through the salary scale for all professors of the Centre québécois de formation aéronautique.

5.8. Pay substitution and overtime hours to Centre québécois de formation aéronautique professors in the same way as is done for all CEGEP teachers.

5.9. Ensure that professors of the École des pêches et de l'aquaculture du Québec (EPAQ) who hold a marine certificate receive the same salary bonus as granted to Institut maritime professors.

Starting salary

While colleges are having an increasingly tough time recruiting and retaining labour, entry-level salaries remain grossly inferior to what professors can earn if they work in their field of specialization, and sometimes even well below what graduates can expect to be paid when hired right out of college.

5.10. Extend accelerated promotion to the first eight (8) steps of the salary scales and make adjustments for the CQFA.

THEME 6 – OTHER DEMANDS

This section groups together three miscellaneous demands that—while no less important—do not fit under any of the previous five key themes.

The collective agreement stipulates that chiropractic services are to be included in the group insurance plan, which is not the case for any other professional service. This limits the benefit options that can be negotiated with the insurer (6.1).

These last two demands are aimed at harmonizing professors' rights (6.2, 6.3).

6.1. Remove from the collective agreement the mention of chiropractic services as a compulsory element of the health insurance plan.

6.2. Stipulate that professors teaching in a program leading to a diploma of professional studies (DEP) at École des Pêches et de l'Aquaculture du Québec (ÉPAQ) are included in the scope of application of the collective agreement.

6.3. Ensure that all approved amendments are applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the CQFA.

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT

LABOUR ORGANIZATIONS

CSN: Confédération des syndicats nationaux

FNEEQ: Fédération nationale des enseignantes et des enseignants du Québec

OTHER ACRONYMS

CCTT: Centre collégial de transfert de technologie (College technology transfer centre)

CEEC: Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial du Québec (Quebec college teaching evaluation board)

CI: Charge individuelle (Individual workload)

CId: Charge individuelle liée au temps de déplacement (Individual workload relating to travel)

CNR: Comité national de rencontre (CPNC and FNEEQ) (National meeting committee)

CPNC: Comité patronal de négociation des collèges (College management negotiating committee)

CQFA: Centre québécois de formation aéronautique

DEC: Diplôme d'études collégiales (Diploma of college studies)

DEP: Diplôme d'études professionnelles (Diploma of professional studies)

EPAQ: École des pêches et de l'aquaculture du Québec

FTE: Full-time equivalent

LRC: Labour Relations Committee

QPIP: Quebec Parental Insurance Plan

RAC: Recognition of acquired competencies

SWD: Students with disabilities