



APRIL 29, 1986

BULLETIN EXPRESS

LOCAL ADMINISTRATIONS INVITED TO NEGOTIATE

College administrations were invited to a meeting in Montreal on April 30. CSN unions and Federations, representing 14,000 members (teachers and professionals), took this initiative to get negotiations started in earnest. We made our intentions public in a press conference in Montreal on April 28.

Various actions at the local level were undertaken to put pressure on local administrations to participate at this negotiating meeting. The teachers' Union at Gaspé College went as far as reserving a plane ticket for their director general! Other unions undertook actions such as picketing, occupations and demonstrations always aimed at pressuring their local administrations to meet with FNEEQ's negotiating committee and start negotiations, on a sectorial «Annexe A». The «partie patronale» has yet to come out with offers on Annexe A. Our objective, we repeat, is to accelerate the negotiating process and to avert a complete stalemate resulting from Bill 37 and management's self-serving interpretation of it. After 20 negotiating sessions, its becoming increasingly difficult to advance in any meaningful way since a good half of management's offers are missing. When we raise the question, or point out that part of what we are about to negotiate is missing, the cliché answer is «this is subject to local negotiations». Rather than negotiating, their main preoccupation is to convince us to agree to negotiate locally-something that we have massively rejected. We have been mandated to negotiate the entire collective agreement provincially, including Annex A, and they know it. They also know, but don't want to admit, that it makes no sense to negotiate something which is doomed to remain unsettled, since the other important component is missing. For example, how can one discuss job security since some aspects of seniority are subject to local negotiations.

UPDATE ...

UPDATE ...

UPDATE ...

Shortly before printing this bulletin, we were informed that a directive has been given to local administrations to refuse to attend the meeting tomorrow to start negotiations on Annex A. We learned that this decision was taken after a meeting of all college administrations on Friday April the 25th, called by the «Fédération des cegeps». This last minute refusal is particularly astonishing since, up until the 25th of April, several Colleges -among them Ahuntsic, John-Abbott, Joliette and Limoilou- had already indicated to the unions that they would participate at this meeting.

We will furnish more details on this issue in the next bulletin, after the «42» meeting of May 2-3.

18TH AND 19TH NEGOTIATING SESSION

HIRING

At the meeting of April 23 and 24, we started discussions on article 5-1.00 (Hiring). For management, both hiring mechanisms and rights attached are local issues. It is extremely difficult not to be able to consider hiring mechanisms and rights when discussing provisions like seniority and job security, etc., simply because hiring is in annex A.

For example, on one hand management thought it appropriate to reiterate the fact that the employment of non-permanent teachers comes to an end automatically on the last day of the contract. Yet, on the sectorial level they eliminate the clause indicating that the contract of a permanent teacher renews automatically. Where is the logic here and what is the motive?

JOB SECURITY

We have pointed out to them that it is very difficult to apply the job security mechanisms in the present situation. On one hand, the hiring priorities based on the status of the teacher are found on the sectorial level (in their sectorial offers). On the other hand, the decision as to the status of a teacher is left at the local level (which means nowhere in sight, since we don't have their offers on Annex A).

By giving us an example showing the divergence of opinion between two colleges as to the status of a teacher, management made it clear that it is of little concern to them which teacher has priority over another. If this is true, we asked them why they maintained the status of a teacher as a criteria in the hiring order. Certainly they have a mandate to negotiate this, since it is in the sectorial offers. The reply was that if we had something to propose, they would be willing to look into it.

PART-TIME / FULL-TIME «CHARGES DE COURS»

Regarding our demand for a part time rather than an hourly paid status for teachers in continuing education, they said that they are not opposed to it for monetary reasons (which after all are not that high) but rather because it is a «local» issue. Yet in earlier discussions they said the opposite (see Express no 10).

We maintain that salaries of part-time teachers must be based on the most advantageous of the three calculations: CI (individual workload), or left over residual «charge» or the release. Management objects to that, claiming that it will create deficits for the colleges in their 2A budgets («masse salariale» of teachers) for them salaries of part-time teachers have to be based solely on the CI.

As far as recognition of full-time status, management said that this favours permanence and that for a teacher it makes no difference in salary whether it is based on a CI 76 or 80. However, they took note of our remark that even though it may not make a difference in salary, it will surely make a difference in pension plans.

TENURE

On article 5-2.00 «permanence», our demand asking for permanence for all full-time teachers especially for those who have taught full-time for many years, makes management freak. The idea of increasing the number of MEDs shocks them. According to them, we are talking about 200-300 more MEDs in the network. We clearly stated that there is nothing to be shocked about. Our demand is a just one and seeks tenure for all those teachers who, by having accumulated years of experience over a long period of time, have proved that full time work has always existed especially with the expansion of continuing education.

SENIORITY

Management admits that sending the seniority issue to the local level risks returning to a situation of endless delays, which we have already experienced in determining the seniority of MEDs in the past. These delays were reduced significantly by standardization at the «Bureau de placement». But it is not their fault ... it is because of Bill 37! We must not talk about the double rule of seniority either (one local, the other provincial), we were told. But then we asked, «Who is going to be given a poste? A less senior teacher who has more local seniority or another teacher who has more seniority for relocation purposes?» They will think about it. Debate on this issue will continued next week ...

