

TEACHERS UNITED

Initial Sectoral Submission

October 21, 2022



INITIAL SECTORAL DEMANDS

October 21, 2022

Drafted by the FEC-CSQ and FNEEQ-CSN Regroupement cégep bargaining committees:

Nadine Bédard-St-Pierre – FEC-CSQ

Frédéric Clermont – FNEEQ-CSN

Josée Déziel – FNEEQ-CSN

Paul-Émile Houle – FEC-CSQ

Julien Lacombe – FEC-CSQ

Philip Lagogiannis – FNEEQ-CSN

Julien Lapan – FNEEQ-CSN

Anna-Belle Marcotte – FNEEQ-CSN

Héloïse Moysan-Lapointe – FNEEQ-CSN

Nathalie Munger – FNEEQ-CSN

Rachel Sarrasin – FEC-CSQ

Editing and layout:

Marie-Pier Dalpé, Christophe Chapdelaine and Caroline Simard

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preamble	1
Topics	2
Precariousness and professional integration	2
Workload, resources, and student success	4
Distance education, Continuing Education, and the survival of the CEGEP model	6
Collegiality, teaching expertise, and program vitality	9
Work organization and labour relations	11
Salary scale and other remuneration issues	13
Interim committees	14
End-of-bargaining protocol	15

PREAMBLE

To the CEGEP employers' bargaining committee (CPNC)

It is generally accepted that the main mission of the CEGEPs is to facilitate access to the labour market and to university studies by offering quality general, specific, and complementary training. However, for four years the Legault government has demonstrated the narrowness of its conception of education. By attempting to reduce the role of CEGEPs to that of training centers aimed almost exclusively at meeting the needs of businesses, the government is demonstrating its lack of vision in higher education.

Faced with what we perceive as attacks on the very foundations of the college network, we, CEGEP teachers, refuse to countenance these developments. We call attention to our major contribution to economic and social prosperity through the technical and pre-university training we offer throughout Quebec, and we demand that it be fully recognized, notably in terms of our salaries and working conditions. We believe that to succeed, students must be able to access comprehensive humanistic, civic, and professional training deployed in the best conditions.

To fulfill its various missions and support student success, the college network must be able to count on adequate public funding whose priority is not simply to meet the immediate needs of businesses. This funding must make it easier to attract and retain faculty members, better recognize the complexity of the tasks we perform, significantly reduce precariousness, adequately support success, provide CEGEPs with the necessary equipment and infrastructure, and ensure the vitality of regional CEGEPs.

The college network must also be maintained in the form advocated by the Parent Report, both in terms of program offerings and the role of teachers, particularly in governance structures. As far as program offerings are concerned, CEGEPs must return to their initial mission: to prepare students arriving from secondary school to undertake a university curriculum or to begin a professional career in Regular Education on the one hand, and to meet the needs of adults wishing to pursue their college studies in Continuing Education on the other. In addition to their role with students, teachers must occupy a prominent place in the management of pedagogical affairs and in decision-making processes. The sustainability of the network also requires the circumscription of distance education. To prevent it being used for inducing unhealthy and harmful competition between CEGEPs, compensating for the lack of classrooms, or making up for insufficient funding, its practice and its development must be marked out by our collective agreement.

It is in this context and in light of these concerns that the Fédération de l'enseignement collégial (FEC-CSQ) and the Fédération nationale des enseignantes et des enseignants de cégep (FNEEQ-CSN) are filing a joint project for the renewal of their collective agreements. This project, developed following consultations with the CEGEP teachers we represent, aims to highlight the issues raised by them and to present avenues for reflection that will feed discussions and facilitate the search for solutions between our parties.

TOPICS

PRECARIOUSNESS AND PROFESSIONAL INTEGRATION

Currently, of the almost 19,000 teachers in the CEGEP network, more than 8,000 have no job security. This is a situation that is by no means confined to teachers who are beginning their careers. A large proportion of teachers live in a state of uncertainty that can last years, or even in some cases an entire career. This uncertainty means economic insecurity in terms of both income and protections. To compensate, precariously employed teachers must perform a tricky balancing act to defend their position on the seniority list, typically by accepting every portion of a teaching load they are offered, whether from a single employer or from several. The work overload and hyper-alertness that job insecurity demands are a significant source of stress and are harmful to both teachers' health and the work environment.

These problems are by no means inevitable. College administrations bear some responsibility, for they can reduce the impact of precarious employment on teachers. Where they have such leeway, it should be used. More manoeuvring room remains to be provided, and the next round of bargaining will be an opportunity to make proposals on this front.

PRECARIOUS WORKING CONDITIONS

Heavier teaching loads, discussed below, are a fact of life for faculty, but they affect precariously employed teachers much more acutely. Many members pointed out that precariousness isn't just a matter of lack of job security. It also means arduous working conditions: preparing for multiple new courses at the same time; the risk of dropping down the seniority list due to the race to replace teachers during the term; accepting inordinate teaching loads in the fall in the hope of obtaining a full-time load—which is nevertheless often out of reach; and so on.

Job insecurity often means having to work at more than one educational establishment or in more than one sector to make ends meet. Many teachers in this situation experience recurring difficulties in obtaining full and reliable information in a timely manner so they can make an informed choice, and report cumbersome, complex and sometimes unfair administrative processes.

Finally, the complications that come with job insecurity also include unequal access to leave and other fringe benefits, along with the potential discrimination this elicits.

PROBLEMS WITH PROFESSIONAL INTEGRATION

Under the unique structure of the CEGEP system, the integration of new teachers into the teaching profession is a shared responsibility. The current shortcomings in this area cannot long persist without detrimental impacts on both teachers entering the profession and the colleagues who welcome them, who are liable to experience burn-out. Given the significant increase in enrolment expected in the coming years, this problem calls for greater attention.

Institutional support is also considered lacking, as young teachers are offered few opportunities to gradually familiarize themselves with their work environment and the various facets of the teaching profession. As this is a pivotal time in a teaching career, it would be appropriate to make time and resources available to support a smooth onboarding process. The diversity of profiles and backgrounds can be an additional impediment to inclusion in the institution's life and culture, and must be taken into account.

It should also be borne in mind that professional integration problems are not confined to new teachers. The fact that some of us live in a state of permanent insecurity partially deprives our institutions of a valuable contribution to community life and activities. It risks depriving them of dynamism and expertise that could help boost their vitality and their influence beyond the campus and in the community. Without a home base, these long-time teachers aren't always able to contribute to their full potential.

JOB INSECURITY

The specific difficulties experienced by precariously employed teachers are not only numerous but also prolonged. Many members spoke of the prospect of a career with no guarantee of job security and a long road to tenure studded with pitfalls, even after many years working at a college.

This situation is due to the structurally restrictive nature of some of the funding allocated to teaching and its deliberately limited use by some colleges, when it could be used to give many of us better access to tenure. Projections also tend to be overly conservative and local practices with respect to opening permanent positions (*postes*) can be inequitable or deliberately restrictive. These practices are particularly detrimental to teachers in small disciplines at some colleges, who have little to look forward to but permanent insecurity.

IMPACT ON ATTRACTION AND RETENTION

It is clear to us that job insecurity is not only harmful to the teachers who experience it: it also has negative collective impacts on our institutions. Moreover, prolonged insecurity and the working and living conditions that go with it make it significantly harder to attract new teachers and hold on to them in the long run. This problem is particularly glaring because of attraction and retention difficulties, which are more acute than ever. For all these reasons, finding solutions to the problems described above is a matter of urgency.

WORKLOAD, RESOURCES, AND STUDENT SUCCESS

Our role as teachers is rich and complex. Class time, supervision, evaluation, and grading are the most visible parts of the job, but the time spent on lesson preparation, departmental and program coordination, and our many other activities also contribute to making CEGEPs hubs of learning and culture. Current resources are not sufficient to support our role as essential players in the success of our students, and the lack of resources is causing significant work overload. Lightening our load is one thing the government can do if it wants to keep its promises and make education a priority.

TEACHING LOAD: HOW IT'S MEASURED, HOW IT'S CHANGED

For most of us, the individual teaching load (CI), as it is calculated, no longer reflects the work we do. Some of the many components of the job are not fully reflected in the calculation, such as classroom time, preparation, large class sizes, and travel time. The discrepancy leads to increased workloads, particularly when it comes to evaluation and grading or certain characteristics of the student population (such as the secondary school general average), which is compounded by the late date at which the calculation is performed. As a result, some of our work is neither recognized nor paid. Our numerous and increasingly complex ancillary tasks, notably those related to pedagogical activities and the collaborative school life activities inherent in the programs, are also consuming a growing portion of our working time, particularly in small CEGEPs, regional CEGEPs and small departments. Often, release from teaching duties does not fully reflect the work required. These situations have harmful effects, including increased stress, burnout, and a high rate of teachers taking leave.

In addition to these problems, which affect all teachers, there are specific problems in certain programs and disciplines, such as: clinical or laboratory teaching and supervision of stages in the health and social service technology programs; teachers who give courses whose weight (*pondération*) is less than 3; and disciplines in which technological changes demand constant adjustment by teachers.

INADEQUATE RESOURCES

While the growing complexity of our job is contributing to heavier workloads, the poor fit between resources and needs is also a factor. To begin with, the funding of teaching resources is not aligned with their allocation or adapted to the various teaching and learning contexts, nor to specific features of the student populations served by the CEGEPs. Examples include the funding method by program and the resources provided for in some appendices, where the lack of guidelines sometimes leads to problems of application and of predictability. In addition, the fact that enrolment numbers are read late in the semester tends to yield reduced teaching resources compared with the situation at the start. As a result, a portion of teaching is done without any funding.

TEACHERS UNITED

In addition to these structural problems, insufficient teaching resources are provided for ancillary duties such as coordination (of departments, programs, labs, stages). Other important resources, including physical and technical resources and infrastructure, are also inadequate.

In the same vein, to prevent or correct inequities, we would also like to discuss various subjects such as the full-time-equivalent value of a Continuing Education charge (CFC), certain provisions of the letter of agreement on guarantees and, at some CEGEPs, the reduction of resources caused by the negative Kir.

STUDENT SUCCESS

Student success is at the centre of our concerns. Our subject-matter and pedagogical expertise, our close and sustained contact with students in the classroom, and our in-depth knowledge of the obstacles to success make us key players in implementing measures to keep students in school. Only with adequate, better targeted and more stable resources, combined with a recognition of our professional autonomy, will it be possible to improve learning and teaching conditions in the long term. This would enable us to better support student success and promote the inclusion of all students, by for example filling in gaps, consolidating the still-fragile learning from high school, responding to special needs (EBP), or offering accommodations to students with disabilities (EESH).

At present, we do not have all the required means to develop, implement and maintain measures for these purposes. The use of resources dedicated to supporting student success is in itself a major obstacle to the achievement of our objectives, and often has the effect of aggravating job insecurity. A similar observation can be made about specific resources to support students with disabilities or special needs, which moreover are insufficient and do not generate enough permanent positions (*postes*). It is imperative that their use be reviewed to derive sustainable and meaningful benefits from them.

Simply put, supporting teachers means supporting education. The math is simple: we need more time to teach and to help our students succeed. It is high time that we were given the means to achieve our collective ambitions.

DISTANCE EDUCATION, CONTINUING EDUCATION, AND THE SURVIVAL OF THE CEGEP MODEL

In recent years, and particularly in recent months, the CEGEP model has been shaken by jolts that have undermined the foundations laid by the Parent Report. The combined pressures of adjusting teaching to the pandemic and to rapid technological change have left their mark on the CEGEPs. The CEGEPs have also been under growing pressure to become increasingly subservient to the market and its imperatives, which translates into a utilitarian vision of higher education, a proliferation of short curricula based on the immediate needs of businesses, etc.

In addition to the often-negative impacts on our working conditions, these changes are spurring unhealthy competition between CEGEPs—which could be particularly detrimental to smaller CEGEPs—and threatening the sustainability of the CEGEP network.

DISTANCE EDUCATION

Without a doubt, the pandemic had a major impact on our teaching practices by spurring the development of distance education at our institutions. Although it must only be used for special and predetermined situations—such as providing access to higher education in remote areas—various forms of distance education recently became a solution of last resort for all teaching staff. This experience only confirmed the relevance of the repeated calls by CEGEP teachers that the many issues raised by distance education be addressed. The unprecedented circumstances since 2020 have exacerbated and expanded this need, which also made it necessary to do work between rounds of bargaining.

In general, teachers criticize the lack of provincial guidelines to circumscribe the development of distance education in both the Regular and Continuing Education sectors. These are needed to maintain consistency across the CEGEP network and to make student success the top priority. At present, the reasons for using distance education at our institutions are often questionable or decided unilaterally by CEGEP administrations. In addition, the impacts on inter-CEGEP relations and on the various teaching sectors are not always considered.

Except for a few local agreements, there is no recognition of the extra workload generated by distance education. This means, among other things, that the CEGEPs that remunerate it must do so using existing teaching resources. This situation is simply untenable for the colleges, particularly the small or regional ones that already face significant funding challenges.

Teachers also point to the lack of attention to questions of individual and collective professional autonomy, academic freedom, and the protection of intellectual property for educational content as important issues in the rush to distance education. As well, they believe that the impacts on work organization, teaching conditions, and the kind of student-teacher relationship that promotes educational success must not be neglected in discussions on the use of distance education. Finally, the professional development and technical support needs that inevitably arise with distance education remain acute.

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Continuing Education has been a Trojan horse for uncontrolled development of the CEGEP network in recent years, and those of us who work in Cont. Ed. are paying the price.

According to a joint report produced by the national meeting committee (CNR) in 2014, teaching activities in Continuing Education are similar to those in the Regular sector, including supervision and ancillary tasks, except that the student population is often more heterogeneous and older. Nonetheless, the salary and working conditions of Continuing Education teachers are deplorable. While salaries were improved in the last round of bargaining, they remain significantly lower than in the Regular sector for a comparable teaching load. For example, many of us who work in Cont. Ed. earn half of what we would be making in the Regular sector. Some of the tasks we perform are only partially recognized, or not recognized at all. On the other hand, teachers who benefit from a Continuing Education charge (CFC) receive the same salary as they would in the Regular sector, but the number of these loads is insufficient and their allocation isn't properly regulated.

Aside from salaries, the working conditions and benefits of Continuing Education teachers are barely more than the minimum stipulated in the Act respecting labour standards. For example, we are entitled to very little leave, no salary security, no vacation time, and generally no access to group insurance or reimbursement for professional development. The workload is often very heavy, partly because the number of students and the number of separate courses that must be prepared are not considered. These inequities are compounded by professional isolation; often there are no structures for consultation among teachers, and a lack of professional autonomy, services, and physical resources. Those of us who teach summer courses also suffer these poor conditions.

Finally, it should be noted that there is a significant lack of transparency in the Continuing Education sector, particularly with respect to hiring procedures and work organization.

SURVIVAL OF THE CEGEP NETWORK

While the chaotic development of distance education and Continuing Education are the main threats to the future of the CEGEP system, they are not the only ones. In its haste to respond to the needs of the labour market, the government is encouraging atypical and short programs, for credit or not, that are dangerously far removed from the more rounded education that Regular programs provide. These maneuvers put broad and humanistic training in competition with a model of Continuing Education strictly oriented towards the short-sighted targets of companies. Because they are often less time-consuming and restrictive, such programs are attractive to many students, who nonetheless are giving up their right to a more complete education in the Regular sector and the benefits it will yield in the longer term.

Securing the future of the CEGEP network demands, first and foremost, that the colleges be preserved as living, teaching, and learning environments. The fragmented regional structures of some CEGEPs and the ill-advised proliferation of college centres (CECs), sub-centres, service points, and inter-institutional partnerships all threaten the survival of a strong, coherent system.

TEACHERS UNITED

To ensure the future of the network, CEGEPs located far from major centres must be allowed to play their role as engines of economic, scientific, and cultural development in their regions.

All the problems discussed above call for attention in the upcoming round of bargaining. We will consequently have to tackle the challenges of distance education, working and salary conditions in Continuing Education, and the issues raised by the fraying of the CEGEP model and the proliferation of different training formats and objectives.

COLLEGIALITY, TEACHING EXPERTISE, AND PROGRAM VITALITY

Collegiality, just like professional autonomy in its individual and collective dimensions, is inscribed in the DNA of the CEGEPs. These must remain at the heart of the management of institutions of higher education to allow full teacher participation in decision-making processes and ensure that the voices heard are truly representative. In the departments—where collegiality finds its roots—and in the various committees and academic councils, collegiality is a pledge of transparency, consultation, and thorough analysis of situations and the resulting decisions. While operating collegially can sometimes be a challenge—for example when several disciplines coexist in one department—the results for our institutions are all the richer. We therefore denounce the many attacks that would modify our practices. There is less and less recognition of our prerogatives, just as there is sometimes a tendency to ignore our expertise. The sharing of tasks and functions between faculty and other job categories is problematic at many CEGEPs.

In addition to being based on the principle of collegiality, the CEGEP network originated in a societal decision to make higher education accessible throughout Québec, and to guarantee access to a wide range of programs for all. The vitality of these programs depends on the involvement of teachers at all stages of their life cycle.

PROVINCIAL PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Too often, both the local content of programs and the broader considerations connected with them stem from policies adopted at the provincial level. Worse still, they are adopted without proper consultation. These decisions, which usually come from the Ministry of Higher Education (MES) and sometimes from other ministries, are made with little consideration of the consequences on our institutions, our programs, and our working conditions. Certain elements of Act 14 (Bill 96) are a recent example. Decisions about program offerings (opening and closing programs, provincial review, maximum enrolment at the various CEGEPs, graduation requirements, etc.) are made at a frantic pace, with no overall vision, without analysis of the required resources, and without adequate consultation with teachers.

In both the pre-university and vocational sectors, recent experience has shown that opaque decision-making processes produce unsatisfactory results. The result is a tug-of-war and toxic competition that increases workloads, undermines the work environment, contaminates pedagogical decision-making, and saps both the vitality of programs and the uniform province-wide character of the DEC. This rivalry hits small and regional CEGEPs particularly hard. We believe that a transparent process leading up to decisions at the provincial level, including genuine consultation with teachers and based on the principle of collegiality, would make it possible to avoid many of these pitfalls.

LOCAL PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

The local work involved in the program life cycle is very extensive and demands time, energy, and faculty resources, as acknowledged by the arrangements recently added to our collective agreements. To be sure, those arrangements constitute official recognition of faculty's

TEACHERS UNITED

indispensable contribution to local program design. However, the leave currently granted for this purpose falls far short of the amount of work required of teachers. This mismatch between teachers' contributions in their departments and program committees on the one hand, and the financial resources allocated on the other, is all the more troubling since recent ministerial orientations point towards more frequent and numerous program reviews.

In addition to these glaring funding problems, significant shifts across the board are moving us away from the collegial model of operation and eroding our individual and collective professional autonomy. Examples include more cumbersome accountability processes, and interference by the administrative apparatus in the prerogatives of departments and program committees. This threatens the professional autonomy that is so crucial to preserving the richness of perspectives and diversity of methods which constitute the strength of the CEGEP model.

TEACHING EXPERTISE

We believe the CEGEP network would benefit from recognizing teaching expertise at its true worth and supporting it in consequence. Three topics in particular are indicative of the problem and deserve to be addressed.

First, the FEC-CSQ and FNEEQ-CSN collective agreements contain few if any guidelines related to research by CEGEP faculty members. Yet our contribution to research is not only highly productive but crucial to the development of subject-matter and pedagogical knowledge specific to our level of instruction. Institutional and financial support also fall short in many cases.

Furthermore, while the activities related to recognition of acquired competencies (RAC) were finally recognized in our collective agreements in the last round of bargaining, we note that the provisions remain unclear and do not fully recognize our role and expertise in the RAC process.

Lastly, maintaining teaching expertise is impossible without appropriate allocations to the CEGEPs' professional development budgets. Professional development resources are inadequate to address various needs (new programs that require subject-matter or pedagogical updating, distance from major centres, cost of training, etc.). It should also be noted that in the case of programs with extensive technological content, increasing the amounts allocated to the CEGEPs' professional development budgets will not, by itself, solve the problems.

We teachers carry out the CEGEPs' mission daily, and we wish to give students access to higher education across Québec with a rich range of programs in which our full expertise will be put to use.

WORK ORGANIZATION AND LABOUR RELATIONS

Our collective agreements have been in existence for decades and must be periodically adjusted to reflect new realities and teachers' emerging needs. The challenges of attracting and retaining teachers are another reason, if any were needed, to strive for significant improvements to the organization of work and to achieve better work-life balance.

Problems with labour relations were also noted. To ensure collective work of high quality, a transparent flow of information, and effective dispute prevention, major changes will have to be negotiated.

WORK ORGANIZATION

To promote better work-life balance, improve access to parental rights, and protect the right to log off, certain provisions of the collective agreement should be reviewed or added, particularly in relation to availability, leaves, and schedules. Several teachers protested the lack of a joint committee on work-life balance. In addition, several provisions related to disability and sick leave days need review. Finally, the provisions on job security are deemed inadequate, and adjustments with respect to gradual retirement and phased retirement should be considered.

Current environmental challenges demand the attention of all actors in society, including unions and CEGEPs, but they are not addressed in the collective agreement. These topics are directly related to occupational health and safety and to working conditions, which will be affected by the climate crisis.

Certain provisions regarding substitution and replacement need to be clarified or adjusted, especially in view of the shortage of teachers in the CEGEP network.

Finally, it should be noted that other provisions need to be reviewed or added, including some related to the reform of the Act respecting occupational health and safety, to prevention of and protection against domestic violence, and to joint committees. The absence of guidelines regarding the protection of personal information and the right to privacy is also a problem to consider. Finally, technical or interpretative rewording, adaptations, and clarifications of existing provisions in the collective agreements are also needed.

SPECIAL CASES

Other topics related to work organization affect some of our constituents specifically.

First, the appendix regarding the *Centre québécois de formation aéronautique* (Appendix III-1 of the FNEEQ-CSN collective agreement) is outdated and contains problematic provisions, particularly on availability, workload, safety, pay, and leave.

Secondly, application of the appendix concerning Collège Marie-Victorin (Appendix III-2 of the FNEEQ-CSN collective agreement) is problematic with respect to the criteria for assigning teaching loads in a prison environment and seniority.

TEACHERS UNITED

Thirdly, the provisions of the professors' collective agreement at the *Centre de formation en mesures d'urgence de Lévis* (CFMU) will have to be incorporated into the FEC-CSQ collective agreement in an appendix, and adjustments and concordances will have to be made. Among the particular problems experienced by CFMU professors, we underline recruitment issues, requirements relating to the maintenance of certificates, the updating of the appendix relating to the experimentation of pivot professors, clarification of the notions of availability and reprise de temps, and access to certain leaves.

Fourthly, the appendix regarding instructors in individualized training (*formation sur mesure*) at the Cégep de Victoriaville (Appendix III-7 of the FEC-CSQ collective agreement) will have to be amended, particularly those provisions relating to the three hourly rates, to recognition of new course preparations, to the specialization premium, to the list of disciplines and sectors, and to incorporation of the Cégep de Victoriaville's local letter of agreement into the collective agreement.

Finally, we would like to discuss problems in other areas of individualized training.

LABOUR RELATIONS

Clearly, a concerted collective effort is essential to maintain harmonious labour relations. Sufficient union leave is needed for the performance of local union reps' responsibilities and the activities of the federations. However, the leave provided for these purposes in the collective agreement is plainly insufficient. Too often, local unions must take on work overload to fulfill their duties.

It would also be desirable to improve some of the information provided by management in the interest of transparency and rigour, and to review the provisions for allocating teaching resources. It should be noted too that some practices of attributing expenses to teaching resources are inappropriate and can create significant pressure on the latter.

In addition, it appears that adjustments are needed to improve frequently contentious provisions regarding certain disciplinary and administrative measures. We would also like to discuss the arbitration process, which is often too long and inefficient.

SALARY SCALE AND OTHER REMUNERATION ISSUES

In addition to working conditions and conditions of professional practice, remuneration is a central concern for CEGEP teachers in this round of bargaining. The Quebec-wide labour shortage is affecting CEGEPs as it is other sectors of the labour market. While the problem is more concentrated in certain disciplines and regions, the difficulty recruiting teaching personnel and filling replacement positions has now become widespread. This is only one of the indicators that show long-term solutions must be agreed upon to promote teacher attraction and retention in the CEGEPs.

SALARY SCALE

While the last round of bargaining yielded some modest adjustments to the first steps of the teacher salary scale, the upgrading of CEGEP teachers to rank 23 in 2015 following the technical evaluation of jobs that are not predominantly male or female has yet to be fully applied. Teachers entering the profession are therefore deprived of the full salary they should receive by virtue of their classification. The small gap between the steps available to holders of master's and doctoral degrees is also noteworthy. The unattractive salaries of teaching staff reflect a perception that CEGEP teachers are not full-fledged members of the higher education system, even though they were recognized as such in the salary relativity process. This only exacerbates the challenge of recruiting and retaining teaching staff—all the more problematic in view of the expected increase in student numbers in the coming years.

We believe that our pay scale's lack of consistency with other scales in the public and parapublic sectors must be remedied in the 2023 round of bargaining, all while keeping in mind its specific characteristics and the fact that salaries at the first steps are too low to be attractive. CEGEP teachers also criticized how long it takes to reach the highest step.

OTHER REMUNERATION ISSUES

As a result of the recruitment difficulties, full-time teachers are being called on to fill in as replacements during the term more frequently. However, the pay they receive for these additional hours is proportionately lower than their regular salary. Remuneration for exceeding the maximum individual teaching load (CI) is also insufficient. Finally, the introduction of a single rate for other teaching activities in our collective agreements has resolved some disputes in our workplaces but remains problematic, notably because it is considered too low.

In addition, many faculty members find themselves having to pay to teach. For example, they must cover fees for membership in a professional order or for certifications in the specialties they teach. There are also problems with the current processes for evaluating years of schooling and recognizing diplomas, and with the methods of pay disbursement. Finally, we also note the absence of a financial contribution by our employer to our group insurance plan.

INTERIM COMMITTEES

Finally, it should be noted that, in the 2020 round of bargaining, the two union federations both signed letters of agreement to continue work during the term of the collective agreement on the teaching load and its parameters, Continuing Education, and distance education. These three interim committees are to complete their work before the expiry of the collective agreement, and the employer and union representatives are to produce recommendations, jointly or separately, and submit them to the bargaining parties. We mention that the union recommendations will subsequently be considered in the current round of bargaining.

END-OF-BARGAINING PROTOCOL

As part of the agreement to be concluded, the parties agree on an end-of-bargaining protocol.