

## President's Message



### Fall's Political Colours

It gives me great pleasure to launch the new edition of the semi-annual FQPPU newsletter, which was suspended in 2009. In it, you will be given a glimpse of our positions, studies, representations, and actions.

The Fall issue begins with an overview of our 2015–2016 priorities (see box, p. 2). Major issues within the Quebec university network have led us to take action on all fronts: university funding, at the mercy of austerity and unpredictability, which has led to fewer professors and inferior working and learning conditions; university administration, which reflects a growing authoritarianism and judiciarization with regard to relationships with the academic community, which in turn compromise collegiality; provincial research funding, which is proportionally decreasing in terms of overall funding; and imposed funding conditions from Ottawa, which sometimes conflict with academic freedom.

The floor is then given to the members of the Executive Committee, who have specific responsibilities that relate to certain topics. The column written by Mélanie Gagnon (SPPUQAR), Vice-President, is about working conditions for professors and union issues. The one written by Sylvain Beaudry (SPPUQTR), Secretary-Treasurer, is about pension plans. Finally, those written by Louis Demers (APPENAP) and Denis Belisle (SPPUS) respectively focus on transformations in academic life and on the impact of ICT on the academic workload.

(Continued on the next page)

## Contents

Vol. 1, No. 1 - Fall 2015

Online version: [fqppu.org](http://fqppu.org)

### President's Message

Fall's Political Colours | **1**

2015–2016 Priorities | **2**

### From the Committees

Executive Committee | **3**

Committee on University Funding | **5**

### We Were There

Education International (EI) 7<sup>th</sup> World Congress | **7**

University Leaders Speak at Hearings for the 2015  
Committee on Culture and Education | **8**

### Taking Action

Federal Elections | **10**

### Legal Advice

Union Monopolies and Their Effects | **11**

## Calendar

- **Federal Councils**      October 22, 2015  
February 11 and 12, 2016  
April 21 and 22, 2016
- **Forum on Research**      October 23, 2015
- **Training**      November 27, 2015

**Theme:** Requests for accommodation in cases of a gradual return to work

## 2015–2016 Priorities

### University Funding

Budget cuts of approximately \$737 million since 2012 by the Quebec government have weakened universities and contributed to a deterioration of working and learning conditions.

The FQPPU is calling for a new funding formula and capital reinvestment.

We will document the effect of these cumulative cuts on university operations and the academic workload, denounce, with our partners, the systematic destruction of the university network, and claim to the Minister of education, higher education and research for an urgent reinvestment.

### University Administration

The budget cuts are accompanied by an administrative drift and exploitation of the faculty. Authoritarianism and litigiousness are major characteristics of the relationships between university administrations and the academic community, who have been reduced to interchangeable human resources who are marginalized within organized bodies and during decision making.

The FQPPU advocates collegiality as the foundation of academic life and that the academic community have majority representation when it comes to university administration.

We will participate in preliminary meetings for the États généraux sur l'enseignement supérieur (Estates general on higher education), reiterate the need for and importance of creating a National Council of Universities, and organize a conference about university administration for the 2016 Acfas congress.

### Research

Without a adequate financing of the national research policy, the decrease in support from the Quebec government with regard to overall university research funding, reaching 20% in 2014–15, as compared to 24% in 1997–98, threatens existing structures and the renewal of activities.

The FQPPU advocates the additionality principle for the components of the academic workload, as well as freedom of research, which involves additional funding.

Since the federal government funds 50% of the research carried out in Quebec universities in an increasingly oriented manner, we are calling upon representatives of the opposition parties, within the context of the federal election, to commit to academic freedom, and we are organizing a Forum on Research, which will examine funding, as well as conditions for carrying out research and disseminating its results so as to identify courses of action that would require commitment from the provincial government.

Martin Maltais (SPPUQAR), will then present the work carried out by the Committee on University Funding, of which he is President. The Committee is mandated by the organized bodies that make up the FQPPU to compile the data that is at the basis of our analyses, that backs our views, and that orients our actions. He is supported by Michel Umbriaco (SPPTU), the Committee's Vice-President, and a team of researchers: Jules Racine, Simon Lafrance, and Nicolas Déplanche.

In the next section about recent events, Hans Poirier, professional researcher and part of the FQPPU's permanent staff along with Camille Gauthier, administrative assistant, and Marie-Claude Thomas, secretary and website attendant, recounts issues, debates, and resolutions that were passed during the Education International (EI) 7th World Congress, which was held in Ottawa in July 2015, and with which the FQPPU is affiliated. The event notably enabled us to denounce, with our partners through press releases and interviews, the Canadian government's offenses against the scientific community and unions, as well as the Quebec government's austerity measures, which undermine higher education networks.

It is rare for leaders to give us the facts about what is going on in universities; however, the Parliamentary Committee on Culture and Education provided such an opportunity. Martin Maltais, Nicolas Déplanche, and Emanuelle Maltais attended these hearings in August and provide us with their observations.

In addition, the federal election taking place on October 19th is an opportunity to challenge opposition parties to make commitments to funding and to research conditions. Hans Poirier summarizes the FQPPU's actions regarding this matter and announces actions that are planned for early fall.

The issue ends with a section on legal advice given by experts in labour relations within academia. Written by Mélanie Gagnon and Pierre Brun, an attorney, this first glimpse deals with union monopolies and their effects.

Do not forget to save the date for the FQPPU'S Forum on Research, which will be held on October 23, 2015 (see poster, p. 6). The most dynamic and critical stakeholders with regard to research in Quebec have been invited to the event. The program is available on our website: [fqppu.org](http://fqppu.org).

In solidarity,

Jean-Marie Lafortune

## From The Executive Committee

**Mélanie Gagnon, Vice-President**

Working Conditions for Professors and Union Issues



The collection and analysis of data from a research project on working conditions for professors has been completed, and a third brief report entitled "Research and Creation: Conducting Quality Research and Creating, or Overproducing?" will be launched by the Federal Council on October 22, 2015. The report, third in a series of four, demonstrates the passion that professors have for this essential component of their workload, but also discusses the spillover effects that accompany it and that require collective action.

With regard to union issues, a research project about the identity relationship between work, employment, and unionism for Quebec university professors is well underway. There have been more than 1000 respondents from FQPPU member associations and unions. In fall, the survey will also be sent to colleagues at Université Laval and Université de Montréal for a more complete picture. Some of the objectives of this research partnership are to identify the relationships between professors' work and employment and what they experience daily in the currently changing academic environment, to evaluate their level of commitment toward union action, and to understand their expectations regarding this action, while taking into account work and employment realities. Preliminary results will be presented to the Federal Council on February 11 and 12, 2016. A full report will follow.

Finally, in the aftermath of Acfas's *Journées de la relève en recherche*, aimed at valuing and supporting the next generation of researchers, a consultation entitled "*La recherche étudiante au Québec : accessibilité, excellence, rayonnement*" (student research in Quebec: access, excellence, outreach) will take place on September 24, 2015 at Université Laval. Guest speakers such as Claude Lessard, President of the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation (CSE), and Rémi Quirion, Chief Scientist of Quebec, will make the event a memorable one. I will take part in order to learn about the actions of the Quebec government with regard to assistance for future researchers, since assistance for established researchers who are university professors is decreasing.

**Sylvain Beaudry, Secretary-Treasurer**  
Pension Plans



The university pension plan bill was supposed to be introduced before the end of the parliamentary session in June, but ultimately it was not. We will follow up on this matter, which could see developments in the fall. After striking at municipal plans, in spring, the government, in parliamentary committee, worked on Bill 34, which addresses multi-employer pension plans, and indicated that universities would be next.

The Minister of Labour, Employment and Social Solidarity declared that the bill for the university sector would occur "in the wake of legislation passed for municipalities." Since then, an open-mindedness on the part of the government has given way to slightly more flexibility for pension plans. However, since the bill has not yet been introduced, we cannot analyze the real consequences of the new rules being proposed. The 2014 financial statements for university pension plans show very good returns, which effectively reduce actuarial deficiencies, since most university pension plans have a capitalization rate of around 100%. This data confirms that the university sector has no reason for concern (if we exclude Université Laval's pension plan) and that a bludgeon law is not necessary.

**Louis Demers, Councillor**  
Transformations in Academic Life



Generating new knowledge is a distinctive characteristic of university teaching. Conducting research is thus an essential component of the academic workload. However, research is increasingly evaluated in terms of productivity, reputation, and economic usefulness, which reduces critical thinking, as well as the number of intervention studies and

longitudinal studies. This prioritization of knowledge values articles published in journals with editorial review boards. Even more celebrated are colleagues who publish articles in journals with high impact factors (IF), despite “the absurdity of using the IF of a journal to evaluate researchers [...]” (Gingras, 2015, p. 8).

<http://revueinternationalepme.com/ojs/index.php/ripme/article/view/1040/632>

One of the clear effects of valuing research productivity is a dramatic increase in the number of co-authors for scientific articles. According to *Thomson Reuters Web of Science*, the number of articles with 50 or more co-authors exceeded 1400 in 2012, whereas there were less than 200 in 1990. Even more surprising is the fact that almost 200 articles were written by 1000 or more co-authors in 2014, while there were almost none in the early 1990s.

<http://www.wsj.com/articles/how-many-scientists-does-it-take-to-write-a-paper-apparently-thousands-1439169200>

We would hope that the increased number of co-authors is in part due to more fair recognition for graduate students. But is this really the case? A study, carried out by two researchers from the Georgia Institute of Technology, of 2300 lead authors of scientific articles in various disciplines, raises doubt about this issue. In 22% of cases, at least one graduate student who had participated in a research project was a “ghost” author. There was also a significant number of other people who were not credited as co-authors, since 55% of articles had at least one “ghost” author.

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/08/24/research-reveals-significant-share-scholarly-papers-have-guest-or-ghost-authors>

These trends are troubling since they legitimize and reinforce the production-oriented, instrumental concept of the university. Has the time not come for us to collectively examine the evaluation criteria that we want implemented in our field and our university? More broadly, we should collectively defend the concept of the university as a public service that recognizes that professors from all universities have a research role, while valuing access to higher education and the quality of students’ education.

**Denis Bélisle, Counsellor**  
ICT and the Academic Workload



The research component of our workload requires that we contribute to the exponential flow of scientific publications: more than 38 million since 1980, an average of 3400 per day.<sup>1</sup> Of course, you want your hard work to be added to the 2 million articles that will be published in 2015. But how to choose from among the multitude of journals (between 28 000 and 32 000)? There are also issues such as the formalities associated with submission, unnecessarily long response times, and peer review that is not always up to par. More than ever, online scientific publications seem to be an attractive solution, although publishing in them can be costly, since it often involves a fee of between \$200 and \$2000.

However, caution is required since unscrupulous entrepreneurs have realized that scientific publication is global market worth almost 10 million USD in 2012,<sup>2</sup> a market that is only lightly regulated. The result is as follows: you can now find open-access journals online with attractive websites, grandiose wording, very short review times, and panels of experts with piles of degrees; they are scams run by predators of the scientific publication world.

You pay the required fee and your article is posted online basically as is—you have now been “published.” The perverse effects on knowledge are dramatic: on one hand, completely valid, pertinent articles are relegated to electronic oblivion, as most publishers do not last long, and on the other hand, imposters who make up pseudo-science will find an audience and contaminate knowledge with nonsense.

A good name to remember is that of Jeffrey Beall,<sup>3</sup> a professor at University of Colorado, who has tracked and openly denounced fraudulent scientific publishers for a number of years. On his website, *Scholarly Open Access*,<sup>4</sup> you can find a list of publishers and journals to avoid; he has identified more than 1800.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://bit.ly/BornmannMutz>

<sup>2</sup> <http://bit.ly/STMreport2012>

<sup>3</sup> <http://bit.ly/JeffreyBeall>

<sup>4</sup> <http://scholarlyoa.com>

# *Committee on University Funding: A Reminder of Our Origins*

*Martin Maltais, CFU President*

In 2006, the FQPPU established a Committee on University Funding (CFU), one of many decisions of which it can be proud. The story begins with then-President Cécile Sabourin's conviction to commit to trying to better understand university funding.

Michel Umbriaco, professor at TÉLUQ, discussed with her areas that needed to be prioritized in order to regain control of the university agenda, so that professors, primary agents of academic life and primarily responsible for maintaining collegiality, could give themselves the tools needed to ensure their full participation in university administration.

At the time, there were many announcements about investing in universities, but very few faculty members saw anything materialize. It was thus decided to establish a committee that would examine university funding. Michel Umbriaco was given the mandate to preside over the committee.

## **The CFU: Birth of the Research Team**

I was sitting in my office at TÉLUQ, after having recently returned from a trip as a visiting scholar at University of London. My wife, a PhD student like me at Université Laval, had just given birth to our first child, Marie. I was beginning to find my research areas on universities somewhat risky, so I was looking at the "Place de l'Université du Québec" garden through my office window.

Michel Umbriaco came into my office and started talking to me about something very technical, which I do not remember anymore. I do remember however, that just before leaving my office (and it is important to know that at TÉLUQ, flesh-and-blood students are rare), he said: "If you know someone at Université Laval who is interested in university funding, tell him or her to contact me. I am working on a small research project."

I responded: "Well, what is it exactly?" (My heart skipped a beat).

Michel said: "Well, we need to find data, and a lot of people have it, compile it, read financial statements and funding rules: boring stuff. I enjoy it because I'm strange like that, but really, it's boring."

I said: "I know someone: me!"

"Ha, perfect," he said. "We don't have much money for it, but we do have 2000 bucks, full-time."

That is basically my memory of how things started. I prepared the first report. It was well received and I was asked to write more. Quickly, I became overwhelmed by my other contracts and started working with a friend, who I later found out did not share my strange interests, but it did not stop me from completing the second document.

Next, they asked me to begin to make a team. I first hired Mario Lavoie, who was impressively efficient when it came to processing data and to financial analysis. We spent our evenings and weekends together in a bubble that we shared with Michel Umbriaco. Together, we produced the first series of reports, and to present them to the Committee members, Michel had me meet him at the FQPPU offices in Montréal.

As a first-generation student, I felt a little bit like an impostor when I first sat down at the table. But very quickly, I had the impression that the others shared my aspirations, that I was at home and part of my community, and that what we were working on was essential for the FQPPU and for Quebec. This impression was no doubt a result of the energy emitted by the other members of the CFU.

At the time, the members were Régis Fortin of UQAR, Jacques Derome and Brendan Gillon of McGill, Alain Gamelin and Claude Genest of UQTR, Lucie Lamontagne and André Breton of UQAM, Louise Briand of UQO, Norman Ingram of Concordia, Cécile Sabourin, FQPPU President, and Michel Umbriaco of TÉLUQ. The group's energy was mobilizing.

We gradually began to collect the data needed for our analyses and to reconstruct the framework of inputs and outputs within the universities. Cécile and Michel began a tour of the universities to try to explain the "missing link" between what we were being told was entering the universities and the absence of certain "realities," which should have normally occurred as a result of increased funding. The tour was a tremendous amount of work and took over a year to complete. Several team members left and Jules Racine-St-Jacques and Simon Lafrance joined the team.

The first reports and first tour allowed us to draw an important conclusion: we needed a complete, clear understanding of the logic inherent to Quebec university funding to fully carry out our role within the system.



When Max Roy became President of the FQPPU in 2009, new orientations were introduced, but the CFU remained an important tool, particularly within the context of the Higher Education Summit.

Stronger ties between the CFU President and the FQPPU President, as well as tremendous support from the members of the Executive Committee, enabled the FQPPU not only to effectively promote a vision of the university, but also to share, with all of the actors, an understanding of the state of the Quebec university network, which to this day remains the only credible source on this matter.

Given the improvisation that the current Quebec government has demonstrated in funding universities and research, this year, the CFU should double its efforts.

The situation is getting worse: not only are universities being diverted from their mission, but they are also in the midst of a deterioration of working and learning conditions. A detailed examination of the current situation is required to turn the tide.

The looming “Iron Man” will be taken on by a small team supported by the Committee on University Funding of which I am the President, with the unwavering support of Michel Umbriaco, Vice-President.

The CFU is relying on the participation of Catherine Beaudry (APEP), Guy Bellemare (SPPUS), Louise Briand (SPUQO), Louis Demers (APPENAP), Alain Gamelin (SPPUQTR), Brendon Gillon and Joseph Varga (APBM-MAUT), François Godard and Charles Côté (SPUQAT), Mario Houde (SPUQ), Catherine Larouche (SPPUQAC), Geneviève Robichaud (CUFA), and Jean-Marie Lafortune (FQPPU President).

In the coming year, we will publish a report on the state of research in Quebec universities and updates with regard to operations and capital property.

Other projects are also in the works, which will provide new understandings of our universities, and we will be available to meet with you and discuss these matters.



# FORUM sur la recherche

Des représentants de la communauté universitaire, des milieux institutionnels et associatifs feront le point sur les tendances actuelles et débattront de pistes d'action.

- Financement
- Conditions de réalisation
- Diffusion des résultats

**DATE**  
**Vendredi 23 octobre 2015**  
*Inscription requise avant le 16 octobre*  
**Programme: [fqppu.org](http://fqppu.org)**

**LIEU**  
**Institut de tourisme et d'hôtellerie du Québec**  
3535, rue Saint-Denis, Montréal  
M Métro Sherbrooke

Fédération québécoise des professeures et professeurs d'université  
[info@fqppu.org](mailto:info@fqppu.org)  
Tél. 514 843-5953 / sans frais 1 888 843-5953

## Campaign Promoting Professors

Six video clips, broadcast on Canal Savoir, on our website, and on social media this fall, launched our campaign promoting the university professor occupation. Please send suggestions for potential candidates among your members to [hans.poirier@fqppu.org](mailto:hans.poirier@fqppu.org).



# Education International 7<sup>th</sup> World Congress

*Hans Poirier, Professional Researcher*

**A**n FQPPU delegation that included Jean-Marie Lafortune (President), Denis Bélisle (Councillor), Max Roy (former President) and Hans Poirier (Professional Researcher) took part in the Education International (EI) 7<sup>th</sup> World Congress held in Ottawa from July 19 to 26, 2015.

About 800 delegates and 400 observers from 260 labour organizations in 142 countries were in attendance. The mandate of EI, an organization with 32 million members, consists in protecting the interests of education workers at all levels, with regard to governments and major international organizations that have an influence on public policies regarding education, such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank.

Held every four years, EI congresses are an opportunity to adopt resolutions that orient mobilization and actions. Since the Congress took place in Ottawa, affiliated Canadian organizations—the Canadian Teachers' Federation (CTF), the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT), the Centrale des syndicats du Québec (CSQ), the Fédération nationale des enseignantes et enseignants du Québec (FNEEQ-CSN), the Fédération du personnel professionnel des universités (FPPU), and the FQPPU—played an important role in organizing this year's event.

## Post-2015 Goals

EI puts a lot of emphasis on its post-2015 goals, which are replacing the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). While some emphasize that progress has been made since 2000, EI's "Unite for Quality Education" campaign has asserted for two years that there is need for new governmental commitments to free access to quality education for all children at the primary and secondary levels.

Discussions about this issue should take shape on September 25, 26, and 27, 2015 in New York, where the United Nations summit will be held for the purpose of adopting a post-2015 development program.

Post-2015 Campaign: <http://bit.ly/1GgzjPY>

## Recognition of Issues Specific to Higher Education

Only a small group of EI members are higher education and research unions. Moreover, the representation of higher education unions on the EI Executive Board is minimal, or even non-existent. As a result, the organization places little emphasis on issues that are specific to academic life. In this context, the FQPPU delegation participated in the higher education caucus, which took place before the Congress began. The meeting was an opportunity to discuss the hazards associated with the brain drain, MOOCs, academic freedom, and international trade agreements, which include provisions that enable the privatization of public education systems.

As part of the Congress, Jean-Marie Lafortune spoke in favor of a resolution proposed by SNCS-FSU (France) and CAUT, entitled "Public research and scientific and academic freedoms," which was adopted by the Congress.

Public research and scientific and academic freedoms:  
<http://bit.ly/1KbW2Yr>

Stop TTIP, TISA, CETA, TPP and other similar trade and investment agreements: <http://bit.ly/1VUQV5R>

## Network of Francophone Unions in the North American and Caribbean Region

Our delegation was given the opportunity to participate in networking activities as part of a meeting of the Comité syndical francophone de l'éducation et de la formation (CSFEF), as well as of the North American and Caribbean Region.

The activity organized by the CSFEF provided us with an opportunity to reflect on the representation of francophone unions in EI, where the predominant language is English. While the CSFEF Board has been around for over 20 years, this was its first meeting with all of the francophone unions affiliated with EI.

The new CSFEF President, Florian Lascroux, delegate for the Syndicat national des enseignants de second degré (SNES-France), expressed the desire for francophone unions to have a bigger role within EI, and called for increased funding for such unions, so as to enhance the chances of having representatives from francophone African unions.

CSFEF website: <http://www.csfef.org>

In addition, the regional meeting provided an opportunity for candidates from North America and the Caribbean, who aspired to holding various positions

within IE, to share their visions and seek support. Two Canadian candidates were elected the next day: Dianne Woloschuk, of the CTF and Daniel B. Lafrenière, of the CSQ.

### Communication and Representation

Even though our organization does not have the same means and human resources as large labour unions, the FQPPU was very active both before and during the Congress with regard to communications. In addition to supplying our members with information about Congress activities on social media, two joint press releases were published with our involvement. The first, written in conjunction with CAUT, was aimed at attracting attention to the poor record of the current Canadian government with regard to research and science. Its dissemination resulted in a Radio-Canada International article and interview with Jean-Marie Lafortune. A second press release, jointly signed by the other Quebec organizations affiliated with EI—the FNEEQ-CSN, the CSQ, and the FPPU—focused on the effects of the Quebec government’s austerity policies on the university and college networks.

“Canada’s government gets an ‘F’ in science,” joint press release with CAUT: <http://fqppu.org/6524>

Radio-Canada International article and interview with J-M Lafortune, July 21, 2015: <http://bit.ly/1LctnYQ>

“Québec : Les mesures d’austérité minent les réseaux de l’enseignement supérieur,” (Quebec: austerity measures are undermining higher education networks), joint press release with the FNEEQ, the FPPU, and the CSQ: <http://bit.ly/1iJgDOg>

Finally, at the request of the affiliated Canadian organizations, the EI Executive Board published a declaration aimed at denouncing the passage of Bill C-377, which discriminates against labour unions by forcing them to publicly disclose their spending. See: <http://bit.ly/1G8baLz>

The following were among the resolutions that were passed:

- Privatisation and commercialisation in and of education: <http://bit.ly/1Qy7ByB>
- Trade union action to counteract neoliberal policies on education: <http://bit.ly/1KbWjdP>
- For language diversity <http://bit.ly/1MsuMqc>
- Fighting austerity to defend rights, status, jobs and salaries: <http://bit.ly/1GIWZaB>

## University Leaders Speak at Hearings for the 2015 Committee on Culture and Education: A Report

*Martin Maltais, Nicolas Déplanche, and Emanuelle Maltais*

Every three years, the Committee on Culture and Education calls on Quebec university leaders. These hearings are public and the FQPPU’s Committee on University Funding (CFU) takes part, both to collect and compile the data that has been submitted, and to listen to and interpret the messages the leaders are conveying to the parliamentarians.

From August 17 to 20, 2015, eleven universities participated in the hearings, which began in fall 2013, but when the election was called, it delayed their conclusion. A final day of hearings is scheduled for September 21, 2015, when leaders from École de technologie supérieure and Université Laval will appear.

Two types of information, which we will report on in this column, attracted attention during the presentations and the exchanges that the leaders had with the parliamentarians. The first type relates to recurring themes, partially because parliamentarians return to such themes, since whether university leaders are working together or not, they address the themes systematically, and there are often points of convergence.

The second type of information relates to the messages that leaders delivered to parliamentarians. Almost all of the leaders relayed a key message, and they sometimes relayed secondary messages as well.

### Parliamentary Committee Themes

All of the themes discussed in the parliamentary committee, especially those that recurred, were financial in nature.

Underfunding of universities was the first theme to be discussed. It had already been raised by university leaders before the first cutback phase in 2012, where we established that there was an immediate need for 249 million dollars (brief filed by the FQPPU following the Summit). Since then, the most striking response has come from Université du Québec, which highlighted the fact that cutbacks were in the range of 276 million



dollars, including the recent announcement for 2015–2016. The recurring shortfall would now be 525 million dollars. The situation is even more troubling, says UQ, since education is not as an expense, but a worthwhile investment: one dollar invested into university education yields a six-fold return.

The second theme was cutback impacts. They ranged from reduced number of professors, to attrition of professional and support staff positions, hiring and wage freezes, and a direct wage decrease at the Université du Québec head office.

Other effects were an increased administrative workload for all involved and a bigger teaching load for professors, as well as fewer course and program offerings. Finally, there was reduced staff motivation and more burnout, which increases insurance premiums.

The third theme was challenging the current funding formula, which is the Achilles' heel of universities. It ensures the distribution of the budget, which has been allocated politically by the government based on number of students, and is thus heavily criticized.

Many highlight the fact that in terms of capital property, the government does not fund universities according to its own standards (UQAC), and that the formula should be revised to take into account the specific situation of each university; weighting by discipline should also be reviewed (UQAR, Polytechnique).

Each university calls for its wealth of programs to be better funded. The UQ head office feels that it is useless to review the formula without reinvestment, since there will be losers. We are surprised that no university leader asked to return to a funding system that is based more on programs offered or on a more historical approach, in order to decrease the frantic competition for clients, which reduces the funding allocated for each student.

### **Messages Conveyed by University Leaders**

With regard to messages, there is some overlap, but each university had its own message. The UQ head office feels that the major challenge is to maintain the development of the graduation rate, at a level comparable to the rest of Canada and other developed countries. Polytechnique shares this sentiment, but for engineering only. The clearest messages are those of UQAC, Sherbrooke, UQAR, and UQAT. UQAC thinks that the government has public relations work to do to promote education.

Sherbrooke “demands a clear commitment from the government for a significant reinvestment into education, starting in 2016–2017,” pointing out that universities are at the end of their rope.

UQAR thinks that it is imperative to maintain its faculty, while UQAT purports to be unable to hire more faculty members. Bishop's hopes to focus on its liberal education model. While documents tabled by Bishop's discuss “the importance of university research,” the President asserts, in no uncertain terms, that there are no plans for development in that area, even though it is an essential part of its mission.

The issue of good governance is of major importance to UQTR, while TÉLUQ considers that a more tailored, flexible response that helps meet the needs of its faculty is the cornerstone of pursuing its growth.

With regard to secondary messages, there are more overlaps, which can be summarized as follows:

- Enrolment can continue to grow (there are still gains to be made and we have the resources to accomplish it; distance education and delocalized campuses can be used).
- The image of university leaders has been tarnished by the 2012 strike; some presidents are afraid to go out.
- Cutbacks have led to serious repercussions (reduced faculty, abolition of positions, anticipated decrease in enrolment, and significantly underfunded research).

We will continue to analyze the discussion and the transcript of the data that was tabled, but it must be understood that parliamentarians know very little about the university as an organization. They often see it as a business, or at best, as a type of top-level school, which they assume is managed in the same way.

Many of them do not understand the data tabled with the Committee, and it is crucial that senior administrative teams educate them by explaining the concept of the university and the work that is being accomplished.

The Committee proceedings are available on the National Assembly website, and you can take part in the next consultation in person or through live webcast on September 21, 2015.

# Federal Elections

## The FQPPU's Actions

Hans Poirier, Professional Researcher

**T**he FQPPU is not in the habit of being partisan and favouring one political party over another in its decisions, at both the provincial and federal levels. The reason is simple: not all professors who are members of the FQPPU have the same political loyalties, which is just as well. This diversity reinforces the credibility of our actions. Similarly, supporting one party is a double-edged sword; in the short term, it could breathe life into some of our claims, but it eliminates the neutrality we require to criticize public policy.

Some insist that the strength of the FQPPU lies in its documentation. It supports positions based on research and evidence. Its actions certainly concern the working conditions of its members, but first and foremost, it is concerned with protecting the university as a public institution, promoting public, non-oriented university research, and preserving academic freedom. However, the current government's record with science is less than stellar: abolishing of the long form of Statistics Canada's census; funding research that is oriented towards the needs of businesses at the expense of basic research; muzzling government scientists; closing a number of scientific libraries; closing laboratories and research centres focused on environmental issues; and cutting the jobs of over 4000 government scientists.

Over the past few years, there has been a consensus among scientists and a number of Canadian universities with regard to denouncing the disastrous effects of the Conservative Party's policies on their work. The FQPPU is no exception. It presented a brief to Industry Canada during the 2014 Science and Technology Consultation. When the federal budget was announced and during other events, it systematically, through press releases, criticized issues such as university research funding, orientation of such funding toward applied, marketable research, as well as political interference in the governance of federal granting agencies and programs such as the Canada First Research Excellence Fund.

In the context of the current election campaign, the FQPPU requested to hold meetings with representatives from each of the major opposition parties in order to secure clear commitments from them with regard to research funding, academic freedom, and re-establishing a mandatory long-form census.

In addition, the FQPPU has examined the platforms of the New Democratic Party (NDP) and the Liberal Party of Canada to better understand their main orientations regarding science and technology. Their ideas are similar: both parties have promised to put measures in place that would end muzzling of federal scientists. They also advocate the return of the mandatory long-form census, a valuable tool for researchers, civil society, and businesses. The Liberals hope to rebalance research funding so that basic research is once again valued. They also plan to invest in research on renewable energy. Finally, they hope to bring back the Chief Scientist position, which existed when Paul Martin was Prime Minister. The NDP recently introduced a bill to create a Parliamentary Science Officer position. The officer would provide Parliament with advice, but would also serve as a watchdog to ensure that public policies are supported by scientific data. The NDP has also introduced a bill about freedom of speech for federal scientists. The party hopes to continue its efforts in this regard and also hopes to invest more in order to support the indirect costs of research.

### To Learn More

Agence Science-Press (2015) Élections : des candidats qui parlent de science. (election: candidates who are talking about science). Émission Je vote pour la science, 8 septembre : <http://bit.ly/1Nk8H1d>

FQPPU and ACPPU (2015) Canada's government gets an 'F' in science (press release), July 21: <http://fqppu.org/6524>

FQPPU (2015) Budget 2015: The Conservateurs continue to hinder public research (press release), April 28: <http://bit.ly/1Rdo1fL>

FQPPU (2014) Mémoire de la FQPPU présenté à Industrie Canada dans le cadre de la consultation sur la science et la technologie (FQPPU brief presented to Industry Canada for the Science and Technology Consultation), 9 p. : <http://bit.ly/1QcF3tO>

FQPPU (2014) New program: Canada First Research Excellence Fund—More funding for economy-driven research (press release, December 8: <http://bit.ly/1ZGAajq>

FQPPU (2014) Que devient la recherche publique au Canada ? (What is happening to public research in Canada?), (press release), February 18: <http://bit.ly/1M6GmtB>

FQPPU (2014) Federal Consultation on Science and Technology: The future of science at risk in Canada (press release), FQPPU, January 17: <http://bit.ly/1Qy8tmT>

Turner, Chris (2013) *The War on Science*. Greystone Books, 176 p.

## Legal Advice

### Union Monopolies and Their Effects

**Mélanie Gagnon, Vice-President**

**Pierre Brun, Partner at Melançon, Marceau, Grenier et Sciortino**

As a member of the executive committee of your union, you may have had come across a professor negotiating specific working conditions, different from those in the collective agreement, directly with the university administration. Are these agreements, which fall outside the collective agreement, possible or valid? In such situations, how should the union act and what are the possible recourses? These questions are briefly answered here and are asked with an acute awareness of the fact that unions, in Quebec, have a monopoly on representation.

Certification, in the context of exclusive representation pursuant to the *Labour Code*, is important for a union that obtains it, since it at once becomes the one and only voice for the group of employees within the unit.

The main effect of union certification consists in forcing the employer to recognize the union, or in other words, its authority with regard to negotiating and implementing working conditions for its members. The union becomes the only authority to represent them, and this representation exclusivity is established in the *Labour Code*.

The result is that only the union, as the unique, exclusive voice of its members, has the authority to act in the name of the current and future employees included in the bargaining unit (without seeking assignment of receivables), including those who opt out of the union. This is the most significant effect of the monopoly on representation.

As a result of having a collective agreement, there can be no place for an individual employment contracts, nor any rights that would result from them. This position was made clear by the January 2006 decision of the taken the Supreme Court of Canada with regard to the Isadore Garon case (see box).

*Isidore Garon Itée v. Tremblay, 2006 SCC 2, decision rendered January 27, 2006 jointly with Fillion et Frères (1976) inc. v. Syndicat national des employés de garage du Québec inc., 2006 SCC 2, January 27, 2006.*

Furthermore, the monopoly on representation that certified unions have is an obstacle to all individual contract negotiations and to all agreements between employers and employees that directly or indirectly relate to working conditions in the collective agreement. The interpretation of the general process is that the collective agreement is monopolizing. Setting aside direct negotiations of individual working conditions with the employer, the monopoly on representation enables, and even forces, the union to act in lieu of employees.

In the late 1930s, a number of labour disputes took place in the province. Quebec's lawmakers, along with those in other Canadian jurisdictions, were inspired by the American model, commonly known by the name of the first act to have applied it, the famous 1935 *Wagner Act*. Interestingly, North American lawmakers did not implement the monopoly to hassle employees, but instead to simplify the process by identifying one contact for employers, in order to ensure the sustainability of the union and, above all, to safeguard the industrial peace needed for economic growth.

#### Main Points

- Individual negotiation of working conditions between a professor and the university administration is impossible because of union monopolies on representation.
- Unless they are endorsed by the union, such agreements are null and void.
- The union can thus file a grievance to challenge these agreements.
- The terms and conditions set out in these agreements can therefore be nullified in their entirety.
- The union can also file a union grievance to stop the employer from negotiating directly with professors in the future.
- The union can subsequently use these agreements as precedent for improving collective conditions during the collective bargaining process.