

# LA PASSERELLE

## In this issue

### PAGE 1

[Editorial](#)

### PAGE 2

[Change to funding for  
special needs students](#)

### PAGE 3

[Maintenance of the  
2010 pay equity](#)

### PAGE 4

[The Rights of Students  
With Special Needs](#)

### PAGE 5

[Education consultants:  
The state of affairs](#)

Suggestion de lecture

### PAGE 6

[Material Resource Profes-  
sionals](#)

## EDITORIAL



Johanne Pomerleau,  
President FPPE(CSQ)

**Vacation time is right around the corner and no matter what we do for a living, we all try to wrap up pending matters before we leave.**

I sincerely hoped to be able to announce the successful closure of many of the cases we've been work-

ing on for a long time; I specifically wished to settle the education consultant ranking issue and the complaints regarding the 2010 pay equity maintenance plan. It didn't seem unrealistic to think these cases could be settled in 2017–2018! Unfortunately, it hasn't happened yet, and I'll be leaving on vacation without any news—good or bad—to announce. It wasn't for lack of trying! Unfortunately, these two cases have one thing in common: our counterparts are the people in charge of job assessment at the Conseil du trésor, and getting them to move is quite an undertaking! The summer vacation will give us the chance to recharge our batteries so we can continue these battles and quickly arrive at a settlement that will satisfy as many of us as possible. When I joined the FPPE in 2009, I knew certain qualities were important to work as an executive in a

federation. But I didn't know just how much patience it would take and how mine would be put to the test!

So I wish us all an excellent vacation ... and patience! We will make sure our professions are recognized for their true worth!

## *Have a great vacation!*

Get a quote  
and Save.



 thePersonal

## CHANGES MADE TO FUNDING FOR SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS A DISAPPOINTMENT

For several years, following a survey conducted among affected members, the FPPE has been asking for the validation step to be eliminated. Last year, the government announced it would be changing the funding method, and thus the validation process, and stated that 2017–2018 would be an interim stage as we move toward a radical change in funding. Its aim was to accelerate payments, increase their predictability and stability, and reduce the administrative load for the affected personnel so they could offer more direct services to students. We applauded this announcement and decided to wait and see if the last objective was going to be reached before celebrating. And then, as you read in the [March Passerelle](#), we observed some problems and denounced them along with contradictory instructions.

The unions were consulted this spring on the changes to the budget rules and, specifically, the deep changes affecting the funding of disabled students (H) and students with severe behaviour disorders (TGC). The changes affect two areas:

- ⇒ Finances
- ⇒ Quality assurance (which replaces validation as it was known until 2016–2017).

### Finances

Starting in 2018–2019, the budget envelope for the basic allocation of educational services will be changed to include all students, including H and TGC students. All students will thus be considered “regular.” Added to this basic allocation will be a distinct envelope for disabled students and students with severe behaviour disorders, which will be divided into four sub-envelopes:

	Code 33 and 34 (1 teacher per 10 students)	Other (1 teacher per 6 students)
Preschool and elementary	X	X
High school	X	X

For each of the four envelopes, the starting amount will be calculated based on the final certification for 2016–2017 (the number of declared and recognized H and TGC students), to which will be added an average annual rate of change of the number of students calculated over the period from 2013–2014 to 2016–2017. There will be a protection mechanism against a decrease in declared students and a maximum difference at the average rate.

Afterwards, the average variation rate (specific to each school board) will be projected over three years by adding to it the relevant indexation factors. Each school board will thus know the precise amount it will receive for the next three years. As such, this new method of funding is not directly related to the validation process and should improve school organization.

### Quality assurance

The funding process described above was adopted as part of the new budget rules. Regarding quality assurance, the content below is what was submitted at the consultation and it is all we have on the subject at this time. It has not yet been approved by the minister, and changes are still possible, which we would be pleased to see.

Up until 2016–2017, funding was directly related to validation. Now, the verification process, as the ministry is calling it, will only verify code compliance based on the following three criteria: diagnosis, limitations and services. Sample audits could be done of any declared student's case (H or TGC) until September 30, even if the case was declared several years prior. The ratings were grouped into five pools and the sample percentage varies depending on the pool.

Pool A		Pool B		Pool C		Pool D		Pool E	
Code	# Students	Code	# Students	Code	# Students	Code	# Students	Code	# Students
23	405	50	16707	34	10846	53	4133	14	964
24	2153							36	1420
42	554							99	1219
44	1381								
33	6789								
Total in Pool	11,282		16707		10846		4133		3603
Sample	1.5 %		2.1%		2.1%		2.1%		4.6%

**Continued from page 2 Quality assurance**

The ministry wants to have a sample of at least 20 cases per school board, with a maximum of 100. According to its calculations, it estimates it will be verifying about 1600 cases instead of validating 8500.

Now, for each new student declared to have a disability or a severe behaviour disorder, a brief sheet to open the file must be filled out any time during the year. However, on this new sheet, it specifies that case summaries, report summaries, and evaluation reports that determine the student's situation must be attached. The same statement was used on the long validation sheet. This means professionals must have finalized the report and collected all the complementary reports to attach to the opening file sheet.

In November, the school boards will be notified of the case samples that were retained for verification. These cases must be sent to the ministry in early February and include the following:

1. The diagnostic assessment that led to the declaration
2. An updated description of the educational disabilities and limitations
3. Updated information of the services in place
4. The latest intervention plan

The long validation sheet was only changed to avoid having to rewrite information found elsewhere. Professionals will simply be able to write "See report X on page Y."

Once the committee finishes the verification, it will give the school board its feedback, and if the number of non-compliant cases is particularly high, the sample size might be increased.

We were very disappointed to learn about this new process. It's quite clear that having to provide all the documents at the time of declaration means there is no hope of lightening the administrative burden associated with client validation (or verification). Further, we expect there will be issues with confidentiality. I invite you to read the [notice](#) sent to the ministry during the consultation that explains the issues, our position, and our recommendations.

As mentioned earlier, there may still be changes to the process since the final version is not yet available. We can still hope that our recommendations will be taken into account and that we will be able to reduce the number of administrative tasks required for verification.

I also invite you to read the [CSQ notice](#) on the budget rules that we contributed to, which covers the issue more broadly.

Johanne Pomerleau,  
President FPPE (CSQ)

## MAINTENANCE OF THE 2010 PAY EQUITY

In early March, we learned that the government was working to quickly settle grievances from 2010 under the pay equity maintenance plan following the conciliation. This was excellent news. In the March *Passerelle*, we mentioned this and hoped that this time it would be successful. At the same time, the Commission notified us that its inquiries were beginning and that it had called the organizations to a first meeting to explain the process. Of course, from the start of our efforts to have our grievances investigated, we hoped the situation would be quickly settled following the conciliation. Unfortunately, that isn't the case. Several meetings were needed to first establish the process and context for the discussions so that the Conseil du trésor could eliminate any risk of the unions or individuals taking legal action against it after a settlement. We're still hopeful for a tentative agreement since meetings are still taking place.

Regarding the inquiries, the Commission de l'équité salariale requested our arguments behind the grievances of dominance and job classes (grievances intended to create, merge, or separate categories). In 2010, the FPPE did not file any grievance on categories, but we did have two grievances about dominance for education consultants and guidance counsellors.

In the fall, we will also be submitting our arguments regarding job evaluations for which we have grievances. We are preparing them based on what was already presented to the Conseil du trésor during the conciliation.

If the discussions following the conciliation stall and we have to wait until after the Commission's inquiries to hear the decision, it will take several months. The Commission has informed us that it will only be making one decision after seeing all the complaints.

# THE RIGHTS OF STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

From 2001 to 2016, the Commission des droits de la personne et des droits de la jeunesse (CDPDJ) led a groundbreaking study on the evolution of educational conditions for special needs students based on administrative data collected by the Ministère de l'Éducation et de l'Enseignement supérieur and the school boards. It also recorded testimonials from 150 people, including school board staff members, parents, and student ombudspersons.

The CDPDJ aimed to build an overall picture of how well special needs students are being integrated into schools in Quebec's public school network and to assess whether the services offered to these students foster their success and lead to greater respect of their right to equal access to free public education.

## General observations

"Twenty years after provisions for special needs students were adopted in the *Education Act* and the *Politique de l'adaptation scolaire*, Quebec is still not able to guarantee adapted services for all special needs students."

- ◆ **Several educational sectors and services lack the resources** needed to make the necessary adjustments for these students, including in the areas of vocational education, adult education, daycare services, etc.
- ◆ **Individualized assessments are not being done correctly in many establishments.** Consequently, special needs students are not receiving services that truly meet their needs and that enable them to reach their full potential.
- ◆ **Specialized personnel are working mainly in diagnostic assessment**, which is required to receive funding for special student services. Yet that leaves little time for them to work directly with students, set up adaptation measures for them, and support teachers.
- ◆ **Many educational programs are inaccessible to students with disabilities** due to a lack of resources (vocational education, adult education, etc.) or to selective admission criteria, as is the case for special educational programs like international schools, sports- or arts-centred programs, etc.

Sophie Massé,  
Vice-president

## Recommendations

The CDPDJ made several recommendations, including the following that directly concerns our services:

"THE COMMISSION recommends that every school board define a basic level of services to meet the needs of the special needs students in their establishments, and that is, for every type of educational program it offers. To do so, the Commission recommends that the Ministère de l'Éducation et de l'Enseignement supérieur make sure the defined baseline will enable the school boards to fulfill their obligation to provide adapted educational services to students with special needs based on their needs and abilities, and that it accordingly allocate the necessary resources to accomplish this to the school boards."

### The CSQ's reaction:

The federations involved in the school network that welcomed the recommendations produced a press release when the report was published.

<http://www.fppe.ca/blog/constats-alarmants-pour-les-eleves-en-difficulte/>

### More information on the study

- ◆ Study: [www.cdpedj.qc.ca/Publications/etude\\_inclusion\\_EHDAA.pdf](http://www.cdpedj.qc.ca/Publications/etude_inclusion_EHDAA.pdf)
- ◆ Summary: [www.cdpedj.qc.ca/Publications/etude\\_inclusion\\_EHDAA\\_synthese.pdf](http://www.cdpedj.qc.ca/Publications/etude_inclusion_EHDAA_synthese.pdf)
- ◆ Web page on the rights of special needs students: [www.cdpedj.qc.ca/fr/droits-de-la-personne/EHDAA](http://www.cdpedj.qc.ca/fr/droits-de-la-personne/EHDAA)



## EDUCATION CONSULTANTS: THE STATE OF AFFAIRS

After negotiations ended in 2015, two committees were created to address the education consultant issue:

The **monitoring committee**, whose goals are to ensure the new pay structure is seamlessly integrated in April 2019 and to try to reach an agreement on settling the five mixed job classes, including that of education consultants, which is the only group in education without an agreement.

The **attraction-retention committee**, whose goal is to examine the education consultants' situation regarding attraction and retention of this job class as it relates to the teacher job class.

Now at the end of 2017–2018, we have come to a road-block. Despite all the technical and political presentations, the Conseil du trésor will not budge. We are currently putting significant pressure on the CSQ so that management finally acknowledges the problem and stops shrugging off our arguments and demonstrations. It is crucial that they start looking for a solution.

As the FPPE, we are continuing to urge the MEES and the Fédération des commissions scolaires to also take steps with the Conseil du trésor. The education consultants' talks with commissioners from several school boards are helping us increase pressure so we can reach a settlement and fair recognition of this job class.

This case will remain open as long as we have not obtained a settlement in favour of these professionals.

I can't talk about education consultants without mentioning the CAQ's platform to enhance the value of the teaching profession. Many of you have read about their idea to eliminate the education consultant job class and to replace it with emeritus or expert teachers who maintain their teaching status. The FPPE wrote a [press release](#) vehemently opposing the idea and contacted Jean-François Roberge, the CAQ's education spokesperson. We explained our position and presented our arguments. We will keep a close eye on this issue if the CAQ is elected in October 2018 so as to keep it from materializing.

Johanne Pomerleau,  
President FPPE(CSQ)

## SUGGESTION DE LECTURE



Francis Lagacé  
**Ce billet a cours légal**  
Chroniques sociales, politiques et d'humeur  
Préface de François Saillant



### Ce billet a cours légal

By Francis Lagacé

Alternately, university teacher, linguist, author, publisher, syndicalist and social activist.

In this collection, Francis Lagacé offers updated, revised and

contextualized notes that were originally published on his site. They are inspired by current topics, moods and political philosophical or artistic encounters.

. His offbeat and critical personal view of the highlighted facts concerns issues of political beliefs as well as cinematographic criticism through all social jokes and reflections.

Social justice and humanism are the red threads of this colorful quilt. He has the look of the one looking for the eel under the rock, the filigree, the frame, the forgotten corner, the organizer scheme.

Seriousness and rigor are punctuated by touches of humor or fantasy: a critical conceptualization without a smile or a laugh is a very sad abstraction.



## MATERIAL RESOURCE PROFESSIONALS

# INVALUABLE EXPERTISE FOR THE SCHOOL BOARDS

**In Québec, we seem to have spent years turning a blind eye to the deterioration of school infrastructures, to the point where 50 percent of all schools are in disrepair today. Recently, the government has been looking to correct the situation through financial investments for school infrastructures.**

At the FPPE conference, the education professionals adopted a recommendation to promote the role and importance of professionals who work to preserve school board properties. The FPPE, which represents the architects and engineers working for the school boards, surveyed its members on the issue and published a report highlighting the expertise of ma-

**According to the ministry's data, in 2016–2017, 20.11 architects (FTE—full-time equivalent) and 65.82 engineers held positions in school boards (FTE). Only 17 school boards benefit from such expertise.**

terial resource professionals.

With Lab-école and the Schola project, it is time to develop a vision for the future of schools based on the link between the environment and educational success. Tomorrow's schools must be built with a view to sustainable development and a smaller environmental footprint. They must offer welcoming and varied outdoor spaces that are in harmony with nature. Indoor spaces must be comfortable, bright, colourful, functional, and adaptable to the diverse needs of students, including those with disabilities, and staff members. They must also accommodate the diversity of new teaching methods and facilitate digital integration.

The FPPE believes that work of this magnitude cannot be done successfully without substantially more architects and engineers working for the

school boards. Their expertise enables school boards to lead their own projects, meet the actual needs of their communities, ensure the quality of their projects, and closely monitor the schedule and budget. This results in better use of public investments.

Unfortunately, it is clear that for several years, attracting and retaining experts has posed a major challenge to school boards, as jobs in Québec's public sectors offer architects and engineers—who are also sought after in the private sector—more attractive conditions. The attraction and retention issue, which has grown worse over the past several years, demonstrates the urgent need to act. In its action plan, the FPPE will reach out to the MEES and the Conseil du Trésor regarding this matter.

[To read the report](#)

**Marie-Eve Quirion,  
Action professionnelle Consultant  
FPPE(CSQ)**

