

Montreal, December 18, 2012

Dear colleagues,

On June 10, 2012, I sent you a [letter](#) describing new developments related to pay equity. As the holiday season approaches, I wanted to update you on our work related to both pay equity and pay scales.

First, let me address the issue of **pay equity**. In my June letter, I let you know that a reconciliation process had been created, with the goal of resolving some of the 7,000 complaints received by the *Commission de l'équité salariale* subsequent to the pay equity maintenance process in 2010. The complaint review process was scheduled to start in the fall, but unfortunately no meetings have yet been held. It appears that the *Commission* was hoping to resolve the complaints filed in 2007-2008; but as this has not yet happened, it has delayed the start date for reviewing the complaints filed in 2010. While we understand the decision to first resolve the complaints from 2007-2008, we also feel that this has caused unacceptable delays. We are doing all that we can from the political standpoint, advocating both to the *Centrale* and the *Commission* so that work can begin as soon as possible after the holidays.

It is also important to note that in light of its experiences with pay equity maintenance in 2010, the Treasury Board decided to collaborate with unions for the pay equity maintenance process in 2015. In 2010, the Treasury Board decided that, as allowed by law, it would simply maintain pay equity, without collaborating with unions. This resulted in more than 7,000 complaints; meetings have already been held to set a framework for the pay equity maintenance process in 2015. We strongly hope that this issue will be resolved between now and the next round of negotiations so that the government will not confuse "*pay equity*" with "*salary increases*".

Concerning the **pay scale** issue, we have some developments to report. Unlike pay equity, which aims to give the same pay to predominantly female and male job categories that are considered to be equivalent, pay scales aim to assign the same salary to all jobs that are considered to be equivalent, regardless their predominant gender. While these two processes have different objectives, the same methods can be used for both of them.

No law requires employers to have a pay scale process, and no law specifies the methods for creating pay scales. Normally, the pay scale process starts with a negotiated agreement between employers and unions. In the education, health and social services sectors, the various parties have negotiated an agreement on the pay scale creation process. The letter of agreement was signed on January 24, 2011. Let us be clear: the terms of the pay scale process will be negotiated by the parties, as will the results of the process. In addition, before the CSQ enters into any agreement, it will consult with the appropriate entities.

And so, the work of evaluating "neutral" jobs (those with no predominant gender), began this fall. For us, this concerns Education Consultants, Spiritual Care and Guidance and Community Involvement Animators, Architects, Student Life Animators and Specialists in Teaching Methods and Techniques.

For two of these employment groups—Spiritual Care and Guidance and Community Involvement Animators, and Architects—surveys should be completed after the holidays. The Architect job category did not exist in 2001, so it must be surveyed. The FPPE has strongly encouraged a new survey of the Spiritual Care and Guidance and Community

Involvement Animator job category, because it had just been created in 2001. At that time, the survey respondents were pastoral animators. In the end, the Treasury Board acquiesced; approximately 20 surveys will be conducted.

Despite our advocacy efforts, the Treasury Board refused to conduct new studies for the other three job categories. Assisted by representatives from the Federations in question, the CSQ evaluated these jobs itself. There are still some adjustments to be made; the next step will be to have other union organizations approve the evaluation's results. We will then compare our results with those gathered by employers.

We are following these issues closely, and we are particularly concerned about the classification of Education Consultants. As I mentioned in my June letter, employers used an unofficial document to classify Education Consultants at step 23. But despite our efforts, employers still refuse to make that classification official, forcing us to evaluate this job category ourselves. We are tracking that evaluation's results very closely, and we have done everything possible from the political standpoint so that we can have the proper context for these job category classification challenges.

Undoubtedly, the pay scale process will be a lengthy one, and may have repercussions for many of our job categories. At the same time, we must remember that in April, 2011, the *Conseil général de négociation* authorized the CSQ to refuse to decrease or freeze salaries for any job categories. Rest assured that the FPPE will be there at every step of the process to make sure that this decision is upheld, and to protect the pay classifications for our job categories. If you have questions related to the pay scale process, please visit:

<http://www.csq.gc.net/equite-salariale/relativites-salariales-foire-aux-questions.html>

In closing, I would like to clarify that although pay equity complaints and the pay scale process are two different things, there is a clear relationship between the conciliation gains that will be achieved for some job categories and future pay scale negotiations. For example, if we can make use of the pay equity complaint review process to have Education Consultants recognized as a predominantly female category, we may be able to retroactively classify them at step 23 during the maintenance process. In addition, the *Commission* may decide to conduct new surveys, but that would remove this group from the pay equity issue.

As you can see, these two complex issues are related. Rest assured that we will remain as vigilant as possible in order to defend the interests of our members who are affected by one or both of these issues.

I also wish all of you a very happy holiday season!

Best regards,



Johanne Pomerleau,
FPPE President