

MINUTES OF THE BRITISH COLUMBIA HISTORY ARTICULATION MEETING

HELD AT CAMOSUN COLLEGE, VICTORIA, 22 OCTOBER 1982

PRESENT: Rob Taylor and Dickson Falconer, Camosun; Robert Campbell, Capilano; Andrew Yarmie, Cariboo; Jackie Gresko, Douglas; Bob Smith, Fraser Valley; Helen Brown and Clarence Karr, Malaspina; Gerry Sylvester and Clarence Bolt, New Caledonia; Thomas Ralston, North Island; Curtis Nordman, Northern Lights; W. Rodney, Royal Roads; Bill Sloan, Selkirk; Allan Seager, Simon Fraser; Bob McDonald, U.B.C.; Jim Hendrickson, U. Victoria; and Morag MacLachlan, Vancouver Community College. Don Couch, Executive Director of the Academic Council, addressed the group in the afternoon.

Morag MacLachlan, Chairman  
Bob McDonald, Secretary

---

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.
2. AGENDA: MOVED That the agenda proposed by the chairman be accepted.  
SECONDED  
CARRIED

3. MINUTES OF THE 18 JUNE 1982 MEETING:

MOVED That the minutes be adopted as circulated.  
SECONDED  
CARRIED

4. TRAVEL TO ARTICULATION MEETINGS:

M. MacLachlan asked a spokesman from each of the institutions represented at the meeting to comment on the availability of travel money for attending articulation meetings. While most members indicated that money had been made available for the present gathering, several asserted that money was tight at their institutions. The New Caledonia representatives pointed out that finding travel money was a real problem. On this matter, Peter Weber of Northwest College had indicated to the chairman, by correspondence, that one-day meetings in the south were too expensive for representatives of his institution to be able to attend. Curtis Nordman agreed that travel costs from northern colleges were very high. But in addition, he said he felt that Northern Lights College did not fully understand the role of articulation meetings and their value to college instructors. The meetings were essential for teachers to articulate courses, to make contact with the province's universities, and to see how others in the college system were coping with problems common to all of them. The discussion ended with the introduction of the following motion:

MOVED That, while representatives at the moment did not  
SECONDED face major problems in finding money to attend one  
articulation meeting per year, they wished to express  
their increasing concern about the availability of  
travel funds in the future.

CARRIED

5. THE NATURE AND ROLE OF ARTICULATION MEETING AGENDAS:

During the discussion about travel money, Gerry Sylvester raised the issue of Articulation Meeting agendas. He noted that 75 percent of the requests at New Caledonia College had been refused. The administration required that it receive the minutes of articulation meetings and a report from representatives who had attended the sessions. In addition, agendas were to be examined before funds could be made available. Thus it was important, he said, that agenda items be clearly defined. Jim Hendrickson responded by suggesting that our committee should make available before meetings an agenda that was precise and comprehensive. The chairman indicated that the agenda for the present meeting was tentative because she had been waiting for feedback from college people themselves and because she was concerned about whether the core curriculum and Open Learning Institute issues should be raised. The question of whether our agenda should focus explicitly on articulation issues was then introduced. When one member suggested that we should make our agenda highlight articulation issues, Bob Smith replied that, as long as he could remember, we had always discussed other issues, such as library concerns, in addition to articulation matters. The chairman mentioned that Don Couch of the Academic Council had not expressed reservations about committee members going beyond articulation concerns to discuss other teaching-related problems of mutual concern to college instructors. Gerry Sylvester reiterated the point that, in his view, the first agenda item should reflect articulation issues, because otherwise the agenda could be rejected in some of the colleges. However, he endorsed the idea that professional concerns other than transfer were a legitimate concern of the group. This last sentiment was widely shared among the members. Clarence Karr said that contact with others in the field was especially important for those in one-member departments. It was also important that members maintain continuity of contact. Bob Smith stated that articulation meetings were the only time when instructors could find out about courses being offered in other institutions and could evaluate their own programs in the context of what other colleges were offering. Jim Hendrickson noted that, while transfer credit problems remained of concern to the group, the concept of articulation may have evolved since the time when this was almost the only concern of committee members. It was important that college and university instructors have a means of talking to one another. Robert Campbell and William Rodney endorsed the comment that an interchange of ideas among instructors was important: communication was thus one of the important functions of the articulation meetings. No formal motion was introduced, the meeting revealing a general consensus on the role of articulation meetings.

6. ENROLLMENTS:

The chairman polled members about fall enrollments in college and university history programs. The results were:

- a) Camosun - increasing at college level; history even.
- b) Capilano - overflowing.
- c) Cariboo - big increase.
- d) New Caledonia - 30 percent increase in Arts and 50 percent increase in history.
- e) Douglas - history program now operating at 109 percent of capacity versus 82 percent in spring of 1982 and 77 percent in spring of 1981.
- f) Fraser Valley - up.
- g) North Island - overall increase but history level.

*Malaysian*

- h) Northern Lights - overall enrollments up' history double.
- i) Royal Roads - enrollment fixed.
- j) Selkirk - overall 15 percent increase history up at Notre Dame.
- k) Simon Fraser - overall increase.
- l) U.B.C. - lower level history courses are up 27 percent upper levels have increased by 15 percent.
- m) U. Victoria - university increase of 10 percent upper level history has increased by 5 percent.
- n) Vancouver Community College - every history space was taken, and overall the college, built to accommodate 3800 students, has 5800.

7) OPEN LEARNING INSTITUTE (OLI):

The chairman then turned to an issue raised at the Fort St. John meeting in June, concern about the lack of coordination between the Open Learning Institute and the colleges. She noted that Don Couch has expressed some concern about OLI. In addition, said M. MacLachlan, we know that OLI has been running some courses in opposition to college history courses. A general discussion about the relationship of OLI and other B.C. post-secondary institutions offering history courses ensued. A poll of the members attending the meeting about their difficulties with OLI revealed that college instructors had few specific complaints about Open Learning Institute courses. At the same time, however, almost all who were present expressed concern about the quality of OLI's program and about potential overlapping in the future of OLI and college courses. Lack of knowledge about OLI was leading to paranoia among college instructors. The meeting felt that better coordination was needed. Jackie Gresko cited the case of students taking the first half of their Canadian history program at Douglas College and the second half from OLI. Here was a concrete case where more coordination was needed. Several members suggested ways to improve communication between OLI and other institutions. Thomas Ralston mentioned that there was no reason why OLI students could not come to see instructors in the colleges, but noted that OLI never has co-operated with the colleges. Contact at the teaching level would help provide cooperation. Two other members expressed reservations about how practical this suggestion was, noting that work done for OLI by college instructors would have to be closely monitored to keep track of funding and that such extra work done by college instructors might violate their contracts. Gerry Sylvester suggested that the Post-Secondary Co-ordinating Committee be revived to act as a liaison between the colleges and OLI. W. Rodney replied that, in his view, our message to OLI should be made clear by this body and not be channelled through an intermediary group. Bob Smith also asserted that we have professional interests involving OLI that can only be expressed at our meetings. Clarence Karr strongly urged that the Open Learning Institute be represented at our Articulation meetings, and after some discussion of what form this representation might take the following motion was introduced:

**MOVED** In order to effect understanding and co-ordination  
**SECONDED** between the Open Learning Institute and the History  
Articulation Committee, we think it would be appropriate  
that OLI send a history representative to our meetings  
on a regular basis.

**CARRIED** (one dissenting vote was cast)

8) CORE CURRICULUM:

M. MacLachlan then turned to another issue discussed at the June meeting, that of the 'core' curriculum. Reporting on a recent appearance at VCC by Grant Fisher of the Department of Education, she said that Fisher indicated a rewritten report would incorporate the principle of a core curriculum, though the exact mechanism would have to be worked out later. He implied that the core could vary between different institutions. Clarence Karr spoke first, indicating that he had had second thoughts about our earlier discussion at Fort St. John. He would like to add the phrase "should it be adopted" to the motion passed in June "that articulation committees have input into the definition and implementation of the core concept". Curtis Nordman asked if any steps were afoot in the universities to make history a requirement at the first year level. The university representatives indicated that no such move had been initiated. Jim Hendrickson stated that no judgements about the core idea had been made at Fort St. John. It was possible that a core program might work to the advantage of a particular place. But he felt that it would probably be hopeless to get the universities to accept the idea of mandatory history courses at the first year level. Morag MacLachlan wondered if a core would in fact narrow the focus of existing programs. Many institutions had a core of history courses now, centring around European, Canadian, and local history offerings. In the smaller colleges a core program might not require that any courses be cut. To Andrew Yarnie's question about whether the "core" was to be defined by discipline or by college, the chairman replied that it would be by college. Bob Smith commented that the report outlining the core concept seemed vacuous, telling us little more than the obvious (such as the fact that there are cutbacks).

The discussion then turned to the extent of history offerings in the colleges and the relationship between the programs offered by history and other disciplines. The issue was raised by the chairman's comment that the Academic Council seemed concerned about the large number of courses being offered at the college level. Bob Smith responded that some time ago a report had spoken of the proliferation of courses, but in fact this was mistaken. In reality many were not given, and not all were given at the same time. Bill Sloan and Jackie Gresko also noted that college calendars had to deal with three different universities. Every course is not given every year. When Bill Sloan remarked that rationalization was already under way at Selkirk, with philosophy, anthropology, and political science having been cut, several other members responded by strongly defending the retention of a broad range of Arts and Social Science offerings in the colleges. Clarence Karr stated that we must keep our scope wider. Too much rationalization will affect history by making the college program as a whole less attractive. Bill Sloan cited a specific case: by cutting a Doukhobor folklore course in Anthropology, Selkirk College had made the whole program less attractive. Helen Brown agreed that a core that omitted Anthropology and other disciplines would affect history. To think only of history misdirects our concern. She noted that at Malaspina she and Clarence Karr had fought hard to keep Political Science and were now concerned about Anthropology.

The chairman concluded this discussion by stating that we needed more information on the subject of the core curriculum.

9) MEMBERSHIP ON THE ARTICULATION COMMITTEE:

After a brief discussion of the principles that governed eligibility to sit on the History Articulation Committee and to attend its meetings, the following motion was introduced:

MOVED That this body declare its desire that institutions  
SECONDED send as their delegates people who are teaching history.

CARRIED (two members abstained from voting)

10) NUMBER OF MEETINGS PER YEAR:

The committee reasserted its earlier commitment to two meetings of the History Articulation Committee per year. However, it agreed to honour the request that, in the short term, no additional meetings be held before March 31, 1983.

11) SPRING MEETING 1983:

MOVED That the spring meeting of the History Articulation  
SECONDED Committee be held at U.B.C. in conjunction with the Learned. A specific date for the Articulation meeting between June 5 and 8 will be determined later.

CARRIED

12) NOMINATIONS FOR NEXT YEAR'S EXECUTIVE:

MOVED That Bob McDonald be nominated as chairman of  
SECONDED the History Articulation Committee for 1983.

ELECTED - (unanimously)

MOVED That Clarence Bolt be nominated as secretary of  
SECONDED the History Articulation Committee for 1983.

ELECTED (unanimously)

13) The meeting broke off for lunch between 1:00 and 2:00 p.m.

14) Address by Don Couch, Executive Director of the Academic Council.

At 2:00 p.m. Don Couch addressed the Committee and fielded questions from its members.

A) College Offerings

Mr Couch first commented that he was not so much "shocked" by the number of courses now being offered by the colleges, as was stated in the minutes of the Fort St. John meeting, as "concerned" about the issue. On a couple of occasions Academic Council had reviewed the transfer guides, finding that about 7000 combinations of college-to-university transfers were possible. Researchers found that the number of courses being offered was increasing regularly and at a rate exceeding that of enrollment (over three years the number of History courses

had gone up 20 percent but the number of students by only 9 percent). The reason was that most colleges left courses on the books even if they were no longer given. The number of courses listed was, he admitted, a bit misleading. But they did raise concern about whether a plan or pattern existed for course offerings. Jackie Gresko asked whether Mr. Couch had taken into consideration the fact that the colleges must prepare students for three different universities, citing as an example the fact that S.F.U. requires five fields. She also noted that while Douglas College had 20 history courses on the books, 15 had been given in the past two years. Both Jackie Gresko and Bill Sloan asserted that the number of courses offered was being limited by a drop in the number of faculty employed to teach them. Don Couch responded that Academic Council's concern was not the number of courses offered per se but the escalating rate of increase of those on the books. He also asked if there was a time limit for those courses already listed by the colleges. Jim Hendrickson commented that at U. Vic., students were required to take a specific number of units (6) in lower level courses but were not required to take specific courses. Morag stated that at VCC students did not have to take a basic course before others followed, but Clarence Karr responded that Malaspina does have prerequisites; methodology was taught at the first year level. Don Couch, responding to another comment in the previous minutes, said that what the Academic Council was concerned about was less what was essential and more what is current. Jim Hendrickson concluded this part of the discussion by suggesting that perhaps we should update our calendars. One member, in a whispered aside, commented that this might be like opening "Pandora's Box".

B) Core Curriculum

In response to the chairman's query about the idea of a "core" curriculum, Mr. Couch said that he probably couldn't be very helpful. Academic Council had reviewed second year offerings and in that review had suggested a core program. Roland Grant's report raised a number of questions about this but at present he (Mr. Couch) was not aware that these ideas were being adopted. He referred to the institutional prerogative here. The Academic Council's position was that offerings concerning both disciplines and courses was strictly a college matter. The Council's concern was very simple: that colleges offer students a viable program of academic studies. Until that ended Academic Council would not be as aggressive as some would want. He recognized that in some colleges second year programs may be threatened: this was the case, for example, at Selkirk and David Thompson where two campuses served a limited number of students. Until the Council found colleges not offering second year courses it was loath to intervene. The Council also resisted the idea of provincial priorities, being reluctant to spell things out.

Helen Brown then reiterated for Mr. Couch a point made earlier in the meeting, that if a core curriculum eliminates subjects like Anthropology or Political Science, it will reduce the attractiveness of a college's liberal arts offerings as a whole. The cycle of cuts then becomes self-perpetuating: History might be a core subject but enrollments in History courses will be hurt when courses in other disciplines are chopped. Mr. Couch responded by noting first that registration in the hard sciences appeared to be increasing while that in the social sciences in some areas was not. Academic Council's argument will be that some prerequisites will have to be met: a case can be made that students going on to university need certain courses at certain levels. But

Helen Brown repeated her point that more than specific prerequisites is involved here; if we lose Anthropology the whole academic program starts to fall apart. Mr. Couch then addressed the issue of general concern about maintaining academic programs. He noted that some are saying that people are being turned away from the colleges, but other educators are responding, "so what"? Career programs have done this for years. There is, continued Mr. Couch, a real blurring of lines between academic and career programs. The case for a liberal education has to be put again.

Jim Hendrickson then asked what Academic Council's role could be in putting forward the case for liberal education. As an observer of the Articulation Committee for a number of years he sensed a real concern about the viability of the academic program, especially at the second year level. Restraint and blurring made this more serious. It raised the question of how viable academic programs in some colleges are. This group wonders if Academic Council can make this case to the ministry. Can the Academic Council assist the colleges in determining what is essential? Clarence Karr added, how do we sell the idea of training that doesn't end with a certificate of competence; we teach such skills as thinking and writing but don't get much sympathy. Mr. Couch responded that perhaps the Council had misjudged this. Its position was that so far cuts had been at the margins and not at the core of programs. One way of selling our case is within our own institutions. Academic Council has consistently argued that the strength of the colleges is with the colleges themselves. "You won't find the Council out ahead of the colleges," he concluded.

C) Open Learning Institute (OLI)

The chairman then directed discussion to the last major issue of the day, the Articulation Committee's concerns about the Open Learning Institute. She summarized these as concern about the duplication of courses between OLI and the colleges, the quality of OLI courses, the perception that OLI might threaten the course offerings of some colleges in the future, and the way in which we could best arrange to have OLI represented at our meetings. Mr Couch dealt with the last issue first. Articulation committees come under the authority of the Academic Council, according to the Colleges Act. The Council saw the committees as "facilitators". The articulation process would continue. The intention was that each institution be represented at the meetings, but Mr. Couch expressed uncertainty about whether the representatives were to be instructors only or whether administrators were also allowed to attend. In his former role as dean at Cariboo College he had tried to attend articulation meetings. But basically the Council's policy was to allow each discipline to manage its own committees.

Turning to other questions about OLI, Mr. Couch said that OLI was created to complement other post-secondary institutions. Academic Council had recommended to OLI that it pick up courses that would supplement some college programs (for example, some science courses). Mr. Couch said he recognized that many were concerned about competition between OLI and the colleges, but he noted that all educational institutions grow through the numbers game. OLI was founded on the idea that a little competition could be a good thing.

Concerning communication between OLI and other institutions, Clarence Karr mentioned the motion passed earlier in the day to invite OLI to send a history representative to our meetings. Mr Couch said that OLI was represented at the articulation meetings of other disciplines. Morag MacLachlan asked Mr. Couch about the suggestion that the Post-Secondary Co-ordinating Committee be reconstituted. Mr. Couch replied that it still exists, in the form of the Academic Advisory Committee to the Academic Council. But the Council has found it more useful to get information directly from the articulation committees.

D) Knowledge Network (KNOW)

Don Couch then turned to the Knowledge Network, stating that this institution concerned him much more than OLI. The original understanding was that KNOW would be strictly a non-credit delivery system, but this is not happening. Also, the Knowledge Network was much more aggressive than OLI. There have been discussions to see if the two could not be brought together. Clarence Karr wondered whether KNOW was being promoted by specific people or by the colleges. In answer to another question about what department KNOW fell under, Mr. Couch said that it was mostly under Universities. Bob Smith argued that not enough money was being made available for program creation. The promoters of KNOW in the colleges were administrators and technical people, but no funding was coming from the academic sector, with one or two exceptions, for serious input. He wondered if we shouldn't be suspicious of such a centralized learning institution? Management of KNOW was not controlled by people who were aware of its implications (such as about Canadian content).

E) Louse Ends

A number of final points were made. Robert Campbell stated that Capilano was increasingly concerned about cost recovery credit courses and asked Mr. Couch his view of these. The latter stated that accessibility was still a major concern but recognized that the former principle that programs should be available to all no longer applied.

Mr. Couch ventured the opinion that he was not sure where all of this was headed. The percentage of costs paid for by students had dropped for a decade and administrators were not trying to recover the difference. Curtis Nordman asked about the rumour that the colleges would get a zero budgetary lift in April. This, he said, would probably bring colleges to the threshold of damage, as Roland Grant had suggested. Mr. Couch stated that zero lift was an optimistic estimate. Nobody knows. The irony is that while money lessens, registration rises. Bob Smith noted that this process could only go so far before all reserve capacity was extinguished. Mr. Couch stated that it was difficult to get information on graduates and on college capacities. Curtis reiterated that zero lift or less meant drops in financing, which would mean layoffs. Doesn't this lead to alternatives like OLI? Mr. Couch replied that he had never heard at the provincial level that OLI was a fallback position. He stated that at least one-quarter of the capacity of college academic programs province-wide was not being used. The problem was getting numbers at some places. Clarence Karr noted that "graduates" as used by Mr. Couch was not the correct word. "Course completion" was more appropriate, because it took into consideration the fact that many students completed only partial programs at the colleges.

The chairman thanked Mr. Couch for attending the meeting. The session adjourned at 3:35 p.m.