AN EXAMINATION OF THE BARRIERS TO ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS

BETWEEN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN ONTARIO

by

Danielle Renaud

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-49863-8

Canada

AN EXAMINATION OF THE BARRIERS TO ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS BETWEEN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN ONTARIO

Danielle Denise Renaud, Doctor of Education, 2000
Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning
University of Toronto

ABSTRACT

This descriptive qualitative study examines the current barriers to articulation agreements between colleges and universities in Ontario. Interviews were conducted with Presidents and Vice-Presidents, Academic at all colleges and universities in the province, as well as with Deans at some colleges and universities in areas selected to represent the entire province.

A six-question open-ended survey was conducted by telephone interview by the researcher. Analysis of the data revealed that there are 21 themes of barriers, the most obvious being attitudes; 14 themes of reasons for the barriers, the most obvious being the monopoly status of Ontario universities; and 17 themes of responses for what needs to occur to prompt change of the current situation, with government policy and funding incentive the most obvious themes. Respondents also discussed the types of agreements currently in place and the process by which those agreements were negotiated. Finally, summative comments were provided by the respondents.

From these results it was concluded that there are perceived barriers, as well as actual barriers to articulation agreements; that people operate under the perceived barriers; that the proximity of colleges and universities does not appear to influence articulation agreements; and that some government intervention is necessary to encourage progress.

The barriers which were identified in the study, the reasons for the barriers and suggestions for change, as well as conclusions and implications are examined in this study.

ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

LIST OF TABLES

APPENDICES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This study was conducted to examine the current barriers to articulation agreements between colleges and universities in Ontario. It is intended to provide a comprehensive view of an important and timely issue in postsecondary education, that is, the need for increased cooperation between colleges and universities in order to facilitate seamless transfer of students from one postsecondary education system to the other. Since "both colleges and universities are being challenged by the public, governments, and business to work together effectively to meet the emerging higher education needs of this province" (CUCC Report, 1998, p. 7), the barriers to increased articulation merit serious attention at this time.

Articulation is most commonly defined as the arrangement of credit transfer between a CAAT (College of Applied Arts and Technology) and a university to enable a college graduate to pursue baccalaureate degree study with advanced standing. This arrangement is referred to as traditional transfer. Additionally, there is reverse transfer, a more recent trend, where a university graduate moves to a college program, either for a diploma program in a different area than university study, or in a post-graduate program which is similar to that studied at university. For the purpose of this study, the focus is on the barriers to traditional transfer arrangements.

Essentially, the purpose of transferability is "to respond to the needs of learners, facilitating the portability of their learning as they move from one postsecondary institution to another, from employer to employer, across provincial or national boundaries and from the jurisdiction of one professional licensing body to that of another" (Byrne, 1999, p. 7). Thus, it can be said that transferability is "about removing inappropriate barriers to the movement of

1

learners" (Byrne, 1999, p. 7). There is, however, another consideration to transferability.

> Ideally, the transfer function also serves to establish the academic validity and
> credibility of the transferring institution as a legitimate partner in providing
> education for the transfer student. But, in reality, it hasn't worked that way.
> Barriers exist, which have more to do with differences (real or perceived) in
> academic cultures and attitudes between two-and four-year ... [institutions] ...
> and faculty than anything else, including: division-based 2-yr. colleges vs.
> discipline-based 4-yr. [universities]; teaching emphasis ... vs. research emphasis;
> accessibility and low-cost tuition vs. standards and higher cost tuition; ...
> non-traditional, working, commuting students ... vs. full-time, residential,
> traditional students ... ; realistic & practical emphases ... vs. learning for its own
> sake ... (Susskind, 1996, p. 5)

The concept of a collaborative and cooperative relationship between colleges and universities in Ontario has been both discussed and debated in many forums since the creation of the college system more than thirty years ago. However, the evolution of the college system "has not historically included a significant amount of collaboration and partnership with the university sector" (Marshall, 1995, p. 1). "For all intents and purposes, Ontario colleges and universities have historically worked in isolation of each other" (Del Missier, 1999, p. 10). Additionally, the academic cultural differences have often led to "non communication, competition, and suspicion" (Susskind, 1996, p. 5).

In the absence of a policy framework that supports collaboration between the two systems and without the investment of the necessary resources to effect collaborative

programming, there remain numerous deterrents (CUCC Report, 1998). "Until these barriers are

addressed in a substantial way, it is unlikely that major improvements will be seen in Ontario

college/university collaborative efforts. Meanwhile, employers and student[s] face an urgent

need for degree completion opportunities" (ACAATO Report, 1999, p. 6).

Employers are "critical" of the lack of opportunity for degree completion for their

employees who are college graduates as there is a "growing need for degree-holders as a

prerequisite for employment in some fields, and as a critical element of career advancement in

others" (ACAATO Report, 1999, p. 2). For example, both professional associations for certified

general accountants and for nurses now require degrees as entry level qualification for practice

in Ontario, where previously a college diploma was deemed acceptable for registration.

Despite numerous recommendations over the last several years by government appointed

task forces and commissions, there is no mechanism to standardize the movement of students

from colleges to universities, or, vice-versa. Many articulation agreements which are negotiated

between colleges and universities are done so with inordinate amounts of work by individuals in

related departments rather than by the institutions as a whole. Additionally, "meaningful degree

completion arrangements between Ontario colleges and universities are infrequent, remain ad

hoc and vary greatly from institution to institution" (ACAATO Report, 1999, p. 5), while

students encounter "barriers and strong resistance when attempting to acquire fair and

appropriate recognition for their college credits" (Del Missier, 1999, p. 10).

The Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario (ACAATO)

(Report, 1999) reports that the "recently published Ontario College University Transfer Guide,

promotes many Ontario-based agreements, but in reality very few of the agreements reflect

substantial degree completion opportunities; agreements that are learner friendly and include appropriate and significant transfer credit for college graduates" (p. 5).

Successful negotiation of agreements depends upon a number of factors, some which are within the control of the colleges, and some which are not. Those factors which are not, are external factors such as: economics, student demographics, community involvement, the proximity of primary transfer institutions, and the policy and financing structure, or lack thereof (Cipres & Parish, 1993). There are also internal factors which affect articulation and transfer efforts which include the college mission and goals, organizational structure, administrative environment, and funding (Cipres & Parish, 1993).

The reality of postsecondary education in Ontario today is vastly different from, and incongruent with the structure and policy framework which was created with Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology (CAATS) in the 1960s. Education is currently operating within a paradigm shift and this new phase is a "quantum leap" from the past (Fullan, 1993, p. viii). In this new paradigm there is a changing profile of higher education due to a "rapidly changing economic, social and cultural environment", and thus the role of universities has "shifted, from the provision of a rather narrow range of scholarship and professional training and the education of a social elite to the provision of the ever broader-based elite required to sustain economic leadership and cultural order in a very different world" (Shapiro & Shapiro, 1994, p. 8). A new mindset for the change which the postsecondary education system is undergoing is thus also necessary. Without a major shift, or "metanoia" (meaning a fundamental shift of mind), there remains an "insurmountable basic problem [of] ... the juxtaposition of a continuous change theme with a continuous conservative system" (Fullan, 1993, p. 3).

Postsecondary students do not choose either college or university solely dependent upon the stream through which they progressed in secondary school anymore, nor based upon their choice of career. Many do not know which path they will follow, and thus may attend college first and then progress to university for degree completion, or, they may attend university first and then follow up with a college diploma in order to obtain specific skills for employment. In addition, with the looming disappearance of the OAC (Ontario Academic Credit) year, another factor which was part of the original framework is thus removed from the equation, as all students who enter postsecondary education will come from four years of secondary school.

In a society in which "social mobility increasingly is seen ... as a right, ... there has been, is and will continue to be growing demand ..." for postsecondary education " ... especially on the part of groups (e.g., women, racial minorities, the disabled, aboriginal populations) traditionally excluded ..." (Shapiro & Shapiro, 1994, p. 9). The most obvious consequence of this changing student population is an "increasing heterogeneity of the university community" (Shapiro & Shapiro, 1994, p. 10). Such heterogeneity, however, is not positive to some in the university community. For example, Bercuson, Bothwell and Granatstein (1997) decry the increasing inclusion of "dullards" (p. 54) in university lecture halls due to enrolment-based funding of universities. It has, they purport, "clogged" the university system with classrooms full of students who are "not intellectually suited to handle the university experience and challenge" (p. 49).

If the situation in Ontario is compared to that in the U.S., one sees a higher education system which has experienced some similar issues, but is essentially different, given that two-year colleges are feeders to four-year institutions, and articulation is a much older topic there.

For example, Florida had state-wide articulation in 1959. Much has been written in the literature about challenges of and barriers to articulation agreements, citing many of the same issues currently being cited in Ontario. The situation is unique in some respects in Ontario, given that the college system was not created as a feeder to universities, as in the U.S., or in other provinces such as Alberta or British Columbia. Both of those provinces' college systems have undergone much growth and change and have metamorphosed into applied and associate degree granting institutions.

In the U.S. experience it has been found that the creation of articulation agreements, transfer centres, consortia and national centres aid in the reduction of the barriers to transfer, enhance mobility and improve teaching and learning. However, it has also been found that raising the academic emphasis of colleges above all other purposes also serves to weaken their comprehensive nature and fails to improve transfer rates (Grubb, 1990). Consequently, new issues may then arise around the reconciliation of curriculum and policy, in that in keeping with perceived progress in the policy domain, a requisite continual shift in curriculum becomes necessary.

It is apparent that a thorough examination of the barriers which currently exist to articulation between Ontario colleges and universities is timely. Based predominantly on information collected through government reports, discussion papers, other related documents and literature, as well as telephone interviews, this examination is intended to explore the present barriers so that all parties involved clearly understand the importance of the issue, rather than to create a framework for change, or, to analyze specific aspects of the issue. However, a clearer understanding of the true nature of the problem may, in fact, facilitate some solutions.

Historical Overview

University education in Ontario more or less began shortly after the Constitution Act of

1791 in what was then Upper Canada. It was modeled after the English education system, as was

grammar school at the time. It wasn't until much later, however, that the ongoing battle between

government and church control of university education was settled. By 1887, industrialization

demanded more of postsecondary education than scholars who were trained in the classical

tradition as thinkers and, consequently, research began to gain importance

Since public money was funding schools, change began to occur rapidly after the late

1800s. Common schools became elementary schools, and grammar schools became secondary

schools, thus setting them apart from other public secondary schools as collegiate institutes.

The new secondary schools offered education to the senior matriculation level, or, grade

thirteen. This meant that the first year of university education could also be completed in local

high schools (Cameron & Royce, 1996).

According to Cameron & Royce's (1996) historical account this "legacy" of Ryerson

"obivate[d] the need for the development of community colleges along the American model as

local feeder institutions for universities; it immediately confirmed the primacy of academic

programs over vocational or technical options at the secondary level" (p. 70). Ryerson's

successor, John Seath further streamed secondary education into two clearly parallel lines, thus

setting the stage for two parallel lines of postsecondary education later; which remain today.

Post-war veterans and the baby boom both contributed substantially to a huge demand

for postsecondary education; a demand quite unexpected. As well post-war universities were

infused with federal cash and graduated thousands of service people, who then populated the

classrooms as teachers for incoming baby boomers, who would have to be well educated in order to provide a population capable of intelligent defense against continuing tyranny in the cold war (Bercuson, Bothwell & Granatstein, 1997).

By the early 1960s, the focus of government shifted to the coordination of fast-growing postsecondary education with that of rapidly changing secondary education. Robarts, then Premier of Ontario, had changed the dual secondary system from academic and vocational streams into a three stream system which included arts; science and technology; and business and commerce. This education was available in both four and five year programs depending upon whether the graduate would proceed to work, or to technical institutes (Cameron & Royce, 1996).

By the mid 1960s unprecedented numbers of high school graduates were emerging with expectations of continuing their formal education beyond secondary school. The Minister of Education, William G. Davis, then substantially altered postsecondary education by combining all forms of postsecondary education, other than universities, into one new system known as Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology.

This new system was quite different than that of the university system in that it was centrally controlled by a Council of Regents. This council has since endeavoured to retain the original structure and mandate of colleges, rather than see them become "junior universities" (Cameron & Royce, 1996, p. 75) as are found in the U.S.

While the United States is and has been the strongest external influence on Canada and its university system, such has not been the case with all colleges. Most provinces, other than Ontario, have adopted an American style college system, whereby two-year colleges are feeders

to four-year universities. Ontario, however, developed the binary system, which exists today, in which both a college diploma and a university degree are viewed as a terminal credential.

In the 1960s both the federal government and the provincial government shared the costs of postsecondary education and substantial funds were both needed and given to deal with huge expansion in the number of students wanting to enrol. "The 'more' method of governance perfectly suited the 'me' generation. Spending more money created an illusion of flexibility and, better still, liberalism. In fact, however, universities were building in rigidity" (Bercuson et al, 1997, p. 18). This giving of more "helped form a conviction that more of everything — money, students, professors — would solve whatever problems ailed the university, or society in general" (Bercuson et al, 1997, p. 18). It has been suggested by certain historians that the outcome of this trend in the 1960s, is a specific cultural identity that has been entrenched, given that "a large segment of the professoriate came to believe that universities were a model in which society's problems would be solved; [but] unfortunately, universities tend to be a mirror in which most of society's problems are reflected" (Bercuson et al, 1997, p. 18).

Background to the Problem

In 1965 the college system was created mainly through the energy and vision of the Minister of Education, William G. Davis. Davis enthusiastically endeavoured to meet outgrowth needs of the changes to the secondary system recently redesigned by Premier John Robarts. With a major restructuring of the secondary system coupled with a rapid growth in secondary student numbers there was a very real prospect that there would be "thousands of students graduating from high school in 1966 and 1967 with nowhere to go ..." (Cameron & Royce, 1996, p. 75)

With a newly conceived and constructed postsecondary system the movement context for students in Ontario schools was expanded, for those who were not university bound, from that of elementary education, to secondary education, to work. There was now a new, larger movement context in which more students than ever before would move from elementary education, to secondary education, to postsecondary education, and then to work. In order to accommodate this larger context there were 20 colleges across the province by 1970, which granted an alternative credential to the university degree.

Higher education is now seen as "central to our common effort to create sufficient wealth to support both the standard of living that we are or would like to be accustomed to and the broad range of social, medical, and human services that characterize the nature of the society we would like to become" (Shapiro & Shapiro, 1994, p. 24). Within the higher education framework, there have been two distinct pathways which lead to both similar, and different, types of careers. Increasingly, however, as our society changes, the lines separating these two pathways are becoming blurred as the original mandates of universities and colleges change.

The policy framework for postsecondary education in Ontario was set in the mid 1960s by Robarts and Davis and has not changed much since then. Ontario's postsecondary education system is still a binary system despite the creation of numerous commissions, task forces and committees over the intervening years. These groups were mandated to study the system and to advise the government on procedures for handling growth and demand in postsecondary education, something which far exceeded projection and expectation. Most of the reports from these commissions, task forces and committees recommended, among other things, the creation of formal linkages between the two systems. These include the *Vision 2000 Report* (1990), the

Pitman Report, *No Dead Ends: The Report of the Task Force on Advanced Training* (1993), and

the Smith Report, *Excellence, Accessibility, Responsibility: Report of the Advisory Panel on*

Future Directions for Postsecondary Education (1996) (see Appendices I, II, and III).

Two obvious challenges of this situation remain. The first is to create new alliances

between two systems which some see as having quite different missions and mandates, and the

second, to find areas in which cooperation will be of mutual benefit. Given that these two

systems have evolved in isolation from each other, both policy and curriculum directions have

historically been incongruent with one another as each has seen to the needs of different

populations - at least philosophically. It is difficult at this point to systemize collaboration with

two mindsets, two missions, two philosophies and two perceived outcomes, especially when one

of the intended participants is essentially "unwilling" (Del Missier, 1999, p. 10).

It is now apparent, however, that there is an "increased urgency ... to secure

arrangements that would enable [college graduates] ... to obtain a degree" (Skolnik, 1999, p. i).

This urgency is deemed to be the result of the current employment environment in which

increasingly a university degree is becoming a requirement for entry into occupations for which

the CAATs formerly provided adequate preparation. Consequently, according to Skolnik

(1999), "a growing part of the career education role of the CAATs could become obsolete if

students and graduates in those CAAT programs cannot continue on to degree completion in an

expeditious manner" (p. i).

This creeping credentialism creates an environment in which substantial change is

deemed necessary, not only for the college system to remain a viable educational option, but for

students as well as employers, who are increasingly indicating that both a diploma and a degree

are the credentials which are required to obtain acceptable employment. One of the consequences of the need for rapid change in an educational system which is essentially conservative is "constant aggravation" (Fullan, 1993, p. 3) for those involved. Change in postsecondary education is also currently considered to be necessary given that the "stakes are higher" (Fullan 1993, p. 2) now that the government is more involved in education. Increased government involvement in education also raises a new set of interrelated public policy concerns: access to education; numbers; cost/benefit; diversity; quality and role (Shapiro & Shapiro, 1994, p. 23); issues which must all be addressed.

According to Shapiro & Shapiro (1994) "the difficulty with collegiality in an environment of substantial change is that it can become so biased in favor of the status quo, not to mention the status quo ante" (p. 19), that nothing in fact does change. Similarly, Fullan (1993) posits that our conservative educational system is "more likely to retain the status quo than to change ... [and] when change is attempted under such circumstances it results in defensiveness, superficiality, or at best short-lived pockets of success" (p. 3).

The most recent and clearest recommendation for formal linkages of the two systems are contained in a 1996 document entitled *Excellence, Accessibility, Responsibility: Report of the Advisory Panel on Future Directions for Postsecondary Education*, known as the Smith Report. This document contains eighteen specific recommendations for the "arrangements for credit transfer and cooperative college-university programming ..." (p. 44) as well as for the creation of an advisory body to deal with new and existing postsecondary issues; a body which will operate "at arms-length from government" (p. 47) (see appendix III for a complete list of the recommendations of the panel).

To this point most of the recommendations outlined in the Smith Report have not been heeded. Articulation agreements are still created on an ad hoc basis, usually at the behest of the colleges. There are only a few instances of Ontario universities approaching colleges for articulation agreements, and this appears to happen when the viability of the university program is questionable. Most other approaches from universities come from out-of-province and out-of-country universities, who see Ontario as a market ripe for the picking. Some Ontario universities maintain that they are not particularly interested in negotiating agreements with colleges for a variety of reasons, including the fact that the looming double cohort, where due to the elimination of grade thirteen, two groups of secondary school graduates will fill up university classes.

One attempt to improve linkage of the two systems (although, in fact, the universities are not technically a system, but a group of independently chartered institutions (Marshall, 1995) is the College-University Consortium Council (CUCC). It was created in 1996 with a mandate to "facilitate, promote and coordinate joint education and training ventures that will: aid the transfer of students from sector to sector; facilitate the creation of joint programs between colleges and universities; and, further the development of a more seamless continuum of postsecondary education in Ontario (CUCC Report, 1998, p. 2).

The CUCC's report (1998) states that the first two years of its mandate have "occurred within a rapidly changing political and economic environment for colleges and universities" (p. 3). The report indicates that of fifteen collaborative projects implemented, only six have achieved positive outcomes, while five partially achieved their outcomes and four did not achieve their outcomes. Further, the report points out that "[w]hen ideas about and approaches

to collaboration are tested in real-life projects the structural barriers and underlying attitudes are uncovered" (p. 3).

Despite the numerous recommendations for the creation of linkages between Ontario's two postsecondary cousins over the past thirty years, there are not as many as would be expected which actually provide substantial credit for college graduates. Given the most recent, and the most emphatic recommendations for such linkages, as well as a current flurry of discussion papers on the topic by both college and university bodies (ACAATO and COU), a thorough examination of the current barriers to articulation agreements remains long overdue.

There is a paucity of research currently in Ontario into the creation of articulation agreements as well as to the real and perceived barriers thereof. As previously stated, most of the information is contained in government documents, which undoubtedly don't have a wide readership within, or outside of the education system.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the barriers which currently exist to articulation agreements between colleges and universities in Ontario from the perspectives of those involved. It is intended to provide a comprehensive view of a situation which has been considered to be problematic; not to be a prescription for change, nor an in-depth analysis of one or more aspects of the overall issue from a theoretical perspective.

Transferability and mobility have been identified as key issues currently faced by the postsecondary education sector in Canada, and as such have attracted the attention of the Council of Ministers of Education (Byrne, 1999, p. 7).

"Ontario has been slower than any other province in promoting the transferability of

credit as a real issue" (Del Missier, 1999, p. 10) despite recommendations that "have all urged

the provincial government to develop a postsecondary education vision that provides the

knowledgeable and skilled work force necessary to advance Ontario's competitiveness in the

global economy" (Del Missier, 1999, p. 10). Many of the current articulation agreements are

concentrated in business and technology areas, with fewer in the arts and sciences. It seems

logical that graduates of college programs in these areas, such as in the human services, may

have the desire to pursue further education at the university level in areas such as social work,

psychology, or education. At this time most college students must negotiate individual

agreements for credit transfer with the universities they would like to attend and many find such

a prospect overwhelmingly complex and frustrating.

It has been suggested by Skolnik (1999) that "what is needed most in the near future is to

replace the present fragmented and ad hoc approach with a provincial vision for university-

CAAT cooperation, a framework for implementing this vision, and to assign responsibility for

providing the necessary leadership in this direction to an appropriate provincial level, not

sectoral body" (p. ii). It is logical, then, that a clearer picture of the current situation, both the

actual and perceived, is imperative at this time; a more comprehensive view of a changing issue.

Statement of the Problem

For the purpose of this study, several questions were examined. They are as follows:

> I. What are the current barriers to articulation agreements between colleges and
>
> universities in Ontario?
>
> II. In relation to the barriers identified, what are the reasons?
>
> III. What needs to occur in the future that may prompt change in this situation?

IV. What agreements does each institution currently have articulated, or in

progress?

V. At what level were these agreements negotiated? (top-down or bottom-up)

Definitions

For the purpose of the present study the following definitions were used:

Articulation - credit transfer agreements between two and three-year college

programs and three or four-year university programs which are formally

negotiated by the institutions.

There are two categories of credit transfer arrangements: transfer credit and collaborative

program. **Transfer Credit** arrangements refer to those in which a credit course taken at one

institution is considered to be the equivalent of a course at another institution. **Collaborative**

Program arrangements are those academic or vocational programs that have been developed

cooperatively by university and college partners (OCUTG, 1998).

College - a two or three-year diploma granting institution (CAAT)

University - a three or four-year degree granting institution

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Introduction

The following review of literature will trace government commissioned studies and discussion papers, in a chronological format in order to clearly show how the present situation regarding articulation agreements came to be. Postsecondary education in Ontario has "been profoundly shaped by choices made previously ... and we need to know and appreciate some of the critical choices that have brought them and us to where we are. Ignorance of our past is a poor basis upon which to chart future decisions" (Cameron & Royce, 1996, p. 68).

Government Commissioned Studies and Related Discussion Papers

As a result of the rapid growth in the postsecondary system in the 1960s a need was seen for a concrete plan of development rather than an uncontrolled expansion. Thus, the Advisory Committee on University Affairs was created in the early 1960s to plan and to control future expansion of universities. While originally a government committee the work was taken over by a subcommittee of university officials, who subsequently became known as the Deutsch Committee.

This group considered that junior or community colleges offer the first two years of university work. They ultimately rejected this idea for fear that the colleges "would be regarded as an inferior substitute for degree-granting institutions and would fail to win public acceptance, or else ... there would be an overwhelming demand to add a third year and grant a degree" (Deutsch Report, 1962, p. 20). It should be noted that both of these last two reasons for not structuring colleges as feeders to universities (as is the case in other provinces and in the United

17

States) have occurred anyway, that is, adding a third year and pressure to grant associate degrees.

The committee eventually recommended city colleges, which later became the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, and liberal arts colleges which were to be associated with existing universities.

Despite the attempt to structure the growth of postsecondary education in Ontario, that did not occur. Robarts and Davis essentially created the framework for the system in the 1960s and it has not changed since then in spite of numerous commissions and studies. The recommendations of most of these studies have not been implemented resulting in a loosely structured, yet, binary system. This is because the demand for higher education far exceeded the expectations of the original architects.

Late in the 1960s it became clear that the policies that were in place were not suitable for a system which had grown faster than had been anticipated, yet was projected to shrink in the next decade. Two studies were commissioned as a result. The first, the Commission to Study the Development of Graduate Programmes in Ontario Universities (1966) (the Spinks Report), cited a "complete lack of a master plan" as the most striking characteristic of higher - not only graduate - education in Ontario" (p. 77).

In 1969 a second commission was appointed to examine revision of policy to more adequately meet both short and long term needs. According to Cameron & Royce's (1996) historical review the report of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education in Ontario, entitled *The Learning Society* (1972), "stands as the only comprehensive review of the postsecondary policy framework to include both colleges and universities" (p. 78). Unfortunately the recommendations of this commission were rejected as being "too radical" because they

"promoted postsecondary education as 'a continuous, life-long process', encompassing colleges,

universities, and social and cultural institutions. Among other things, the commission

recommended a new policy framework in which operating grants distinguished between

educational and instructional expenditures on the one hand, and payments for research and other

activities on the other" (Cameron & Royce, 1996, p. 78).

In the 1970s as the growth rate in the Canadian economy slowed, unemployment rose

and inflation became a serious problem. As a result, growth in postsecondary education was

halted with a slow down of construction of colleges and universities and faculty hiring. With the

boom over, enrolments fluctuated and the prevailing mindset shifted from growth to

maintenance mode, despite the fact that people stayed in school due to the stagnant job climate.

The temporary cutbacks in postsecondary education of the 70s became the permanent austerity

of the 80s and somehow slid into the recession of the early 90s (Bercuson et al, 1997).

There were a third and fourth commission created in 1981 and 1984 respectively with

the same mandates as previous commissions. Both were charged with envisioning the future

role and the future development of universities exclusively within the framework of restraint in

public spending (the Fisher Report and the Bovey Report). At the same time separate similar

commissions and studies were undertaken within the college system.

In 1981 a Task Force was established "with a view to resolving the complex and

important issue of CAAT growth" (Task Force Report, 1981, p. 2). This Task Force essentially

concluded that the original mandate of colleges was not congruent with the present picture and

recommended a thorough review of the colleges' mandate as well as the development of a

blueprint for future operation. This blueprint was to address issues such as admissions policy,

funding and governance.

To further deal with governance issues an advisory committee was struck in 1985. The report of the committee (the first Pitman Report) criticized the viewing of colleges as "industrial organizations rather than as learning institutes, which in turn placed too great an emphasis on the 'bottom line' ..." (Cameron & Royce, 1996, p. 81). Pitman's recommendations led to the 1988 creation of Vision 2000 as they included recommendations for sweeping changes to the governance structure of colleges, including the elimination of the Council of Regents and the establishment of an Advisory Council on Colleges. Although this recommendation was not accepted, the Minister did redefine the role of the Council of Regents, "transferring greater responsibility for program approval to the Ministry, decreasing the Council's role in college governance and refocusing its role toward identifying strategic issues in the colleges" (Cameron & Royce, 1996, p. 81).

Vision 2000 was born out of a request by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities that the Council of Regents oversee a comprehensive and far-reaching review of Ontario's colleges that would develop "a vision of the college system in the year 2000" (Ontario Council of Regents, 1990, p. 1). There were five study teams and a special sixth table of francophone representatives who each produced a report and recommendations on the specific area which they were assigned. The document clearly stated that the "collective search for a vision of the system for the next century is in itself a recognition that the colleges are at a crossroads, and that change is necessary to assist the system to meet the challenges of the future. Vision 2000 believes that the change that is needed is fundamental and far-reaching" (Ontario Council of Regents, 1990, p. 2).

Among the forty recommendations (see Appendix I) of Vision 2000 was a strong urging

that greater college-university program articulation be a priority. It was clearly stated that a

"college diploma should not be a 'terminal' credential for those students who are interested in

pursuing more advanced studies" and that the "laissez-faire model for developing college-

university program arrangements appears to yield rather limited and quite uneven opportunities

for college graduates wanting to enrol in university programs in Ontario" (Ontario Council of,

Regents, 1990, p. 16).

While it was recommended "that the Minister of Colleges and Universities endeavour to

expand and improve the opportunities for students to move between the college and university

sectors ...", it was stressed that "each sector fulfills an important educational role in Ontario ... ,

and ... that the colleges should [not] be turned into 'feeder' institutions for the universities"

(Ontario Council of Regents, 1990, p. 16). This was seen to be an "ironic turn of events since

neither the colleges nor universities had, to date, demonstrated a particularly high degree of

cooperation. Coordination was generally seen as difficult enough within each sector, without

adding expectations that it should extend across what remained a firm binary divide"

(Cameron & Royce, 1996, p. 84).

This recommendation was not specifically followed through by the government, however

a Task Force on Advanced Training was created which would investigate this and other relevant

issues presented in Vision 2000 (Task Force on Advanced Training, 1993).

The Task Force, again chaired by Pitman, was called the Task Force on Advanced

Training. Its mandate was to identify the province's needs for advanced training from all

relevant viewpoints (including students, employees and employers) and to recommend ways of

more effective transfer between college and university (Task Force on Advanced Training, 1993, p. 4).

The report of the Task Force, called *No Dead Ends: Report of the Task Force on Advanced Training to the Minister of Education and Training* (1993), was very clear in recommending major structural change to the college and university systems in order to link them with each other, as well as with business (see Appendix II). It stated that the "lack of any agency in Ontario that might have bridged the gap between colleges and universities has made the work of this Task Force specially challenging" (p. 16). As well, it stated that the "founders of the college system would be surprised by the increasing numbers of university graduates who go to college to secure skills for immediate employment" (p. 17). Additionally, it recommended that linkages and a fair transfer of credits be encouraged between the two systems as "there is a sense that knowledge is seamless and should not be balkanized by jurisdictional 'turf'" (p.17).

It was recognized in the report that the "nature of the student body in colleges and universities is changing: it is older, more experienced, and comes from an increasingly differentiated community. It expects opportunities for lifelong learning from colleges and universities — an expectation that is shared by the work force" (p. 17).

It was also recognized that a major barrier to collaboration was that both colleges and universities are filled to capacity and, in some cases, transfer students in both colleges and universities take spots away from secondary school graduates. Further, funding of the university system does not encourage growth when it is already operating above corridor. Restructuring, according to the report, would "demand new levels of flexibility and creativity, and attitudinal change ... " (p. 25).

The report cited a wide variety of structural, policy and attitudinal changes that must occur if Ontario's postsecondary sectors were to meet the needs of learners more effectively throughout their lifetime. It recommended that barriers to inter-sectoral transfer of credits in postsecondary education be eliminated and that an agency or council be established to provide leadership in the development of credit transfer policies and practices.

There was admonition that:

> transfer arrangements between Ontario colleges and universities, while rapidly increasing in number, are ad hoc, frequently informal, and are not governed by any provincial statement of principles and guidelines. There is great variation from institution to institution resulting in unequal opportunities for students interested in transferring with advanced standing. Student transfer with credit is dependent upon several factors — the relationship of college faculty to faculty in other institutions, an informal practice, a formal agreement, the proximity of a sister institution, knowledge of transfer agreements, etc., etc. This is inconsistent with present policy commitments to accessibility and equity; nor does it encourage participation in the advanced training opportunities that are already available (Task Force on Advanced Training, 1993, p. 36).

It was identified that "there is a resentment that a college education receives no formal recognition from the university community" and that "more recognition is given to CAAT programs by American colleges and universities than by Ontario universities" (p. 48).

In a comparative analysis of Ontario's system to other provinces, such as British Columbia, and other countries, such as the United States (California), the United Kingdom,

Australia, West Germany and Japan, it was concluded that:

1. In countries with particularly strong economies such as Germany and Japan, there is a strong and equal partnership of business, labour, and education in the planning, coordination, and delivery of advanced training. The partnership occurs at a state or national level as well as in local communities;

2. In the U.K., as in some American states and in B.C., there appears to be a movement to eliminate barriers between academic and vocational streams so that a student is able to apply credit from vocational as well as academic courses toward a baccalaureate degree;

3. There is a growing recognition of the need for the standardization of core curriculum and of vocational qualifications across a jurisdiction; for example, the national vocational qualifications in the U.K., a call for national competencies and standards in Australia, the investigation of a core business curriculum in B.C;

4. In at least three jurisdictions — Australia, B.C., and California — there are structures to encourage strong sectoral linkages and greater inter-institutional cooperation: a national agency for credit transfer in Australia, the B.C. Council on Admissions and Transfers, the California Postsecondary Education Commission;

5. A number of jurisdictions have invested in sophisticated, user-friendly information systems to increase the general level of knowledge about opportunities for further education and advanced training, thereby making them more readily accessible;

6. In jurisdictions like Ontario — the U.K., Australia, California, B.C. — the

degree continues to be the preferred and recognized credential (Task Force on

Advanced Training, 1993, pp. 74-75).

There was considerable stress on the importance of lifelong learning as "essential if we

are to keep pace with the constant change that is characteristic of a global economy" and as

"necessary in knowledge-based industries" (p. 79). As well it was stressed that the "relationship

of the sectors within higher education determines to a considerable extent whether or not life-

long learning is a theory or a practical reality" (p. 79). There was strong criticism that "linkages

between a college and a university or the transfer of students from one institution to another

have been the exception rather than the rule. For most learners a continuum of higher education

opportunities does not exist" (p. 80). In the absence of program-specific arrangements general

statements on the admission of college graduates appear in university calendars which assess

each student individually, resulting in "inconsistent treatment of students" and "transfer based

on cronyism" (p. 35).

This report also cites recommendations and conclusions of other related reports and

discussion papers from groups such as The Steering Group on Prosperity; The Economic

Council of Canada; and The Premier's Council of Ontario, which all cited cooperation between

postsecondary institutions and improvement of pathways as critical for success in the future. It

emphasizes that:

> ways must be found of improving the organization of postsecondary education
>
> in Ontario, so that better opportunities will prepare learners for the 21st century.
>
> First, postsecondary education should be a single system whose parts fit together

to form a strong and coherent whole. Second, the system must be flexible and

accessible: learners must be able to participate in part-time or full-time learning

throughout their lifetime, in a variety of settings (workplace, home, the

classroom), receiving credit for a wide range of learning experiences and

accomplishments. Finally, education is so critical to the future prosperity of the

country that it demands that all the partners — students, labour, employers, and

educators — be full participants, sharing both the costs and the consequences of

their cooperative activity (pp. 82-83).

Despite the fact that the colleges and universities were

conceived to be separate ... and that ... transfer between the two was neither

provided for nor considered probable ... a quarter-century later the reality is

substantially different. Student movement has grown steadily and reflects a

demand for advanced training opportunities involving inter-system transfer. The

increase has occurred even though policies and structures to facilitate transfer are

not in place. Students are evidently 'voting with their feet' (p. 86).

As such it was deemed by the Task Force that the most obvious "impediments to transfer

include: the absence of clear statements on transfer policy; the informal nature of many

arrangements resulting in the inconsistent treatment of students; the limited recognition by

universities of college courses for credit; the local basis of transfer arrangements, resulting in

great variation in availability, application, and opportunity" (p. 139).

Subsequent to the strong criticisms and recommendations of both *Vision 2000* (Ontario

Council of Regents, 1990) and *No Dead Ends* (Task Force on Advanced Training Report, 1993),

the profile of the articulation issue was raised significantly. In 1994 a *Guide to Transfer Agreements Among Ontario Colleges and Universities* was published as a joint pilot project of ACAATO, COU and MET. As well, there was "considerable discussion and action [generated] at the college and university level ..." (Marshall, 1995, p. 2), which included a flurry of discussion papers published by both ACAATO and COU.

In 1995 David Marshall, President of Nipissing University, spoke on "Trends in University-College Relationships in Ontario in the 90s" to a provincial meeting of both university and college advisors. Such meetings were still generating great attention, as did a meeting of college and university presidents in 1992, which was "heralded in the media" as an historic event (Skolnik, 1994, p. 2). Marshall (1995) examined the "pressures and trends at the Ontario university-college interface ... in order to provide a context for future decisions regarding both articulation and alternate credentialing" (p. 2). In his speech he outlined the "significant dimensions" (p. 3) of the differences in the two sectors as: independence; governance; academic decision making; collective bargaining; financial issues; student entry; and mission (pp. 3-5). He also spoke to the "perceptions that the current articulation level [was] not sufficient" (p. 6) and to the "issues" that would "form the action agenda for college-university relations over the next few years" (p. 6). The twelve perceptions included:

> 1. a continuing perception that the universities place significant and inappropriate barriers in front of students attempting to transfer from colleges to universities;
>
> 2. that block transfer of credits within the system is necessary to truly achieve a seamless postsecondary system;

3. there is a growing panic regarding the yet undefined advanced training needs of the Ontario workplace, and of the need for a hybrid of the college and the university experience/curriculum to meet this need;

4. there is a view held in the college sector that there are existing selected college diploma programs that are 'degree' ready;

5. a growing number of university graduates are enrolling in college diploma programs, seeking to add a vocational/employability dimension to their resumes;

6. the elimination of the fifth year in Ontario high schools will result in some convergence of admission standards, and convergence of the postsecondary education applicant pool for Ontario's universities and colleges;

7. there are continuing discussions within the university system itself of the need for a 'differentiated' university system with a concomitant 'differentiated' degree and funding structure;

8. credentialing initiatives in other jurisdictions, most notably British Columbia, Alberta, and the US, are prompting colleges to ask for similar changes in Ontario;

9. there is some perception of a growing threat to the colleges of the growth of private diploma-offering institutions;

10. there is a perception that the college sector needs an internationally recognized credential for selected programs;

11. there appears an assumption that the colleges are closer to the employability 'market' than universities;

12. there are some efficiencies (financial savings) to be gained from increased

levels of articulation (p. 7).

Marshall (1995) further discussed two trends that had stemmed from *Vision 2000* (1990)

and *No Dead Ends* (1993) and from the perceptions outlined. The first was the creation of the

College-University Consortium Council (CUCC) based upon a request from the Minister of

Education in 1994. The CUCC would pursue three levels of articulation: the first, was block

transfer; the second was discipline specific new diploma/degree programs; and the third was

credit for existing college programs toward degrees. The second trend was the pursuit of an

alternate credential for colleges, that of associate, applied associate, and applied degrees.

Marshall's (1995) observations and conclusions were that pursuit of the second trend

would impede progress on the first resulting in "greatly diminished motivation on the part of the

universities" (p. 16), and that "the failure of the universities and colleges to develop enhanced

academic relationships based upon the consortium framework would certainly fuel demand for a

new credentialing system for Ontario's community colleges" (p. 16). He maintained "optimism

that the future university-college articulation efforts will provide a significant 'value added'

component to Ontario's currently effective and efficient binary postsecondary system" (p. 17),

yet stressed that the "university sector will have to understand the valid and increasingly

important concern by the colleges for alternate credentialing ... " (pp. 16-17).

The credential issue became a greater focus in 1995 as a separate but related issue of

articulation. Both COU and ACAATO held symposiums and workshops to deal with the issues.

COU released a Briefing Paper for Executive Heads entitled *New Credentials for the Ontario*

Colleges? Background and Options. In it the college position was summarized as affirming the

need for Ontario colleges to address the difficulty of the credibility and portability of the

diploma and certificate outside of Ontario, supporting the introduction of associate and applied degrees, expressing concern that they did not want the colleges to become universities, and asserting that since previous efforts have not been successful, a new, bolder, more action-oriented approach would be required (p. 3).

A COU seminar on college/university relationships was also highlighted in the paper. The highlights included excerpts from presentations and the status of the consortium development. At that seminar it was suggested that the new consortium, still under discussion at that time, would have the "potential to meet most of the colleges' concerns about the advanced training needs of their students" (p. 4).

Finally, the paper set out issues for the universities to consider, including the position that the "Consortium Agreement should be strongly supported by the universities as an alternative to the applied baccalaureate degree" (p. 11), that "only universities are authorized to award degrees of any kind" (p. 11), and that while it supported "positive, cooperative relationships" (p. 11) with the Ontario colleges, it must "oppose a step that would undermine the stability of the Ontario university degree" (p. 11).

Several papers were also published in the College Quarterly dealing with both articulation and degree-granting issues. Michael Skolnik's (1995) "Should the CAATs Grant Degrees?" carefully considered the question from several angles. While stating that the standard definition of a degree is "circularly unhelpful" because it is essentially "what those who have the legal authority to award one say that it is" (p.1), Skolnik (1995) suggested that the primary motivation for the proposals from the colleges to grant degrees "seems to be that of enhancing - or recognizing - the stature of the CAATs" (p. 4). Further, Skolnik (1995) posited that

"[a]lthough there has been a considerable increase in the number of bilateral transfer agreements between individual CAATs and universities in the past half dozen years, there are still no provincial infrastructure, policy, nor arrangements governing transfer and degree completion in Ontario which are remotely comparable to what exists in say, British Columbia or Alberta" (pp. 4-5).

Rather than pursue degree-granting Skolnik (1995) suggested that "the first priority should be on developing the articulation policy and mechanisms ... " (p. 5), as well as the development of concurrent programs in which the graduate would receive both a CAAT diploma and a university degree. While concurrent programs are a "real challenge to the bureaucratic structures in both sectors ... [they] show postsecondary education at its best: diverse institutions cooperating to enable students to make the best use of the combined resources of the whole system" (p. 6).

In Erika Gottlieb's (1995) paper entitled "Reconciling the University with the Community College" it is posited that "in Ontario, there has developed a great divide between the two major models of post-secondary education, and this schism ... has long-range intellectual and political-social implications" (p. 1). This division is compared to the satirical situation in David Lodge's novel *Nice Work,* where the separation of theory and practice in postsecondary education has disastrous consequences (p. 1). Gottlieb (1995) warns that the "potentially disastrous results of such sharp segregation of the university-calibre student from the community college student have possibly even more severe repercussions in Canada, specifically in Ontario" (p. 2). As well, "we must reconcile our divided selves and our divided institutions ... [as] removing the barrier between community college and university for the student would also

enhance the potential for teaching excellence both at the community college and at the university level" (Gottlieb, 1995, p. 3).

In June of 1996 the Minister of Education and Training, John Snobelen, announced the establishment of the College-University Consortium Council whose mandate was " to facilitate, promote and coordinate joint education and training ventures that will: aid the transfer of students from sector to sector; facilitate the creation of joint programs between colleges and universities; and, further the development of a more seamless continuum of postsecondary education in Ontario (CUCC Report, 1998, p. 2).

The Council was sponsored jointly by COU, the Council of Presidents of ACAATO, and the Ministry of Education and Training (MET). It included one representative from MET, three representatives from CAATs and three from universities. Its main objectives (CUCC, 1996) were to:

- facilitate province-wide transfer of credit between colleges and universities through the development of "model" policies, guidelines and procedures;

- encourage the development of sequential or concurrent college-university advanced training programs, including degree/diploma programs related to specific disciplines that are key to Ontario's economic renewal;

- promote the value of college-university programming and, in particular, joint academic venture that maximize the utilization of resources for both sectors;

- encourage the development of partnerships with industry and linkages with labour market needs and the government's industrial and social priorities (p. 2).

Additional objectives of the Council included: developing review criteria and project

evaluation mechanisms for advanced training initiatives; updating the Ontario Transfer Guide;

reporting on an annual basis to the Minister of Education and Training; and organizing sessions

in order to encourage institutional innovation and discussion of issues (CUCC, 1996, p. 3).

In July, 1996 a discussion paper entitled *Future Goals for Ontario Colleges and*

Universities was released in order to initiate and focus the public consultation with the Advisory

Panel on Future Directions for Postsecondary Education which would take place between July

and December of that year. This would be the only comprehensive review of postsecondary

education in Ontario since *The Learning Society* report in 1972. In his preamble, John Snobelen,

the Minister of Education and Training, states that although "we have reason to be proud of our

postsecondary educational institutions and their performance over the years, we must recognize

that changes will have to be made if they are to continue to meet the educational needs of the

province". The panel was specifically asked to identify ways to promote and support co-

operation between colleges and universities, among other things.

The paper specified that the policy framework within which decisions were made about

postsecondary education needed to be reviewed and updated. It discussed five broad objectives

that should guide policy development: excellence; accessibility; a range of programs and

institutions; accountability; and responsiveness to evolving needs (pp. 5-6). It further outlined

the factors influencing policy development as being: demographic factors; changes in labour

force requirements and social policy priorities; funding considerations; and the use of

technology (pp. 7-9). There was clear emphasis on the need for increased cooperation and

partnerships between colleges and universities and a caution that the changes urged were, indeed

necessary both to meet evolving educational needs and to adjust to new fiscal realities (p. 13).

While the Panel was compiling its report both colleges and universities, along with many other interested parties submitted briefs; 185 in all. ACAATO (1996) submitted a brief representing the collective college leadership views from both the Council of Governors and the Council of Presidents. It stated that "Ontario community colleges have earned a consistent and respected record of achievement in providing career education and training ... over the past 30 years [and, that] colleges have proven to be change leaders in the education sector..." (p. 1).

There were five recommendations of the Council of Governors which included: first, "the establishment of a comprehensive and coherent education and training vision within Ontario's social and economic policy framework; second, the "immediate implementation of education and training policy that respects institutional diversity and promotes flexibility, investment and innovation incentives ..."; and third, "flexible policy ... to support distance education, shared program delivery, [and] prior learning assessment/credit transfer ..." (p. 2).

The Council of Presidents made twenty-five recommendations under six core mandates: mandate of colleges; value for money; accountability; flexibility; accreditation and standards; and cost sharing and accessibility (pp. 2-4). The first four recommendations of the accreditation and standards core message were:

1. Create a mechanism to recognize the full value of college programs' learning outcomes by universities and other institutions;

2. Provide the option for colleges to offer applied degrees in specialized areas;

3. Clarify the meaning of the college postsecondary diploma in the international marketplace;

4. Improve degree completion opportunities for college graduates with

significant recognition of college diploma standards toward university degrees

(p. 3).

The brief stated that "Ontario's community colleges are at the crossroads of quality, access and funding. Environmental pressures for change are unprecedented. Colleges value diversity and provide opportunities for invitational lifelong learning to Ontario's population across the social and economic spectrum" (p. 6). In order for the colleges to "advance toward [their] vision" it was requested that the government "reduce dysfunctional duplication among education sectors" and "value new models of collaboration and entrepreneurship" (p. 6). It was cited that:

> College graduates have sometimes been penalized because their learning
>
> achievements have not been recognized by universities. In some cases,
>
> recognition has been ad hoc and subjective. While some universities have
>
> developed long-standing articulation agreements, others do not judge college
>
> credits to be transferable. The pace of developing program by program transfer
>
> agreements is too slow to be acceptable to the public of Ontario. Lack of PLA
>
> and credit transfer policy is a barrier to access and it results in unnecessary
>
> duplication and wasted resources (pp. 10-11).

The Council of Ontario Universities Committee on Relationships Between the Universities and Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology submitted a brief as well in October, 1996. In the brief it was stated that the Committee was "pleased to contribute to the Panel's examination of this topic by focusing on the changing relationship between the college and university sectors in Ontario" and that "Ontario universities are committed to working with

colleges to develop programs that enable students who have earned college diplomas to complete requirements for a university degree in an efficient and timely manner" (p. 1). It was acknowledged that "both systems have been in considerable evolution over the past twenty-five years", however, the very next paragraph reminded the panel that colleges were "deliberately established with mandates and target audiences different from those of the universities"; that "few mechanisms were established to facilitate cooperation between the two sectors"; and that "colleges and universities also differ with regard to their structure and their operations" (p. 1).

The brief reiterated the perceptions of the Ontario college-university relationship as identified in Marshall's (1995) speech and discussed some of them individually from the university perspective, while labelling the others "more myth than fact" (p. 3). The paper also commented on a 1994 survey of universities by the Council on University Planning and Analysis of the barriers to university-college cooperation. It pointed out that the proposed College-University consortium would be the appropriate body to deal with such barriers, which included organizational structure, cost, funding and enrolment counting policies and geography, as well as academic issues such as admission requirements and the assessment and granting of credit transfer (p. 11). There were four recommendations put forth in the paper:

> 1. the Ontario postsecondary sectors continue to move beyond strictly bilateral transfer agreements by establishing more provincially articulated and communicated transfer arrangements;
>
> 2. colleges and universities continue to be encouraged to work together to develop new articulation agreements, where the two systems share in program delivery and where some unmet vocational need can be identified;

3. the CSAC initiative be continued within the Ministry, with adequate staffing

and resources, as the foundation for enhanced transfer between the colleges and

the universities;

4. the Ministry of Education and Training continue to provide the necessary

resources to the Advanced Training Consortium to encourage and assist

appropriate collaboration, including new models of collaboration that might

evolve (pp. 12-13).

In December, 1996 the Panel's report, *Excellence, Accessibility, Responsibility* was

released (called the Smith Report). The Panel clearly stated at the beginning of the report that

they believe "the basic structure of Ontario's postsecondary sector is sound ... , there is no need

to impose a grand new design ... [yet,] there are clear signs that the postsecondary sector is under

pressure" (p. 2). The Panel was, however "convinced that, without significant change in the way

the sector is evolving and the way it is resourced, its quality and accessibility will be undermined

... " (p. 2).

A general principle that the Panel endorsed in arriving at their conclusions and eighteen

recommendations (see Appendix IV) was: "Postsecondary education must evolve in a way which

provides the opportunity for a high-quality learning experience to every Ontarian who is

motivated to seek it and who has the ability to pursue it" (p. 3). This operating principle guided

the Panel to frame its comments within several themes. The "framework" in which these themes

— excellence, accessibility and responsibility — "would best be developed" included several

characteristics: differentiation in strengths; a less regulated environment; accountability;

performance; and adequacy of resources (p. 3).

.

The report carefully considered the roles and linkages of the two institutions. It considered the changing mandate of the colleges, yet re-affirmed the distinct, but complementary, aspects of the two systems. While this was seen as a strength of Ontario's system, the need for further change in policies and regulations affecting colleges was clearly indicated. "There should be no unnecessary barriers to students wishing to transfer between universities and colleges" (p. 42) is a clear indicator of the position of the Panel, who were also "encouraged by the degree of activity in recent years in developing linkages among colleges and universities" (p. 43).

The strategy proposed for the future included the belief of the Panel that "our postsecondary institutions need room to experiment ...[and that a] complementary relationship among institutions, rather than a hierarchical relationship, should emerge" (p.19). The Panel saw "no reason to eliminate the distinctions between colleges and universities ... [since] the existing duality captures an important reality in postsecondary education" (p. 19). They did stress, however, that "the ease with which a student can move between the two systems and draw on the different strengths of various institutions will be a key factor in the delivery of the type of academic and vocational and advanced training programs that students need now and in the future" (p. 19).

The eighteen recommendations of the Panel included nine recommendations related to sharing the costs of postsecondary education among all participants. These included: consideration of the "level and distribution of public support, including support for research; the ways in which private sector support could be increased; and the policies on tuition and student support required to prevent the erosion of quality and access" (p. 21).

The next four recommendations (10-13) were related to the roles of postsecondary institutions and the linkages between and among them. They included "ways to enhance college credentials ... [and] views on the need for an advisory body to provide information and analysis" (p. 21). The Panel endorsed the aims of the CUCC and "anticipate[d] that further innovation in the development of joint programming will be achieved ..." (p. 42). The Panel also found that during their consultations there was support expressed for increased linkages, yet, there were differing views on how to proceed. As well, the Panel "was advised that further development of linkages will depend on resolving impediments to the development of college-university programs" (p. 42).

The final five recommendations (14-18) stemmed from an analysis of "issues related to future demand for postsecondary education, including the capacity of existing institutions to meet demand"; an examination of "ways of preserving excellence through strategies for attracting and retaining the finest teachers and researchers, and for ensuring high standards of performance"; and an exploration of the "conditions under which privately-funded not-for-profit universities might emerge in Ontario" (p. 21).

Related Discussion Papers

For the next year or so the CUCC was busy fulfilling its mandate and there was nothing much written on the topic of college-university cooperation until February of 1998. At this time David Marshall, who was both Chair of the COU Committee on College-University Relations and Co-Chair of the CUCC wrote a paper entitled College-University Relationships in Ontario. In it he queried the "increasingly pervading notion that our colleges and universities are in some kind of competition with each other ... (p. 1) and suggested that " ... the problems and issues at

this interface have received far too much attention of late, drawing needed attention away from the central problem facing post-secondary education in Ontario: lack of public/government support" (p. 1). The basis for this confrontation was explored as were ways to resolve the issues in order to move ahead as one united system.

In considering what "has changed over the past decade to upset this comfortable balance of roles" (p. 3) several possibilities were examined. The first was a changing workworld in which the workers required needed a different set of skills and knowledge from those of the past. Colleges have increased the academic rigour of their programs, while universities have added more technological components to theirs. The result, according to Marshall (1998), is that each has begun to "bump into each other's traditional missions and roles" (p. 4).

The other reason, the "essence ... [of the] ... confrontation, ... boils down to a fundamental disagreement over the title 'degree'" (p. 4) in which the colleges are pursuing two strategies: degree granting and articulation. Colleges, Marshall (1998) maintained, "want the benefits of the degree distinction for their graduates" (p. 5) and "believe that Ontario universities are far too slow to enter into ... articulations" (p. 6).

Marshall (1998) cited "tremendous advances in this area over the past five years in Ontario" (p. 6) due to the efforts such as that of the CUCC, which funded 15 articulation projects in 1996-1997. However, the question remains whether college graduates would find the amount of credit granted "satisfactory", given that "[m]any of these initiatives have, as yet, to move to a system level" (p. 7). It is suggested that "a graduate of a three-year diploma at a college should be able to find a university that would give two years' credit towards a similar (same discipline) four-year degree" (p. 7).

In offering suggestions for what could be done to deal with the issues at hand, Marshall

(1998) first stated that "much research needs to be done to determine the pervasiveness and

nature of the problem" (p.8). Suggestions were made that were mindful of future policy

directions. They were:

1. There is no evidence to suggest that there is any need in Ontario, at this time,

for any new kind of polytechnic institute that somehow combines, in one

institution, the vocational and the academic ... ;

2. Offering Ontario's colleges the opportunity to provide baccalaureate degrees

will solve very little in the long run ... ;

3. There is a need to consider a new and distinguishable credential for college

graduates ... ;

4. Notwithstanding the label problems, the establishment of system-wide levels

of articulation between Ontario's colleges and universities is the most appropriate

strategy for addressing the substantive concerns at the college-university

interface ... ;

5. There is no formal structure in place for Ontario's college and university

systems to work together in the resolution of these and other post-secondary

challenges in Ontario ... ;

6. Finally, in all of this, it must not be lost that, by far, the most significant

challenge facing both our colleges and universities is the shortage of funds ...

(pp. 9-11).

Shortly after this paper's submission to COU its Committee on College-University

Relations in Ontario sent a letter to the Minister of Education and Training, David Johnson, to apprise him of the current state of the "issue" from the COU's perspective. The position of COU was that: only Ontario universities should have degree-granting privilege; universities should work closely with colleges to ensure the most seamless and appropriate access to university; universities should provide special degree completion programs for college graduates, especially in regulated professions; COU and the Ontario government have a mandate to protect the "brand name" of the university degree; there are many examples of articulation agreements of which college graduates can take advantage which are "convenient and efficient"; and, articulation is "without a doubt, the best strategy to provide college students with access to a university degree" (pp. 2-3).

The letter's summative comments indicated that the COU "agree[s] that there remains much to accomplish in the college-university area"; "system obstacles ... need to be remedied"; the "credential problem for the colleges is real and the universities have an obligation to help look for an appropriate solution"; that there needs to be a "consistent policy with regard to ministerial consents for degree completion programs on college campuses"; and, "most of all, Ontario's colleges and universities need to work as one in responding to such challenges as secondary school reform, tuition deregulation and so on" (p. 3). Finally, the conclusion stated that the "COU will continue to work with the colleges and the Ministry to address the issues outlined in this letter and other aspects of the evolving relationship between the two sectors in Ontario" (p. 3).

Nearing the latter part of its two year mandate the CUCC held a symposium in February, 1998 entitled College-University Collaboration - Myth or Destiny? At that time Rodger

Cummins, who had been commissioned to study the movement between Ontario universities and colleges, reported his findings to the Council. It wanted "hard evidence" on: movement of students and graduates between Ontario colleges and universities, and their success in those programs; the most important characteristics of students in both colleges and universities; and the aspirations of college students and graduates to move to universities and vice versa and the barriers which face them (1998, p. 2).

Cummins (1998) first noted that "sound evidence that is reliable, complete and current does not appear to exist" (p. 2). He reported on characteristics of the clients, their movement into postsecondary education, as well as within it, and then summarized both knowns and unknowns. While Cummins was asked to examine existing sources of evidence, it was concluded that such sources were interesting, but inconclusive in providing an accurate view of the "big picture".

The data presented, while admittedly underestimated, showed that there is significant movement within the postsecondary education sector, although it was still not clear to what extent. This suggested that there needs to be closer analysis of this movement in order to obtain a true picture on which to base policy decisions.

Following the symposium the CUCC released a paper outlining the issues arising from its work on fifteen collaborative projects. These projects, one of the major objectives of the Council, had received over $800,000 in funding. There were: four projects in nursing and health education; two in applied health sciences/technologies; two in business; four in liberal arts; and three in technology. The issues identified were of two types — functional and contextual — and were grouped under seventeen headings as logistical; access (including admissions standards,

requirements and student success); governance (including funding, registration and tuition, human resources and program approvals); academic (including reciprocity, delivery, rigour, and curriculum reform); mandate; and relationship.

It was acknowledged in the paper that the mandates for both colleges and universities "are blurring at the edges" (p. 4). It was strongly suggested, as well, that "cooperation, not competitiveness, is the key to an effective postsecondary education system for the next century", and that "mindset changes are needed" (p. 5).

Later in the spring of 1998 the COU Committee on Relationships Between the Universities and Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology revisited the college credential issue and released a revised version of its submission to the Smith Panel from 1996. It detailed developments since 1995, citing that COU's position is generally consistent with the recommendations of the Smith Panel (1996), and that "substantial progress in articulation and degree-completion opportunities " (p. 3) had been made by the CUCC pilot projects.

An "informal, off-the-record" (p. 5) meeting of university and college presidents in January, 1998 was summarized, in which it was concluded that there should be a new mandate for the CUCC; one which "would go beyond project management and into policy analysis and reaction" (p. 5).

The conclusions of the paper reiterated the COU's opposition to degree-granting status for colleges; its assumption that the degree-granting issue is separate from the transfer credit issue; and that it should "continue to counter the misinformation that prevails about the Ontario universities: that they are obstructionist, that college credentials are not recognized for transfer, and that the current evolutionary approach to collaboration is too slow or ineffective" (p. 7).

In August of 1998 the CUCC submitted a report to the Minister of Education and

Training on its first two year mandate. It stated that considerable learning about the issues

related to collaboration had been achieved as a result of its four main activities: the fifteen

sponsored collaborative projects; a provincial symposium where results of the projects were

presented; the Ontario college-university transfer guide project; and a study of postsecondary

student movement patterns in Ontario (p. 3).

Of the fifteen collaborative projects, which had received a total funding of over

$800,000, six had achieved their outcomes. It was concluded that these results "demonstrate the

greater willingness of colleges and universities to work together to provide diverse cost-effective

postsecondary learning opportunities for students" (p. 4).

Five of the projects partially achieved their outcomes; three of which anticipated further

progress. The conclusions from these projects were: "that barriers to collaboration may be

positively addressed by clarifying the values and perceptions of the other sector, evolving

alternative perspectives and questioning past practice. Their deliberations changed many false

perceptions of each sector through teamwork, dialogue and mutual disclosure of interests" (p. 5).

It was indicated that articulation issues, such as the admissibility of college graduates without

OAC and their readiness for university level courses were "especially troublesome" (p. 5). It

was also indicated, however, that the progress achieved in resolving issues related to admission

requirements "is a testimony to changing attitudes and recognition of the excellence of college

programming" (p. 5).

The last four projects did not achieve their outcomes. "The absence of a policy

framework that supports collaborative programming and provides financial incentives for

institutions in both sectors to invest the resources needed to develop and implement programs and agreements that are atypical was frequently cited as a deterrent to successful collaboration" (p. 5).

There were numerous conclusions reached as a result of the efforts of the projects. They included: a call for a "system-wide commitment and protocols"; special funding for collaborative programs; empowerment of team members for decision-making; recognition of the quality of learning achieved in each sector; accountability mechanisms; and a clear role of government in setting policies and guidelines for future collaborative efforts (pp. 5-6).

Other, general conclusions reached as a result of the research project on movement of students, development of the transfer guide, and the symposium were that: due to the challenge by public, governments and business to work more effectively, Ontario needs a stable forum where colleges and universities can engage in open discussion, problem solve and vision in the interests of learners; and that the CUCC's mandate should be renewed.

Beginning in October of 1998 degree-granting became an issue between colleges and universities in Ontario with the release of the *Report of the COU Task Force on Ministerial Consents* (1998). The Task Force was responding to the increasing number of applications (over 20) for Ministerial Consent, which are the requirement for out-of-province universities to offer programs in Ontario. It was contended in the report that the "majority of these applications fall outside the original intent of the Ministerial Consent purview" since the policy was "intended to allow out-of-province institutions to offer to Ontario students (on a time-limited basis) degree programs not offered by Ontario universities" (p. 1). A number of the applications pending were degree completion programs to be offered in partnership with Ontario colleges, for example,

twelve of the applications were from Athabasca University in partnership with Sir Sandford Fleming College. Others were intended to establish permanent facilities; also not the intention of the policy.

The Task Force's position was that Ontario's universities "are interested in meeting, as much as possible, the existing and emerging societal needs for university-level education and are confident that, in many instances, they can compete with out-of-province institutions based on the quality product they deliver. However, to do so they must first be informed of the perceived need. Second, their plans for meeting that need must be given due consideration" (p. 1).

As a result, the Task Force developed a set of eight principles and numerous step-wise processes for the review of Ministerial Consents which clearly specified the conditions under which consents would be granted.

Further to this position being stated, ACAATO passed a resolution on December 1, 1998, which requested that the Minister of Education and Training authorize CAATs to offer applied degrees in specialized program areas. The whole debate over degree-granting appeared to be descending into defensive posturing on both sides.

In addition to its position on Ministerial Consents, COU also struck a Task Force to re-examine its position regarding degree-granting authority for the colleges, which released a report in January, 1999. There were five aspects to this issue considered: the position of college presidents; the educational objectives of college students; the degree-granting models in two western provinces; the current level and types of articulation and collaboration arrangements between Ontario's colleges and universities; and current impediments to such arrangements (p. 1). As well, the Task Force considered the progress and ongoing work of the CUCC.

The report stated that while "significant progress has been made to date in the area of program credit transfer and collaboration, ... that an expansion and improvement of the opportunities for Ontario's college students to complete a degree is a laudable goal ..." (p. 3). It was suggested that "Ontario's universities can provide college students with access to degrees through degree-completion and joint/integrated programs, and by expanding articulation agreements with the colleges in an accelerated fashion" (p. 3). The Task Force "believe[d] that the proportion of college students interested in completing a degree would increase if some of the impediments to access were removed" (p. 5).

The report identified "numerous issues ... as impediments to the implementation of articulated and collaborative programs ... " (p. 11), which, it stated, needed to be addressed. They are:

1. Funding and tuition fees;

2. Enrolment counting and corridor funding policies;

3. Equalization of program costs;

4. Quality assurance and standards;

5. Bridging and remediation;

6. Assessment and access to information;

7. Start-up costs;

8. Strategic behaviour (pp. 11-12).

The final recommendation of the Task Force was for "Ontario's universities to adopt an accelerated approach to greater articulation and collaboration with Ontario's colleges that includes a proposal for multi-college degree-completion arrangements" (p. 13). The key

elements of such a proposal would be: a clear policy from the government that establishes a stable framework; a commitment by colleges and universities to accelerate articulation agreements; and additional funding to address the described impediments, to support start-up costs and to offset the increased costs associated with course delivery (p. 13). It was deemed important that a "high level working group representing the Ministry should be created to provide recommendations to the Minister regarding specific policy and funding changes that will facilitate the accelerated articulation approach and identify the major specific arrangements for consideration" (p. 13). To date, however, there has been no action in this regard.

In January of 1999, Michael Skolnik's paper, *CAATs, Universities, and Degrees: Towards Some Options for Enhancing the Connection between CAATs and Degrees*, which had been commissioned by CUCC, was released. Its purpose was threefold: to outline the "principal factors which have led to increased urgency for Ontario colleges of applied arts and technology (CAATS) to secure arrangements that would enable many of their students to obtain a degree; [to] survey the major issues associated with improving degree opportunities for CAAT students; and [to] present a number of options to achieve this goal" (p. i).

Skolnik (1999) discussed all of the available options, questioned past policy and practice in Ontario and presented several opinions on the issues. He suggested that an alternative to the sectoral approach, currently used in Ontario, would be a system approach "in which all elements of postsecondary education are treated as components of a whole" (p. 13), as in Australia.

The six options presented for enhancing CAAT-university cooperation and degree opportunities were:

   1. Assign responsibility for leadership to some province level body;

2. Develop a vision and framework for inter-sector cooperation to which all or most interested parties subscribe;

3. Arrange for the function of an open university to be carried out in Ontario;

4. Develop and disseminate model agreements for degree completion;

5. On a competitive basis, approve a limited number of applied degree initiatives in selected areas;

6. Encourage the creation of at least one conglomerate postsecondary institution which incorporates a university and a CAAT under a single governing board (pp. 15-21).

Shortly after Skolnik's (1999) paper was released the College-University Relations SubCommittee of the Academic Vice-Presidents, ACAATO released a response to the COU Ministerial Consents report (January, 1999). The response paper, which was endorsed by the Committee of Presidents of the colleges, presented the colleges' perspective both on the Ministerial Consents issue, as well as on the current state of Ontario college-university relations and provided a set of four recommendations to the Minister for consideration.

First, a need for out-of-province degree completion opportunities in Ontario was presented. Several reasons were cited, including: meeting the needs of employers and stimulating economic development; expanding flexible educational opportunities; providing a cost effective alternative; capitalizing on technological advances; providing access for college graduates from northern and semi-urban regions; and meeting the double cohort and demographics challenge (pp. 2-5).

Second, the current state of degree completion opportunities was presented from the

colleges' perspective. Citing the recommendations of past reports and commissions (as previously cited in this review), as well as the outcome of the CUCC collaborative projects, (six of fifteen projects achieving their goals) several reasons for the "persistent inactivity and lack of significant progress despite the best efforts of colleges and universities" (p. 5). The reasons include:

a) The university corridor funding system acts as a disincentive for collaboration with colleges;

b) The lengthy process for program approval at universities;

c) Attitudinal barriers;

d) Lack of system-wide policies and procedures for collaborative agreements;

e) Lack of effective collaborative program funding formulas;

f) Lack of transfer credit incentive for university faculty and staff (pp. 5-6).

Further it was stated that "until these barriers are addressed in a substantial way, it is unlikely that major improvements will be seen in Ontario college-university collaborative efforts [and that the] growing number of applications for ministerial consent are a reflection of this environment" (p. 6).

Third, the paper recommended several guiding principles for degree completion opportunities for colleges graduates, which included: assuring the integrity of credentials offered; meeting the higher education needs of business and industry and colleges graduates; ensuring appropriate credit for college diploma and post-diploma graduates; and expanding the range of degree completion options to ensure flexibility and choice for college graduates (p. 7).

Fourth, the paper reiterated the current guidelines for Ministerial Consent applications

and critiqued the COU's recommended process for granting such consents, citing it as "unacceptable", as a "fundamental policy shift based on the premise that institutional accreditation in the home jurisdiction is not a sufficient determinant of academic quality for out-of-province universities", and as "contradictory since a province-wide 'standard' does not exist" (p. 7).

Finally, four CAAT recommendations were presented. These included recommendations that: the protocols and procedures recommended by COU should not be adopted; the existing protocols should be maintained until such time as jointly recommended changes could be made; the six outstanding applications for Ministerial Consent be immediately addressed; and the Ministry should remove the moratorium on considering additional applications for ministerial consent (pp. 8-9).

On March 26, 1999 The Ontario College-University Degree Completion Accord (called the Port Hope Accord) was made official. This was the second draft of principles and a matrix for degree completion recommended by the CUCC. The framework is intended to complement other arrangements such as joint and concurrent programs, in facilitating "expansion of degree completion programs in areas where there is substantial academic affinity". Additionally, it is stated that "universities will work to develop new post-diploma degrees for college programs for which there are no apparent affinity degrees". It is clearly stated that "the Ministry of Education and Training will work with colleges and universities to resolve funding issues related to articulation and joint programming".

One university in each region would "actively pursue the implementation of this accord" and it would be deemed successful "if degree completion arrangements are developed for 90%

of programs with substantial academic affinity" (p. 1).

Program teams of equal representation by university and college partners will recommend degree completion agreements to their governing bodies. Learning achieved by college graduates would be recognized and there would be respect for the missions and academic standards of all partners and necessary changes to curriculum would occur to facilitate both transition from college and direct entry to university.

Of the numerous comments (many positive, some negative) related to the Degree Completion Accord, David Marshall (1999), notably someone whose opinion is informed through experience with articulation, wrote a paper outlining both his comments and suggestions. First, he suggests that the "most expedient way for Ontario universities to comply with the type of template that CUCC proposes would be to develop these specific post-diploma degrees, not the modification of existing degree requirements" (p. 4).

Next, Marshall (1999) proposes a matrix of articulation/degree completion objectives to guide consideration of appropriate levels of advanced standing/credit transfer. The matrix includes three types of articulation - diplomas with no affinity, some affinity and high affinity - and five levels of articulation possible: credit transfer; existing program to existing program articulation; specifically designed degree completion degrees; articulated student flow arrangements; and jointly delivered programs, where each cell of the matrix would suggest a different degree of articulation (p. 6).

It is suggested that "if we are looking for the most expedient path to degree completion for Ontario college graduates, we must consider (i) the public policy purpose/objectives (ii) the specific diplomas under consideration and (iii) the type of articulation most appropriate

(Marshall, 1999, p. 7).

Finally, a set of observations are presented, which include one that purports that "the template that CUCC has proposed would only work for specifically designed degree completion programs and perhaps a very small number of closely aligned college and university programs. However, the CUCC could perhaps develop alternate templates for different types of program affinities" (p. 8).

Conclusions

It is clear from the preceding review of the literature that there are, in fact, numerous, clearly identifiable barriers to articulation agreements between colleges and universities in Ontario. These barriers, which are said to include attitudinal, policy, funding and structural components have been identified by both college and university sectors as "impediments to the implementation of articulated and collaborative programs ..." (COU Task Force on Degree Granting, 1999, p. 11). The reports, commission recommendations, and studies reviewed (see Table 1 for summary of studies and recommendations) identify that there have been significant changes in the context of postsecondary education in Ontario in the past thirty years. Both postsecondary systems have grown and matured, as well as moved closer to each other's mandates. The lines which separate them have become blurred over time, yet the lack of a formal mechanism for collaboration, coupled with a lack of incentive to pursue collaborative endeavours, has resulted in a system which is not meeting the current needs of its consumers - the students. Consequently, the barriers to increased collaboration continue to exist and to impede progress toward a seamless pathway by which students can obtain both degree and diploma credentials.

It has been cited several times by several sources that more research needs to be conducted on this topic in order to clearly examine the true extent of the problem. Despite the numerous recommendations of past studies and discussion papers, the creation of a system of suitable articulation agreements which will provide a smooth pathway, or a seamless transfer, for students within postsecondary education does not exist yet. Thus, further in-depth examination of the barriers which currently exist is necessary so that postsecondary education in Ontario does not stagnate within the Canadian higher education.

TABLE 1 - Summary of Literature

Year	Task Force/Paper	Recommendations	Action that followed
1962	Advisory Committee on University Affairs (Deutsch Committee)	colleges offer first two years of coursework	not implemented for fear of inferior status for colleges, third year, and pressure to grant degrees
1966	Commission to Study the Development of Graduate (Spinks Committee)	no master plan for higher education	still not implemented 33 years later
1972	*Learning Society Report*		deemed too radical
1981	Fisher		
1984	Bovey	studied universities only	
1981	Task Force for CAAT Growth	mandate of colleges not congruent with present picture - recommended thorough review and development of blueprint for future to address admission policy, funding and governance	no
1985	Pitman Report (1ˢᵗ)	colleges viewed as industrial organizations recommendations led to Vision 2000 - sweeping changes to governance structure of colleges	no
1990	*Vision 2000*	colleges at crossroads, change is necessary 40 recommendations namely articulation	led to Task Force on Advanced Training

TABLE 1 - Continued

1993	Task Force on Advanced Training (2nd Pitman Report) *No Dead Ends*	major structural change to both college and university systems, policy and attitude - recommended elimination of the barriers to inter- sectoral transfer and an agency to provide leadership listed impediments to transfer as absence of policy; informal nature of arrangements resulting in inconsistent treatment of students; limited recognition of college courses; local basis of transfer	no
1994	Transfer Guide		
1995	Marshall speech on Trends in University-College Relationships in the 90s	significant dimensions of difference are independence; governance; academic decision-making; collective bargaining; financial; student entry; and mission 12 perceptions 2 trends from *Vision 2000* and *No Dead Ends* - CUCC and degree-granting for colleges	
1995	COU Paper - *New Credentials for the Ontario Colleges? Background and Options*	CUCC would be helpful, no degree-granting for colleges	
1995	Skolnik Paper - *Should CAATs Grant Degrees?*	no provincial infrastructure policy, nor arrangements governing transfer - suggested first priority should be developing articulation policy and	no

TABLE - 1 Continued

		mechanisms and concurrent programs
1995	Gottlieb Paper - *Reconciling the University with the Community College*	great divide in postsecondary education - schism has long range intellectual and political-social implications
1996	CUCC established	mandate - to facilitate, promote and coordinate joint education and training ventures
1996	*Future Goals for the Ontario Colleges and Universities*	changes have to be made to continue to meet the needs of the province policy framework needs reviewing and updating 5 objectives of policy development, factors influencing policy development emphasis on need for increased cooperation and partnership of two sectors and a caution that changes were necessary
1996	ACAATO Brief to Smith Panel	5 recommendations of Council of Governors, 25 recommendations of Council of Presidents stated colleges at a crossroads of quality, access and funding
1996	COU Brief to Smith Panel	acknowledged considerable evolution of both systems over last 25 years, cited 1994 Council on University Planning and Analysis survey of universities

TABLE 1 - Continued

		on barriers to university-college cooperation - they are organizational structure; cost; funding and enrolment counting; policies; geography; academic issues; admission requirements; assessment of credit	
		4 recommendations	no
1996	Smith Report	significant change necessary, acknowledged changing mandate of colleges, cited there should be no unnecessary barriers 18 recommendations - 9 related to cost sharing 4 related to roles and linkages 5 related to issues	no
1998	Marshall Paper - *College-University Relationships in Ontario*	notion of competition, cited advances in last 5 years, need research, 6 suggestions for future policy	
1998	COU Committee on College-University Relations in Ontario - letter to Minister (included Marshall's paper)	no degree granting for colleges, universities should work with colleges, universities should provide special degree completion programs, there is much to accomplish and system obstacles need to be remedied, credential problem for colleges real and universities are obliged to help look for solutions, need consistent policy on ministerial consents, universities and colleges need to work as one	no

TABLE 1 - Continued

1998	CUCC Symposium - College-University Collaboration - Myth or Destiny?	no sound evidence exists, significant movement within postsecondary sector - needs closer analysis
1998	CUCC Paper - *Issues Arising from Collaborative Research Projects*	2 types of issues identified - functional and contextual - 17 headings acknowledged mandates of both colleges and universities are blurring at the edges
1998	COU Committee on Relationships Between Universities and Colleges	revision of brief to Smith Panel - CUCC mandate to go beyond project management into policy analysis and reaction - reiterated COU's opposition to degree granting for colleges, seen as separate issue from transfer credit
1998	*CUCC Report*	4 activities: collaborative projects, 6 achieved goals, 5 partially achieved goals, 4 did not achieve goals; policy framework and funding incentives cited as reasons - numerous conclusions - symposium; transfer guide; study of movement patterns
1998	*Report of the COU Task Force on Ministerial Consents*	limit consents 8 principles and step-wise processes
1998	ACAATO - Request for Degree-Granting	
1999	COU Task Force on Degree-Granting	no to degree-granting, but the proportion of credential

TABLE 1 - Continued

		college graduates completing degrees would increase if some of the impediments were removed - identified numerous issues - final recommendation - Ontario universities need to accelerate approaches to greater articulation which includes a proposal for multi- college degree-completion arrangements - included key elements of proposal - need working group	no
1999	Skolnik Paper - *CAATs, Universities, and Degrees: Towards Some Options for Enhancing the Connection Between CAATs and Degrees* (commissioned by CUCC)	discussed 6 options - questioned past policy and presented opinions - system approach versus sectoral approach	
1999	ACAATO Response to COU Ministerial Consents Paper	cited reasons for lack of progress and need to go out-of-province, guiding principles for degree completion - 4 recommendations	

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

While it is difficult to categorize some qualitative research, this study falls within the theoretical framework of ethnography. It is a descriptive study which consists of semi-structured interviews with senior administrators at colleges and universities to examine a situation which currently exists in postsecondary education - the acknowledged existence of barriers to collaboration between the two sectors. This examination is intended to provide a complete view of the nature and degree of the problem from the perspectives of those involved.

Population

In the present study Presidents and Vice-Presidents, Academic of all colleges and universities in Ontario were interviewed. Additionally, Deans at some colleges and universities in areas specifically chosen to geographically represent the entire province were also interviewed. It was deemed that surveying these three levels of administrators - President, Vice-President, Academic, and Dean - would yield the most information about articulation agreements in each system. Faculty in each system were not included, as they may, or may not have had any information, or experience with articulation. As a result of the design of this study the total number of interviews conducted was 93.

Procedures

The instrument consisted of an open-ended survey containing six questions (See Table 2). The instrument was limited to six questions due to the in-depth nature of each question and to the time constraint under which the participants in the study were deemed to operate. It was important that the responses to this survey not be considered an onerous task for the respondents.

TABLE 2 - Survey Instrument

---

1. What do you perceive as the current barriers to articulation agreements between colleges and universities in Ontario?

2. In relation to each barrier identified, what do you suggest are the reasons?

3. What would you suggest needs to occur in the future that may prompt change of this situation?

4. What types of agreements does your institution (area used for Deans) currently have articulated, or in progress?

5. Describe the process by which these agreements were negotiated.

6. Is there any other information that you think pertinent to this investigation - comments, or pearls of wisdom?

A letter was mailed to each potential participant to introduce the study and to clearly

state the purpose of the research (See Appendix IV). The President of Fanshawe College (the

researcher's employer) co-signed the letter, which was on Fanshawe College letterhead, to

encourage other senior administrators to participate in the study. It was deemed that an official-

looking letter may be attended to more readily than one which appeared to come from an

unknown researcher.

Subsequent to the mail-out of the letters of introduction, each potential participant was

contacted by telephone to set appointments for telephone interviews, at which time the survey

instrument questions would be administered, and to be provided information on the nature of the

questions which would be asked at the time of the interview. In some cases multiple telephone

calls were required before contact was made and an appointment was established for the

administration of the survey.

Additionally, letters had to be re-sent, as it was claimed that they were never received (13 letters to 8 universities and 4 letters to 3 colleges). In such cases the letter was faxed and receipt was confirmed. While the survey questions were not provided prior to the scheduled telephone interview, one President from a college and one President from a university each insisted on receiving the questions. (It should be noted that the university President did not participate in the study, however, it is not assumed to be due to the questions on the survey instrument). The survey questions were not provided ahead of time as they were judged to be straightforward enough so as not to warrant preparation on the part of the respondents. Further, that would suggest more time commitment than was necessary, given the expected familiarity of the participants with the research topic due to the positions which they held in their institutions.

Presidents and Vice-Presidents, Academic of all 25 colleges and 18 universities (see Appendix V for a list of institutions) in the province were surveyed. Additionally, Deans of colleges and universities in 8 geographic areas, which have both a college and a university, and which represent, as completely as possible the entire province, were surveyed. At this level the researcher was investigating the possible existence of obvious, geographically-based differences within the larger issue.

Data Collection

At the scheduled time the researcher telephoned the participants. At the beginning of each interview the respondent was thanked for agreeing to participate in the study, was reminded of the purpose of the study, and was asked permission to tape record the interview for transcription purposes. Each was assured that only the researcher would listen to the tapes. It

should be noted that no one declined permission to tape, however, some needed extra

reassurance regarding the confidentiality of their responses. A commercial telephone recording

device was used to record each interview. The researcher asked each participant each of the six

questions (See Table 2) in order. It was stated beforehand that respondents would possibly begin

to answer one question within the response of the previous question, but that the researcher

would not stop them. The next question, while possibly redundant, would be asked to ensure the

validity of the data collection procedures and the completeness of the data.

Each interview was recorded on a separate side of a cassette tape and labelled

accordingly. As well, during each interview the researcher wrote notes by hand to identify key

points which were stressed during the interviews which would later be used in conjunction with

the transcriptions for the purpose of data analysis. A file card was kept for each interview

detailing the date, time and duration of the interview as well as the count on the cassette tape.

The length of the telephone interviews varied from ten minutes to two hours, although each

participant was told that they would require approximately thirty minutes when each

appointment was initially made.

At the end of the interview the participant was again thanked for his/her participation in

the study and was informed how s/he could obtain the results. (Some asked to be sent copies of

either the entire study, or of an executive summary.)

Data Analysis

Following data collection the tapes of the telephone interviews were transcribed by the

researcher, and matched with the handwritten notes. (See Appendix VI for an example of an

interview transcript.) The data was coded and categorized by hand for each question, and

then entered into a computer file. The coding procedure followed, in order, the three types of

coding as identified by Strauss (1987, as cited in Westbrook, 1994). First, open coding was

conducted to produce "concepts that seem to fit the data" (p. 247). Next, axial coding was

conducted to identify major categories from the data. Finally, selective coding was conducted to

establish core categories, or themes, of responses for each question.

In the process of coding the data, there was first a search for meaning units, which was

then followed by a broad categorization of those units. Once broad categories had emerged from

the data a search for relationships among the categories was conducted in order to discern

relationships, patterns and themes that connected smaller categories. For example, similar terms

used to describe concepts and themes, such as - elitism, arrogance, egos - were collected from

individual categories into more comprehensive categories and named based on the most

prevalent terms used. This data analysis method is congruent with common practice in

qualitative data analysis as discussed by Ely, Vinz, Downing and Anzul (1997). The themes

which are presented herewith were allowed to emerge naturally from the data as themes were

sorted and lifted, and thus speak for themselves as themes, major themes and metathemes.

Again, this process is congruent with common qualitative data analysis practice as discussed by

Ely et al, (1997).

Following entry into the computer file, the data was imported into NUD*IST, a

computer-based qualitative data analysis software package. This was done as a secondary

measure to ensure trustworthiness and fidelity (rigour and validity) in the data analysis process.

NUD*IST is a commercial data analysis software package commonly-used in qualitative

research. It has been widely recommended by researchers for computer-based data management

and analysis, especially in large-scale research projects.

In the present case it was found that the hand-coded data was richer and more complete as NUD*IST, being a word-specific type of software, lost some of the data which did not specifically contain the search words, such as elitist, or arrogant, yet which were coded and included in hand-generated categories because of similar explanations. Further data analysis was done by hand to ensure thorough analysis in such cases where the terminology which the computer program would extract, wasn't specifically used (for example, instead of saying arrogant, or elitist, a respondent would say that universities think they are better than colleges, which was coded and categorized within the elitist attitudes category). It was deemed that NUD*IST, while a good data manager, was less useful as a data analysis tool in this particular study for the above-noted reasons. This does not mean to imply that NUD*IST is without merit in other research projects where the data is less structured. In the present study the responses were already semi-categorized within the six survey questions. The categorized data was then studied for emerging themes, those drawn from each category, for major themes from each question, and for metathemes, those drawn from the entire body of data (Ely et al, 1997).

Additionally, the data themes, which emerged from each question, were ranked according to the most prevalent responses, or frequency (See Table 6 for the top 5 ranked themes). Frequency of responses is deemed to be an indicator of the importance of certain themes, as is the content, in that the higher frequencies of some themes suggest common viewpoints and concerns among participants in the study. The themes were named based on the most commonly-used terms in responses given by the participants in the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Coding and categorizing of the data revealed 21 categories, or themes, for the first

question - the perception of the respondents of the current barriers to articulation agreements

(See Table 3). For the second question - the reasons for the barriers - there were 14 categories,

or themes, identified (See Table 4). The third question - what needs to occur in the future to

prompt change of this situation - revealed 17 categories, or themes (See Table 5).

TABLE 3 - Themes of Responses for Question 1 - Barriers to Articulation Agreements

Theme	# College	# University	Total
Elitism - attitudes	30	16	46
Corridor funding	15	16	31
Lengthy process to negotiate	15	14	29
Lack of incentive	10	6	16
Governance structure	13	2	15
Quality debate - different curriculum	15	23	38
Lack of understanding of each other - values	14	8	22
Admission criteria	12	14	26
Will of people involved	15	11	26
Credentials of college faculty	10	4	14
History	17	14	31
Fear of encroachment by colleges	14	3	17
Taxpayer paying twice	1	0	1
No legislation	7	2	9
Colleges themselves	5	1	6
Government without a comprehensive plan	1	4	5
Lack of resources - financial and human	3	4	7
Misperception of what articulation is	3	5	8
Lack of data on success rates	1	2	3
No model or template	2	3	5
Cost	2	1	3

Total themes - 21

Note: these numbers represent the number of individuals from either college or university who gave the responses, not the number of colleges or universities, as there may be more than one person from a particular institution who gave the same response.

It should also be noted that the tables list the themes in the order in which they were identified during data collection and transcription.

TABLE 4 - Themes of Responses for Question 2 - Reasons for the Barriers

Theme	# College	# University	Total
Monopoly status of Ontario universities	24	11	35
Not enough pressure	4	2	6
Lack of interest	14	8	22
Passivity of government - no political will	8	3	11
Quality issue - degree versus diploma	3	4	7
Egos	17	17	34
Lack of understanding of each other	19	9	28
Decision-makers are university grads	5	1	6
Colleges do not have strength in leadership and scholarship - credentials	4	3	7
Not a reciprocal relationship - bar too high	3	0	3
Funding structure	8	17	25
Curriculum structure	0	9	9
Articulation is the wrong answer	1	1	2
Effort	0	6	6

Total themes - 14

Note: these numbers represent the number of individuals from either college or university who gave the responses, not the number of colleges or universities, as there may be more than one person from a particular institution who gave the same response.

It should also be noted that the tables list the themes in the order in which they were identified during data collection and transcription.

TABLE 5 - Themes of Responses for Question 3 - What Needs to Occur to Prompt Change

Theme	# College	# University	Total
Start from scratch with new collaborative programs	3	15	18
Play fair - be honest with each other	3	8	11
Government policy and funding incentives	36	22	58
Competition - challenge monopoly status of universities	11	3	14
Credibility and opportunity for college faculty	7	5	12
Will of both parties	13	11	24
Attitudes	13	9	22
Quality of curriculum at colleges	5	2	7
Pressure - student demand	6	4	10
Establish open university accreditation group	2	0	2
Degree-granting for colleges	5	0	5
Remove constraints on out-of-province universities	3	0	3
Funding for postsecondary education	6	8	14
Cross appointments for faculty	1	3	4
Address issues of different admission standards	0	1	1
Mandate of colleges	1	2	3
Different models for different places - template is the wrong answer - one size does not fit all	2	3	5

Total themes - 17

Note: these numbers represent the number of individuals from either college or university who gave the responses, not the number of colleges or universities, as there may be more than one person from a particular institution who gave the same response.

It should also be noted that the tables list the themes in the order in which they were identified during data collection and transcription.

Table 6 (see below) identifies the top 5 ranked themes from the first three questions of

the study. The ranking of the themes exemplifies the most prevalent concerns of participants.

TABLE 6 - Top 5 Ranked Responses for Questions 1, 2, and 3

Question 1 - Barriers to Articulation Agreements

Rank	Theme	# College	# University	Total
1.	Elitism - attitudes	30	16	46
2.	Quality debate - different curriculum	15	23	38
3.	Corridor funding	15	16	31
3.	History	17	14	31
4.	Lengthy process to negotiate	15	14	29
5.	Admission criteria	12	14	26
5.	Will of people involved	15	11	26

Question 2 - Reasons for the Barriers

Rank	Theme	# College	# University	Total
1.	Monopoly status of universities	24	11	35
2.	Egos	17	17	34
3.	Lack of understanding of each other	19	9	28
4.	Funding structure	8	17	25
5.	Lack of interest	14	8	22

Question 3 - What Needs to Occur to Prompt Change

Rank	Theme	# College	# University	Total
1.	Government policy and funding incentives	36	22	58
2.	Will of both parties	13	11	24
3.	Attitudes	13	9	22
4.	Start from scratch with new collaborative programs	3	15	18
5.	Competition - challenge monopoly status of universities	11	3	14
5.	Funding for postsecondary education	6	8	14

For question 4 - types of agreements currently articulated, or in progress - numerous

respondents chose to qualify their responses as few, or many, while others did not specify, and

instead discussed the types of agreements (see Table 7).

TABLE 7 - Responses to Question 4 - Types of Agreements Articulated, or in Progress

Response	# College	# University	Total
Few	26	22	48
Many	8	7	15
Unspecified	13	17	30

For question 5 - the process by which agreements were negotiated - numerous

respondents again chose to qualify their responses as top-down, as bottom-up, or, as both (see

Table 8).

TABLE 8 - Responses to Question 5 - Process by Which Agreements Were Negotiated

Response	# College	# University	Total
Top-down	11	9	20
Bottom-up	22	19	41
Both	16	16	32

The responses to question 6 - any other information pertinent to this investigation - ie. -

pearls of wisdom - (which was used as an attempt to inject humour and to encourage participants

to speak freely) were quite long and detailed and are summarized in Appendix VII as a result.

As mentioned previously, there were 93 participants in this study. Table 9 identifies the

number of participants from each sector. (Note - the other column signifies something other

than where the person participated, or refused to participate, as in unavailable).

TABLE 9 - Total Number of Participants in Study

	Participated	Refused	Other
College			
Presidents	19	3	2 unavailable, 1 VPA for both
Vice-Presidents, Academic	18	6	1 doesn't have
Deans	13	14	
University			
Presidents	12	5	1 Registrar for President
Vice-Presidents, Academic	16	1	1 doesn't have
Deans	15	11	

Note: In some cases the equivalent to a Dean was surveyed where there is no title of Dean, yet where the job is equivalent.

Discussion

The present study is an examination of the current barriers to articulation agreements, and is, thus, a descriptive study. As the purpose of qualitative research is to seek deeper understanding of a problem or issue, the researcher allowed the results to emerge naturally from the data and to speak for themselves, rather than attempting to prove or disprove a hypothesis. (In the following discussion the number in brackets with a number sign represents the number of the respondent within the category who provided the quoted material. Each respondent is numbered within each theme and is labelled as C for college or U for university. The reference to the participant is used as an example and does not reflect the total number of respondents who specifically, or generally referred to the quoted material).

Major themes - Question 1

Theme 1 - Elitist attitudes

From the 21 themes of responses which emerged from question 1 - perception of the current barriers to articulation agreements - the following major themes emerged. First, and foremost, the theme of elitist attitudes, on the part of the universities, emerged quite strongly (46 responses). This theme was discussed by both college (30) and university respondents (16), who said that universities have been, and still are, "elitist" (#1C) and "arrogant" (#9C) about what they do as compared to what colleges do. This academic elitism of universities was said to be "based upon tradition which is not relevant to a knowledge-based 21st century society" (#24C). As well, it was deemed to be a "power issue which seems subjective and arbitrary" (#22C).

The university respondents who cited this issue came from all three levels of participants and agreed that the universities' "bigotry", which is "unreasonable and poorly founded", is a "very serious problem"(#11U). The "intellectual snobbery of universities about the goals of education, knowledge and learning" (#14U) has "prevented a lot of opportunity for students" (#18C), because the universities "have a tendency to see the colleges as lesser education" (#16U).

This attitude was deemed to be "especially true on the part of the university faculty, and less true of administrators" (#31U). It is one of the "status issues which we tiptoe around as there is an implicit hierarchy ... that gets in the way" (#35U), especially as universities see colleges "as smaller, less efficient and lesser versions of them, which we aren't" (#38C).

The number and vehemence of the responses in this theme strongly suggest that this is a major aspect of the current problem which requires future scrutiny. This major theme is one that is considered to be at the top of the list of problems by many of the respondents from both

sectors in that it was the first response to the question.

Theme 2- Quality debate - different curriculum

The second major theme which emerged from question 1 as a significant barrier to articulation agreements was the debate over the quality of the curriculum at colleges (38 responses). While it was listed as a barrier to articulation by college respondents (15) - that is that there is a perception of curricular differences - it was emphasized as a problem more by university respondents (23), who stressed that there is "pressure for the universities to accept the [college] curriculum at face value" (#4U). It was stated that "more articulation would require major changes in colleges in curriculum, credentials of faculty and the role of faculty in research" (#8U). However, it was stated by both college and university respondents that "universities perceive their curriculum to be better than colleges "(#15U), whether or not such is the case.

It was argued that there is "no benchmark for bachelor's level curriculum, so there is a problem in comparing curriculum" (#14C), and with "no concrete measuring stick, neither has done enough to use facts rather than perception" (#6C). This appears to be a common area of breakdown in negotiating articulation agreements, especially when, in some cases, the university doesn't know what curriculum is actually being taught at the colleges, but assumes it to be inferior because there is a "perception that colleges are not as rigourous as universities" (#23U).

Theme(s) 3 - Corridor funding and History

The third major theme which emerged from question 1 as a major barrier to articulation agreements, was corridor funding (31 responses). This theme was discussed almost equally by both college (15) and university (16) respondents. There is "no funding incentive for the

universities to take students in advanced years" (#4C) and, in fact, the differences in funding structure of the two systems has been labelled as one of the main reasons that some agreements, such as nursing, have failed to be completed (#20C). It was stated that the "Byzantine funding makes fully integrated and articulated programs difficult to create" (#7U), as well, the differences in funding models make it hard to have win-win situations (#31U).

Another major theme from question 1, which tied for third in ranking, was that our history (31 responses) as separate, binary systems, created with different mandates, to serve different populations, is also seen to be a significant barrier to developing articulation agreements. Both college (17) and university (14) respondents cited this as a "huge barrier" (#7C) to progress. Despite the fact that the college system has evolved from its original mandate (#8C), history and culture interfere. It was maintained that the "universities don't view articulation as something that enhances their credibility as institutions. The mandate of both is changing, both are struggling to find themselves in the 21st century and there is role conflict because colleges are growing and our grads are limited as to where they can go from college unless they have articulations with universities, so universities are being pressured by society to prepare people for the workplace, which is the college mandate. The university mandate is now being squeezed" (#11C).

Theme 4 - Lengthy process to negotiate

The fourth ranked barrier to articulation agreements, which emerged as a major theme in question 1, is that there is an extremely lengthy process to the negotiation of agreements (29 responses). It is labelled as "time consuming, expensive, and cumbersome; something which the Ministry doesn't understand" (#3C), and something which results in "human fatigue and

institutional inertia" (#8U). One of the problems is that "when colleges approach universities for articulation agreements, [they] don't identify the barriers first and attempt to deal with them, and they get in the way later" (#11C), which leaves strong "emotion involved when it fails" (#14C).

Overall, issues such as development of curriculum, timetables, scheduling, consultation and approval processes and follow-up, which require personnel to do the work (#12U) were identified by both college (15) and university (14) respondents almost equally. Due to cutbacks and reductions in both sectors "energy and momentum to keep discussion going is almost nonexistent, so it becomes a lower and lower priority as time goes on" (#23U). As well, "it takes too much time and is a struggle, so why bother is the question some people ask. We can just keep doing what we are doing, which is pretty successful" (#28C), echoed through numerous responses from both sectors. In some cases, from the colleges' perspective, this meant articulating with out-of-province universities, with whom there is deemed to be no struggle, and with whom agreements are negotiated and implemented in a much shorter period of time.

Theme(s) 5 - Admission criteria and Will of people involved

One of the barriers to articulation agreements, which ranked fifth as a major theme in question 1, was admission criteria (26 responses). It was cited almost equally by both colleges (12 responses) and universities (14 responses), and was labelled as a "traditional barrier" (#25U); one that is rooted in history and culture (#2C). It was stated that universities continue to view OAC students as being better academically prepared than college graduates, who have two, or three years of postsecondary education after grade twelve (#20C) and that the elimination of OAC may not change anything (#8C).

Tied for fifth in ranking as a major theme in question 1 - barriers to articulation

agreements - was the will of people involved (26 responses). Both college (15 responses) and

university respondents (11 responses) cited the "reluctance on the part of universities in Ontario"

(#5U). Some university respondents stated that the "attitude in universities is that this is a low

priority given their missions and student numbers" (#15U), and some college respondents

suggested that "there doesn't appear to be enough of a reason for universities to want to develop

agreements with colleges" (#13C). It was posited that "universities that don't need students

won't do it, and those that do, will" (#10C). Otherwise, "universities don't want to become

involved with colleges and don't understand that they are out of sync with the rest of the country

and the world" (#6C).

Other themes

The other themes which emerged from question 1 - barriers to articulation agreements -

(those which ranked below fifth, in descending order) included: lack of understanding of each

other - values (22 responses); fear of encroachment by colleges (17 responses); lack of incentive

(16 responses); governance structure (15 responses); credentials of college faculty (14

responses); no legislation (9 responses); misperception of what articulation is (8 responses);

lack of resources - financial and human (7 responses); colleges themselves (6 responses);

government without a comprehensive master plan (5 responses); cost (3 responses); and lack of

data on success rates (3 responses) (See Table 3 for college/university breakdown.)

Collectively, these barriers suggest that the postsecondary system is still stumbling

around this area blindly; each going in its own direction and not fully aware of the other. These

barriers also suggest confusion within the system, as well as in the Ministry, as to how to best

acknowledge the obstacles and to begin to eradicate them. The lack of knowledge, lack of

interaction, and lack of a mechanism for collaboration between the two systems has resulted in

the perpetuation of cultural stereotypes (values - #10U). Each is afraid of the other's influence

and of the effects of increased collaboration - colleges are afraid of being subsumed by the more

powerful universities, and the universities are afraid of devaluing of their credential (values -

#13U), as well as of the loss of revenue and students (encroachment - #2U).

These barriers have been "compounded by both real and imagined fear by universities

that colleges are changing and the colleges feel they are coming to a dance where nobody is

dancing" (encroachment - #8C). This situation also brings about some "public policy questions

from the government that are of concern to universities - especially the question of degree-

granting for colleges" (encroachment - #10U). There is deemed to be "protectionism by

universities, who are afraid of losing market share" (encroachment - #17C), and due to

"insecurity and fear of rejection" (colleges - #3C) the "colleges have not been vociferous enough

about [their] merits" (colleges - #2C).

Further compounding the situation is the lack of legislation, which other provinces have,

and which would permit interaction between colleges and universities since their traditional

roles have changed and the lines are being blurred (legislation - #9U). It was suggested that

since the government has not made this a "priority" (legislation - #5C), "the two systems will

continue to exist side by side with no formal linkage at the top until there is somebody else to

ask how they are getting on, and not the Minister, whose decisions are political and short-lived

and whose attention is divided"(legislation - #7U).

Since it does not appear that the government has a master plan for postsecondary

education, there will continue to be "huge confusion on the part of the public, politicians, and the Ministry of the role of colleges" (master plan - #3U). From the university perspective "there is a lot of uncertainty of what the government has in mind, if the universities say they can't handle students, then the colleges may get degree-granting status"(master plan - #2U). This, compounded by the lack of both financial and human resources, has contributed to the lack of interest, which would increase with money (resources - #1C). These resources are deemed imperative for both systems to "come to grips with the fundamental questions of what articulation is" (misperception - #5U), and how to proceed in the future.

It was acknowledged by both colleges and universities that "there are always barriers to introducing new things, [and] the conventional barriers within an institution to developing new programs are compounded when two institutions are involved" (misperception - #2U). As well, it was also acknowledged that colleges, despite what universities may think, don't want articulation in every area, or in every course; that the curriculum needs to meet university standards, because the intention is not to set students up for failure (misperception - #1C).

There is not enough data on the success, or failure, or of the aspirations of college students (data - #1C). The analysis which has been done, however, shows "little difference statistically, but there needs to be more of this kind of research to eradicate the perceptions that college graduates are lesser students" (data - #2U).

Finally, the lack of a model, or template (to this point), and the cost of negotiating and working out the details of individual agreements have also been deemed to be barriers, which have prevented more articulation agreements from being negotiated. Since there has not been a model from which to work, nor more experience, there has not been a "positive, big history" (no

model - #3U) and thus, "we get caught in issues that we shouldn't" (no model - #5C). The

newly approved template may prove to be beneficial in this regard, but it remains to be seen.

Major themes - Question 2

Theme 1 - Monopoly status of Ontario universities

Question 2, which asked respondents to identify the reasons for the barriers, yielded 14

themes of responses, from which the following major themes emerged. First, the monopoly

status of Ontario universities was discussed (35 responses), predominantly by colleges (24

responses), but by universities as well (11 responses). It was purported that history and culture

have a role to play in the monopoly position that universities have maintained, but which some

see as being eroded by colleges. "The original policy framework of binary systems didn't

foresee rapid participation growth in universities and growth of need for both specific and

general skill, and universities not providing the applied skills people wanted for career

preparation, so there is a growing demand for transfer opportunity" (#14U).

As was cited in responses to question 1, through several themes, the universities fear

losing their autonomy, students and revenue (#11C), as well as their "credibility if they articulate

with colleges" (#13C). They have what was termed "an entrenched blindness" (#17U) and see

what the colleges are doing "as intrusion on their turf, which is probably why they maintain that

we are trade schools and not educational institutions in spite of what's happening in other

provinces where colleges and universities are collaborating, even if they haven't in the past. The

colleges are not what we were in 1967, we have evolved" (#26C). The universities were deemed

to "have a monopoly on credentials, [to] act as a club" (#21C), and to use their "powerful lobby"

to "reduce motivation for politicians" to make changes (#23C). They were also said to be

"treading lightly because of concern over what this will do in the long run to the institutions. In the short run we'd get all sorts of accolades if we did have the time and the energy to bring this to fruition, but then what? We've never been here before, will we be melded together, and if so, is that bad, or is that good? People are saying don't go that route, let's not go there" (#27U).

Theme 2 - Egos

The second major theme in question 2 - the reasons for the barriers - was egos, which was closely related to the first major theme in question 2, as well as to several themes in question 1. The responses (34) were divided equally between college (17) and university (17) respondents. The words "snobbery" and "arrogance" appeared quite frequently from respondents from both systems, as well as "fear", "territorialism", "institutional jealousy", "tiering", "elitism" and "attitudes" - all familiar terms from question 1 responses.

The university respondents were surprisingly forthcoming about this, saying that the "universities are protecting their turf, are suspicious, and wary of collaboration" (#6U). It was maintained, however, that the attitudes of university administrators are beginning to change, much more quickly than the "elitist, outdated views of university faculty, because they have the opportunity to see firsthand what colleges do" (#13U). There is pronounced "elitism between universities; an attitude which has been projected onto colleges. Even the out-of-province universities have to prove themselves to the Ontario universities to be up to the Ontario standard - whatever that is" (#7C). From the college perspective, this is a case of pure "academic snobbery" (#15C) and "arrogance" because the university arguments have "no merit in precedent, philosophy, culture, or economics" (#4C), especially when "they don't even recognize each other's courses, let alone college courses" (#9C).

Theme 3 - Lack of understanding of each other

Closely related to the two previous major themes which emerged in question 2 - the reasons for the barriers - was the third major theme - a lack of understanding of each other (28 responses). The numerous college responses (19) spoke to the "Achilles heel"; that "the relationship between the systems was never addressed from the start" (#6C), and of the "lack of knowledge of universities, who don't want to know colleges in case we are good and then they wouldn't have a reason not to accept us" (#2C). As well, the responses spoke of the continued "perception of colleges as vocational institutions" (#4C), the "clash of policy, funding, values, and beliefs" (#3C), and that with the "preset notions of universities of what colleges do" (#10C), that there are continued "misinterpretations of the academic rigour of college curriculum" (11C).

The university responses (9) to this theme were much in the same vein as were the college responses, citing this as a "cultural/political issue in which the universities don't understand the merits of colleges" (#2U). There was noted by university respondents to be a "historical perception of what colleges do, [that] colleges are evolving into something different and universities aren't up to this evolution over the last 30 years, [as] nothing is stagnant" (#19U).

Theme 4 - Funding structure

The fourth major theme in question 2 - the reasons for the barriers - was funding structure (25 responses). This was cited more frequently by university respondents (17), than it was by college respondents (8). The issues - "different levels of tuition, rules of deregulation of tuition, different funding formulas of how enrolment is counted" (#19U) - were perceived to be

significant barriers to some (#20U), but were not seen as "substantial problems" (#19U) to others.

The funding formulas currently in place are seen to "discourage cooperation" (#22U), since there is "competition for dollars" (#1U) and with different funding structures and different revenues there are "winners and losers, unlike BC, where adequate funding was provided" (#9U). The "lack of synchronization makes it difficult to develop joint programs and to enrol students" (#10U), and "our model is entrenched in history and mandate and change is an insurmountable challenge given this model" (#9U).

Theme 5 - Lack of interest

The fifth major theme from question 2 - the reasons for the barriers - was closely related to the first four major themes - monopoly status of universities, egos, lack of understanding, and funding structure. Lack of interest (22 responses) was stressed by college respondents (14) and was reinforced by university respondents (8). The universities who need students would be deemed to be interested, whereas "those who don't need students won't, since universities don't see the benefits in terms of resources" (#5U).

Tiering was also deemed to play a large role in the level of interest. The tier one universities, "who aren't hurting, don't care, they believe themselves to be better" (#6C), while the tier two universities "will play" (#1C) with colleges because the "pressure of declining enrolment at some universities will cause them to realize that they have to do something" (#11C). "Territoriality" (#12C), a barrier identified in question 1 responses, comes back into focus here, as both colleges and universities "are chasing the same students in some areas" (#14U).

Other themes

The remaining themes (which ranked below fifth) from question 2 - the reasons for the barriers - included: passivity of government - no political will (11 responses); curriculum structure (9 responses); colleges do not have strength in leadership and scholarship - credentials (7 responses); quality issues - degree versus diploma (7 responses); not enough pressure (6 responses); decision-makers are university graduates (6 responses); effort (6 responses); there is not a reciprocal relationship - bar too high (3 responses); and articulation is the wrong answer (2 responses) (See Table 4 for college/university breakdown.).

These reasons for the barriers also collectively suggest, as did responses to question 1, that there is no clear direction in which the entire system is moving in this regard. Just as the obstacles have not been clearly acknowledged, neither have the underlying reasons for them.

In discussing the lack of political will, both systems cited "the lack of legislation [as] a big reason" (#8C) for the lack of progress. Both pointed out that "the government has encouraged collaboration, but has not mandated it, or funded it" (#9U), and has not realized that "it takes both money and people" (#10U).

Curriculum structure was cited as a reason for barriers to articulation, only by university respondents, who purported that universities operate under a "perception of quality control, assume that coverage of material is lesser at college, and that the college student will be disadvantaged at university going into the upper years" (#7U). For this reason the "colleges are getting huge resistance from the universities because they are not dealing with the fundamental issue - that colleges are not offering university level curriculum" (#2U).

This reason is related to the quality issue of a degree versus a diploma in which the

universities take "pride in what they do and don't want it diluted" (#3C), given that the "degree and the diploma are considered to be different" (#1C). Related to this reason was the equally ranked reason that college faculty don't have the strengths in leadership and scholarship, or, the credentials that university faculty have. However, it was noted that while "universities cite the importance of teaching and research, blah, blah, blah, not all university faculty have Ph.D.s either" (#5U). Further, it was acknowledged that "college faculty are not allowed to use their strength effectively - a major factor - as college professors have different roles than university professors; research and scholarship is not in the job descriptions or union agreements" (#3U).

The lack of pressure, the fact that decision-makers are university graduates, and the effort required all tied as additional reasons for the barriers which prevent articulation agreements from moving forward. While the whole issue of articulation was labelled, on the one hand, as only "a minor blip" (pressure - #2C) to both the universities and to the Ministry, it was acknowledged that there is a "growing student demand for transfer"(pressure - #2U). Students were identified as "more informed investors in education, who need more credit than the grand planners, as the world has changed, the job market is more challenging, and college graduates need more generic skills and university graduates need more specific skills" (pressure - #2U). One of the problems identified was the fact that "there is no agency with responsibility for articulation, for two reasons: it is not the way the system was conceived in the 60s and it was impossible to predict how interrelated knowledge would become" (pressure - #4U).

Additionally, since most "employers, guidance counsellors, legislators, high school and university administrators and Board of Governor members are university graduates, that is what they know, and what they look for", and thus, "don't know what college graduates can do and so

we haven't been invited to the dance" (#1C).

Of the respondents (6) who identified effort as a reason for barriers to articulation, all were from universities. It was cited that for articulation to happen that "a big effort is required and anything that required effort is a problem, as there is inertia and conventional thinking. Even if it's thought to be a good idea, the effort gets in the way" (#1U). Similarly, it was pointed out that the "ideas are good but snobbery and complexity, as well as a lack of knowledge prevent it" (#2U), which relates this reason with many which have previously been discussed.

Major themes - Question 3

Theme 1 - Government policy and funding incentive

Question 3, which asked respondents to suggest what needs to occur to prompt change in this situation, yielded 17 themes of responses from which the following major themes emerged. First, and most emphatically, respondents stressed the need for government policy and funding incentives (58 responses). Both college respondents (36) and university respondents (22) talked of the need for "carrots and/or sticks" (#1C) as incentive and coercion; some cautioning that incentives alone would not work (#5C), while others cautioning that "sticks don't work well in academia" (#22U). Many were adamant, though, that "government action is necessary"; saying "nothing short of this will work, we've had enough studies recommending this - it has been studied to death - and we've had enough committees working on it too, which have only made microscopic progress, while the need has increased. We aren't doing as well now because we aren't meeting a larger need" (#9C).

It was suggested that "the government has to address this from a matter of public policy as there is duplication of education being paid for by taxpayers and the government tends to look

the other way because it doesn't want to take the universities on, they're older, chartered and

their senates can veto" (#19C). As well, it was stated that there are "few sticks to be used with

certain things imbedded in legislation that would be challenged by universities, such as degree-

granting for colleges. Carrots would result in a very different response from both colleges and

universities" (#24U). Sticks, such as blanket agreements, were seen by some to be "schemes

imposed and touted by a third party have broad and politically-based concepts of public good,

are not well thought-out and cliche-ridden and won't sell"(#16U).

Essentially, the solution to this problem of college/university collaboration was deemed

to "be tied to the allocation of resources" one way or the other. "It will take something concrete

to effect change because it's hard to say how much of it is simply philosophical, how much is

indifference, how much is preoccupation with your own challenges and how much is that you

get no additional money; it's an observation of how organizations and human nature works"

(#34U).

It was suggested that each barrier is taken, studied for whom is responsible, and targeted

for action, with the starting point being the leaders, who must take this very seriously. The

bigger public good must be taken into account; "the universities can't just scream autonomy and

run away from the problem and colleges can't just use it to try to get degree-granting status and

government can't stand back piously asking for a lot more collaboration and not be prepared to

address some of the core barriers that it puts up in terms of funding" (#49U).

Theme 2 - Will of both parties

Related to the first major theme of the need for government policy and funding incentive

in question 3 - what needs to occur to prompt change - was the second major theme - will of both

parties (24 responses). There was a close to even breakdown between college respondents (13)

and university respondents (11) within this theme in which many said that not only does

articulation "need advocates" (#5U) on both sides, but through "ongoing, deeper, more real

interchange and communication, we need to see success" (#9U). It was cautioned that "we have

about a year to do it ourselves, or the Premier will act"(#1C), and that "if universities don't

cooperate they may lose out, as colleges will go out of province and country and college

graduates will be better served in Ontario universities" (#22U).

There is increasing realization that "there is lots of movement both ways and we need to

make it easier for students so they are not wasting their time for bureaucratic reasons" (#15U).

As such "when agreements are created an implementation plan has to be worked out as well to

properly market programs; we need to be seen to be working together in development and in

marketing" (#11U).

Theme 3 - Attitudes

Closely linked to the will of both parties (2nd major theme), the third major theme which

emerged in question 3 - what needs to occur to prompt change - was attitudes (22 responses).

Both college (13) and university (11) respondents were clear in their assertions that "universities

need to recognize the benefits of college education" (#22C), including the reality that "colleges

are here to stay, are market-driven, adapt to change and are aggressive" (#1U).

As well, "universities need an open mind; they need not to feel threatened; there is no need for

them to feel that way" (#2C). "There needs to be an increased awareness of each other, we need

to work together to understand each other and to develop respect - a long process due to the

profound misunderstanding on the part of the universities. There needs to be a cultural

transformation and pressure from colleges will force universities to start behaving in a different

way because they won't have any choice" (#8U).

Suggestions such as collaborative research projects (#10U), research data on tracked

students (#16U), education of employers (#6C), campus sharing (#21U), and viewing of the

learner in a different way; one "based on current demographics and not on traditional

perceptions of college versus university students" (#13C), were thoughtfully proposed as means

of changing attitudes.

Theme 4 - Start from scratch with new collaborative programs

The fourth major theme of question 3 - what needs to occur to prompt change - which

was again closely related to the previous themes - was start from scratch with new collaborative

programs (18 responses). New and innovative programs which are developed in partnership,

were suggested, by both college (3) and university respondents (15), but notably, more by

university respondents, "as long as it is not seen as a threat to what either is doing individually"

(#10U).

It was asserted that "we need to stop trying to pound together diplomas and degrees

which are square and round, but to design post-diploma degrees and joint programs ..."(#9U),

"which are designed to fit together"(#12U). As well, it was suggested that "physical proximity

needs to be enhanced" (#16U) so that "faculty from both have to work together on projects and

get to know each other, as that's where the seeds will be planted" (#3U). With closer physical

proximity, senior administrators would also be able to work together to "plant seeds", as well as

to "push government"(#3U).

Theme(s) 5 - Competition and Funding for postsecondary education

Tied for fifth rank, as well as being significantly related to above themes of question 3, were competition - challenge monopoly status of universities and funding for postsecondary education (14 responses each). Both college respondents (11) and university respondents (3) referred to the "threat" of out-of-province and out-of-country universities (#2U) as presenting a "challenge to university domination" (#6C) in Ontario. It was acknowledged, again, that the Ontario "universities need to become more entrepreneurial and responsive to the market" and that the "competition outside of the province will prompt that change"(#3U).

The other fifth ranked response to question 3 - what needs to occur to prompt change - was funding for postsecondary education (14 responses). It was stressed by both college (6) and university respondents (8) almost equally with suggestions that "the whole funding mechanism has to be looked at. There is a need for linking at the top and as long as we have two systems of higher education, which are separated by separate funding models, it is unlikely that we will get the kind of interaction that most of us would like to see. It is not going to happen by serendipity, it is going to take something concrete and it has to be tied to the allocation of resources" (#8U).

Other themes

The remaining themes from question 3 - what needs to occur to prompt change - (which ranked below fifth in descending order) included: credibility and opportunity for college faculty (12 responses); play fair - be honest with each other (11 responses); pressure - student demand (10 responses); quality of curriculum at colleges (7 responses); degree-granting for colleges (5 responses); different models for different places - one size does not fit all (5 responses) cross appointments for faculty (4 responses); mandate of colleges (3 responses); and remove

constraints on out-of-province universities (3 responses). (See Table 5 for breakdown.)

These themes suggest, overall, that the time has come for colleges and universities to put aside their real and perceived differences and to work together to effect the necessary changes which are required to meet the needs of the student of the 21st century. For example, collaborative research projects were suggested numerous times by respondents at both colleges and universities as a means of enhancing the credibility of college faculty. This was related to some of the suggestions made to change attitudes (fifth major theme). Further, if more research is done at the colleges, then university faculty will have the opportunity to recognize the strengths of college faculty (credibility - #8U).

Enhanced mutual recognition of each other would also serve to enhance progress in terms of other suggestions for change. For example, collaborative work may increase the level of honesty in interaction and may serve to begin to address some of the other changes which were deemed necessary, such as quality of curriculum at colleges, the need for colleges to pursue degree-granting and agreements with out-of-province universities out of frustration with lack of progress within Ontario.

It was stressed that dialogue needs to occur "between all stakeholders, not just each university and its nearest counterpart, but all colleges and universities together" (play fair - #7U), so that everyone can "be clear about the shared objective of preparing students for the job market, even though academics don't like to state that" (play fair - #6U).

There is realization that "a cultural change toward colleges ... is starting to happen because of pressure from student and labour markets ... Universities are seeing students voting with their feet and increasingly saying they must get into the action by cooperating with the

colleges" (pressure - #7U). "The most interesting phenomenon is university graduates coming to

college after to build portfolios for adaptability for the future ... in the end it will be the people

who will make the change" (pressure - #9C).

While the curriculum at colleges was deemed to be a barrier to articulation (in responses

to question 1) it was not strongly suggested by university respondents (2) in question 3 - what

needs to occur to prompt change. It was suggested slightly more by college respondents

however, (5) as part of their overall suggestions for increased cooperation.

The remaining responses to question 3 appear to have arisen out of frustration with the

lack of progress to this point, and are indicative of a search for an alternate pathway to degree

completion for college graduates. Each was suggested only by a few respondents, which

suggests that they are not considered to be significant avenues to pursue individually, as they

relate to other suggestions for necessary changes made earlier.

Question 4

Responses to question 4 - types of agreements articulated, or in progress - were quite

varied, as would be expected, depending upon which side of the fence one sits. The most

common response was that there are few agreements negotiated, with varying reasons why. Of

the college respondents who qualified responses as few (26), numerous reiterated earlier points

made that time and effort were part of the reason so few agreements had been negotiated to this

point. Many stated that despite much effort, things had fallen apart at the final stages as a result

of disputes over curriculum and faculty (#40C), that they were "struggling with the same issues

as everyone else" (#45C), and that they're really not getting anywhere because they "keep

coming up against the same barriers" (#48U).

There appeared to be agreement between the college and university respondents (22) who qualified their responses as few, that there is much to do to make progress; both expressing interest in increased number and type of agreements in the future. There was some mention, though, that some agreements were, in fact, pretty good; but not all.

Of the respondents who qualified their responses as many (15), most cited that they were "one offs" (#3U), or were with out-of-province universities (#5C). It was also stated by a university respondent that "there is more demand than space" and that they get "superb students coming from colleges" (#11U).

Of the respondents who did not specify their answers (30) to question 4 - types of agreements - several cited agreements which had been negotiated in uncommon areas, such as, performing arts, or journalism. The more common areas such as business, nursing, technology were also discussed as the more standard types of agreement which was negotiated, or in discussion. As well, the agreements with out-of-province universities were also mentioned fairly frequently by college respondents in both uncommon and common areas.

Question 5

Responses to question 5 - process by which agreements were negotiated - evidenced that the trend in agreement negotiation has shifted from bottom-up to top-down. Of the respondents who listed top-down (20 - which was fairly evenly distributed) several stated that this was becoming the more common approach currently (#1C), especially "so it can get through the senate" (#5U). Both college (11) and university (9) respondents acknowledged that the Vice-President level has become significantly more involved in "opening the communication channels" (#8C) for the agreements, then bringing in faculty to do the "hands-on work" (#7C).

One respondent noted that attempts to develop agreements from the top "did not work" in the

past because of the amount of work which needs to be done at the faculty level (#10C).

However, several stated that "the most successful ones are negotiated across the board top-down

with buy-in from the bottom-up because they need the clout" (#22C).

Many other respondents (41 - almost equally distributed) cited that agreements had been

negotiated from the bottom-up "painfully" (#3U), and with "great effort" (#1C). It was stated

numerous times that for any agreements to be negotiated from the bottom-up "champions who

like and respect each other" (#4C) are necessary. The "disciplinary expertise that's not typically

found in senior administrators" (#26U) was deemed to be essential, despite the fact that without

administrative support the entire exercise would be "very frustrating" (#32C). For this reason, it

is logical that many respondents cited both (32 - equally divided) in response to question 5 - the

process by which agreements were negotiated.

Overall, the consensus in the responses of those who cited both was that "the

combination of levels, including the department, the VP, and the President" (#13U) is necessary,

although is was clearly maintained that "the real activity takes place at the department level,

whether it starts there, or is brought there" (#13U).

Question 6

Question 6 - pertinent comments (or pearls of wisdom) - yielded significantly detailed

comments and observations from respondents. (See Appendix VII for a detailed summary.)

Many comments were quite frank and evidenced the magnitude of this issue currently.

Comments such as "knowledge is the strategic currency of the moment - we are a joke and we'll

lose G7 status unless we make a major adjustment and we'll lose our standard of living - we

must elevate learning as a priority - tenth out of ten in funding doesn't cut it"(#4C), exemplify the depth of concern toward this topic among administrators.

Many of the barriers which emerged in responses to earlier questions were addressed in summative comments. For example, "universities fear that colleges will take over, that's not a valid fear. Shouldn't college graduates have proven themselves more than high school grads to enter university?" (#6C) clearly addressed a barrier to progress. As well, comments such as the following, leave little to the imagination, and clearly address many aspects of the overall issue.

> Real agreements are where students are admitted to both college and university at the same time. A lot of agreements are window dressing or lost leaders ... a research base for the whole process is crucial, we need data and cross appointments are essential. Don't underestimate the power and potential of faculty to faculty negotiation - President to President doesn't cut it. The timing is good for change, we don't need a bandaid, we need dollars, legislation and policy review; we need a strategy to get doctorates for college faculty, we need integrated institutional responses; creative people are killed by those around them who work in status quo (#7C).

There was some consensus that "joint integrated programs are a better idea than articulation of existing programs; they are good value; it is a better resource to possess a degree and a diploma" (#8C) The question: "why do so many university grads come to college after?" (#8C) was asked frequently by respondents from both colleges and universities, and it was deemed that this question requires further study.

There was also a great lack of consensus on many issues expressed by respondents in

their comments toward the process of agreement negotiation. For example, the following

comments:

> Negotiations with foreign universities and out-of-province universities are
>
> relevant as they are large and important universities, not lesser institutions as they
>
> are called by Ontario universities - that is badmouthing. If Ontario universities
>
> are concerned with quality of curriculum, they should look at their own, the
>
> measure of quality in universities is only paper qualification. When you are
>
> teaching something applied you have to be at the cutting edge and you don't have
>
> to get there by doing research, rather by knowing what it is; it is a different kind
>
> of knowledge rather than research within a very narrow scope (#17C),

occurred just after comments such as: "if there is to be movement between colleges and

universities the programming in colleges has to be designed to allow that movement, there are

big questions that need to be answered" (#14U).

Many comments were summative in nature, and some, cynical. "Collaboration won't

happen until it is perceived a win-win result" (#21C); "when it looks like an agreement will

happen, do it fast before it breaks down; if it takes more than 18 months it won't happen"

(#22C); "the nature of learning is both theoretical and applied, just layering university on top of

college doesn't work very well, we have to figure out how to braid the two together as people

need to satisfy labour markets" (#23C).

> Honesty was also present in comments from both systems:
>
> there is a tendency to make assumptions without accurate knowledge; failure to
>
> see potential for closer relationships for colleges and universities comes from

blindness which is sometimes willful; that is not very healthy for people who are supposed to be about inquiry and learning - ironic, learning is about change and we are change agents, yet we are also conservationists; we reconcile that conflict by not changing, yet demanding something different from our students - we are a learning institution? (#26U).

We need to be careful not to carve off the high end of colleges and have it subsumed by universities, or to have tiering in colleges where there are polytechnics and junior colleges, like universities, although there is an unofficial group of 4 or 5 major colleges, which could move forward and leave others behind. There are many pitfalls, but also many prospects that revolve around the broadening of the learning circle of where people can go for degrees, which includes the internet, and it is a stupid educational system that doesn't respond to that; slowly the status of colleges is improving, which adds the prospect to move the government to action; the biggest sticking point in agreement negotiation is on the qualifications of the college faculty - credentialism is a means of protecting status; there is a larger reality than just Ontario and our view of education, others have taken much more creative approaches to articulation than we have (#53C).

Many respondents realize that: "there is not a consistent perspective on what needs to be done and we must look at what is needed to make this work without hyperbole" (#33U).

The biggest impediment to articulation is the lack of understanding of the two systems. If we can commit to putting the students first, look at the issues and

concentrate on quality education this would happen faster. It will continue to be tough sledding until the government does something, it wouldn't have happened out west without legislation either, it was a lot of rhetoric there too. We need to track transfers to have clear information; joint degree negotiation must have joint credentials, or the programs will just be assimilated by the universities and colleges will lose their identities (#37C).

"Competition from U.S. universities articulating in the north has pushed Ontario universities to begin to articulate. We need to focus on students in developing articulation agreements rather than on bureaucracy, there is too much rhetoric about what students are or aren't rather than what can be done to accommodate them" (#39C).

Slowly both systems are coming to acknowledge that "there is a need for individuals who possess the skill of a college graduate and a university degree; through articulation a student can truly gain the best of both worlds and will prove to be an asset in the workforce" (#40C).

Clearly this is an issue whose time has come, it's been coming for a while, it's an issue that must be seriously addressed and resolved in the next year or two, there are too many things happening outside our borders that impinge on us - too many agreements being struck with universities outside of Ontario and Canada that we can't put it off much longer - it is a question of how that dialogue is usefully joined, is it a template on linkages that will satisfy, clearly the idea of degree completion, or program completion in the case of university-to-college, the way to meet the expectations of the students involved, rather than joint programs - they will have to be looked at too - not sure we can do it alone, there may be

enough good will, but there isn't enough time or incentive to really address this

question, at least not for the universities and we are going to be preoccupied with

major investments in research, finding the time and energy to give this priority

will be most difficult (#46U).

Metathemes

Metatheme 1 - Attitudes

In addition to the major and minor themes already discussed, there are also several

metathemes which emerged in this study. (A metatheme is a theme which permeates through

other themes.) First, and most obvious, was the metatheme of attitudes. This emerged at, or

near the top in the top five ranking of the responses to each relevant question, as well as in

summative comments. Included in this metatheme are the related aspects of: elitism; egos;

culture; lack of understanding of each other - values; history; and fear of encroachment. These

aspects were discussed by both college and university respondents (as discussed earlier in this

chapter). It was posited that the issue of barriers to articulation "is core to the broader issue of

relationships between types of postsecondary institutions and the essence of those relationships

has to be reciprocity and recognition of the value of each other's institutions and of the fact that

sustainable and productive relationships are based on a sense of equity and parity and somehow

we have to build that into our relationships as it has been lacking to date; it's been the one weak

element to our relationship" (pearls - #85C).

Many of the responses which were given, especially by college respondents, were

strongly worded, although the university respondents were sometimes just as straightforward.

Comments such as: "there is intellectual snobbery of universities about the goals of education -

knowledge and learning at university and information and skills at college - there is also a fear

by universities that attitudes of college students are dissuited to the reflective, contemplative,

critical inquiry of universities - universities shouldn't spend time worrying about this" (attitudes-

#14U), exemplify that such opinions are not only those of college respondents. It was stated

clearly by college respondents, many times over, that the "elitist approach by universities, who

have never set foot in a college and expect the students to be inferior, shows a lack of

knowledge; they don't know about learning outcomes and academic programs" (attitudes -

#21C). As well, numerous college respondents summed up the situation with comments such as:

"the elitist mentality has prevented a lot of opportunity for students" (attitudes - #18C);

something which few university respondents mentioned.

Metatheme 2 - Lack of interest

Related to the first metatheme of attitudes, was the second metatheme of lack of interest,

incentive, will of people involved, and understanding. As with the first metatheme, the second

metatheme emerged in the top five ranking in each of the relevant questions, and summative

comments. It also appeared to be interwoven within many of the major and minor themes which

emerged in responses; similar to the metatheme of attitudes.

Overall, this metatheme evidences, alone and with its relation to the first metatheme,

that the major barriers, which have been identified, are predominantly of an attitudinal nature.

The relation of attitudes, egos, culture and status with a lack of interest, will, incentive and

understanding predominates in the results of this study, and is too strong to be ignored.

The macro picture which emerges from this data is that these first two metathemes are,

in fact, two pieces of an even larger metatheme. The number of major and minor themes which

are related to these two metathemes comprise a significant number of the total number of themes which emerged in this study. As such, there is a clear picture which emerges as a result, which strongly suggests that the most significant barriers are of a perceptual nature.

Metatheme 3 - Funding

The third, and final, metatheme is funding. This metatheme differs from the two previous metathemes in nature, in that it is a thread of a concrete nature, as opposed to perceptual, which runs through the data. As with the two other metathemes, this also appears in the top five ranking of the relevant questions and summative comments.

Both college and university respondents were quite clear in their assessments of the inadequate nature of funding for postsecondary education in general, as well as the need for funding for increased collaborative activity between the two sectors.

This third metatheme was loosely related to the second metatheme, however, in that the lack of appropriate funding contributes to a lack of incentive on the part of the universities to pursue collaborative ventures with colleges, since there are no obvious benefits.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions

There are several conclusions which can be drawn from this study. First, it is apparent that there are numerous barriers to articulation agreements between colleges and universities in Ontario; some of which are of a perceptual nature and some of which are more concrete. (A barrier of a perceptual nature is one in which the respondent has perceived, or assumed, without the benefit of actual knowledge of fact, that what they think is true - such as the inferiority of curriculum at colleges, or of the qualifications of college faculty. A concrete barrier, conversely, is one which is more factual and less subject to interpretation; one which can be easily verified - such as funding.) It is also apparent that some individuals within the two postsecondary systems are operating under those perceived barriers, rather than the concrete ones, as they have chosen to believe what may be considered myth, or conjecture, rather than what is accurate.

The barriers from the 21 themes, which emerged from question 1; barriers, which are of a perceptual nature, rather than factual, comprise most of the top 5 ranked themes, and include: elitist attitudes (ranked 1); quality debate - different curriculum (ranked 2); history (ranked 3 - tie); will of people involved (ranked 5); lack of understanding of each other - values (ranked 6); fear of encroachment (ranked 7); credentials of college faculty (ranked 10); misperception of what articulation is (ranked 12); colleges themselves (ranked 14); and lack of data on success (ranked 16).

Collectively these barriers suggest that attitudes, ideas, perception and out-of-date information are the basis for some current practice. It has been confirmed by both college and

103

university respondents that there are people within the two postsecondary education sectors who currently operate under these erroneous assumptions.

Conversely, the concrete barriers which emerged from question 1, are: corridor funding (ranked 3); lengthy process to negotiate (ranked 4); admission criteria (ranked 5); lack of incentive (ranked 8); governance (ranked 9); no legislation (ranked 11); lack of resources (ranked 13); no master plan of government (ranked 15); no model (ranked 15 - tie); cost (ranked 16 - tie); and taxpayer paying twice (ranked 17). Overall, these barriers ranked lower than did the barriers which are of a perceptual nature.

Barriers such as lack of funds; lengthy process to negotiate; admission criteria; governance; legislation; and policy issues, are actual (concrete) barriers to articulation which need to be seriously addressed. Outdated notions of the purpose of higher education; status hierarchies; uninformed ideas and attitudes about curriculum and credentials; history; lack of understanding; and territoriality are not, and should not continue to be, barriers to increased collaboration between colleges and universities. It was acknowledged by numerous respondents from both sectors that continued adherence to these notions and perceptions needlessly restrains progress (comments - #28U). It is now more obvious than ever that the original mandates of both colleges and universities have changed; both are under extreme scrutiny because the world has changed significantly in the last thirty years. Yet, if the original mandates of both systems are maintained, each will then be trapped in a system that is not considered to be working properly any longer and the reality of a changing environment is thus being denied.

The 14 themes from the responses to the second question - the reasons for the barriers - also indicated that people operate under both perceptual and concrete barriers. Those reasons

which could be considered to be perceived include: monopoly status of universities (ranked 1); egos (ranked 2); lack of understanding of each other (ranked 3); colleges do not have strength in leadership and scholarship - credentials (ranked 8 - tie); not a reciprocal relationship - bar too high (ranked 10 - tie); and articulation is the wrong answer (ranked 11).

The reasons for the barriers which would be considered concrete reasons include: funding (ranked 4); no political will (ranked 6); and effort (ranked 9 - tie).

The remaining reasons are reasons which could be considered to be both perception and reality, in that whether or not they are, in fact, reasons for barriers depend upon which side of the issue one sits. They include: lack of interest (ranked 5); curriculum (ranked 7); degree versus diploma - quality issue (ranked 8 - tie); not enough pressure (ranked 9 - tie) and decision-makers are university grads (ranked 9 - tie).

Of the 17 themes which emerged in the responses to question 3 - what needs to occur to prompt change - most are deemed to be concrete, logical suggestions. They overwhelmingly suggest that many major aspects of our past and current operation require significant change. Notably, attitudes and the will of both parties follow the more concrete suggestion of government policy and funding incentives as areas in need of the most serious consideration. It is encouraging to see that suggestions such as increased opportunity for college faculty; be honest with each other; and create new collaborative programs, are also serious considerations in both systems.

A second conclusion which can be drawn from this study is that perceptions and attitudes appear to be the most significant barriers to progress toward collaboration in postsecondary education. Attitudes and perceptions, however erroneous, consistently ranked in the top three

responses on each of the first three questions of the study - what are the barriers; what are the reasons for the barriers; and what needs to occur to prompt change. Since attitudes and perceptions constituted the most obvious major themes, as well as metathemes, which emerged in the data, this is a trend which cannot be overlooked.

Attitudes and perceptions permeated numerous themes throughout several questions, thus emerging as a metatheme . The degree of interrelation of attitudes and perceptions with, not only identification of barriers, but of reasons for the barriers, as well as suggestions for needed change, exemplify how ingrained certain attitudes and perceptions are in the history and culture of postsecondary education in this province. As long as those within the two systems continue to operate without the benefit of accurate knowledge, progress will continue to be impeded.

Within the realm of perceptions and attitudes lie the assumptions regarding the curriculum and qualifications of faculty at colleges. These two points have been cited off-handedly several times as both barriers and reasons for barriers. However, it should be noted that neither of these points emerged as metathemes in the data. Different curriculum structure at colleges and universities emerged second in the top 5 ranking of themes - a major theme - in question 1- barriers to articulation - and was cited most by university respondents. Curriculum, however, did not emerge as a major theme in question 2 - reasons for the barriers - and was cited by only nine university respondents (0 college respondents). It was barely mentioned in question 3 - what needs to occur to prompt change - and was, in fact, cited by more college respondents (5) than it was by university respondents (2).

This trend of responses, or lack thereof, appears to contradict the notions that the curriculum at colleges is inferior, when it was not identified as being in need of change. As was

cited by numerous college respondents, as well as several university respondents, it is generally

assumed that the curriculum at colleges is vocational in nature, and is applied, rather than

theoretical. This assumption is made by people who, in fact, don't know what the curriculum is

that is being taught at the college level (by their own admission). The question which bears

asking then, is: Is this a real barrier, or a perceived one?

Similarly, the credentials of college faculty did not emerge as a major theme (in the top 5

ranking) in any of the first three questions - what are the barriers, what are the reasons for the

barriers, and what needs to occur to prompt change. Credentials ranked 10th in question 1 with

14 responses; tied for 8th in question 2 with 7 responses; and did not emerge at all in the

responses to question 3. The question again bears asking: Is this barrier real, or perceived?

A third conclusion which can be drawn from this study is based upon the secondary level

of examination in the study. The Deans (or equivalent) of departments in both colleges and

universities in specifically selected areas, which represent the entire province geographically,

and which have both a college and a university, were also surveyed. This secondary level of the

study was included to examine whether or not there is any obvious geographical influence in the

negotiation of articulation agreements. It is concluded from this secondary level of this study

that there is not enough evidence to suggest that geographical location positively influences

collaborative efforts, and may, in fact, hinder them, as it was cited numerous times that the

colleges and universities compete for the same student pool in some areas. Overall, the same

issues were cited in smaller areas as were cited in larger areas, despite the fact that, in most

cases, the faculty at the colleges are graduates of the nearby university, and thus, are known to

the university faculty. In areas where the student pool is large, there is no such problem in

evidence, and neither are there more articulation agreements, as universities cited that the programs which college graduates desire are the popular and oversubscribed programs, which have no space available.

The one factor which does appear to positively influence collaboration between colleges and universities is the physical sharing of space. In such cases it was cited numerous times that informal contact, in cafeteria lines for example, has in the past led to discussion, which then leads to novel arrangements both for degree completion for college graduates, as well as for post-graduate programs for university graduates. This is an area which requires further investigation, as it was not the main focus of the present study, but suggests an interesting and novel factor, which may help to eradicate some lingering attitudinal barriers to increased collaboration between colleges and universities.

The fourth conclusion which can be drawn from this study is that government intervention is imperative in order to facilitate change in the current situation. This intervention would namely be policy direction and incentive funding. Based upon the large number (58) and vehemence (frequency and content) of the responses to question 3 - what needs to occur to prompt change - this is deemed to be the first order of business on the agenda of progress. Many of the respondents in both systems stressed the lack of available funds to either second staff to work on articulation agreements, or, to finance new program endeavours, and consequently, articulation falls down the list of priorities.

There is, however, no clear consensus as to the best way to proceed; that is, whether policy direction would be a sufficient solution without funding incentive. Whether the "carrot" and/or the "stick" constitute the appropriate solution is, thus, not clear. Numerous respondents

stressed that "sticks don't work well in academia" (#22U); others positing that "there are few sticks to be used" (#24U), while still others stated, unequivocally, that "coercion through incentives won't work" (#5C), because giving the universities more money would only perpetuate the current problems of elitism (#35C).

Overwhelmingly, the trend of responses evidenced that university respondents would like to see funding incentives (15 university versus 2 college) alone; while college respondents favour policy direction (20 college versus 4 university), and/or a combination of policy direction and funding incentive (14 college versus 2 university).

It bears stating, again, that at this time, there are no clear answers to these complex issues. Just as many questions are answered through this examination, more are raised. Questions such as whether postsecondary education is, in fact, entering an new era of cooperation, or, whether words being used currently will be equalled by action remain to be answered.

Implications

There are both specific and general implications which result from the present study being conducted at this time, in the manner in which it was conducted. One point which bears noting is that the same respondents interviewed at a different time (for example one year later) may have very different responses to the same questions as were posed in this study. Information and experience may have an impact on knowledge, attitudes, perception, and ideas about the merits of, and the barriers to articulation between colleges and universities in Ontario.

One implication which is a result of this study is that further in-depth research into several of the themes and issues which emerged in this study is necessary. First, in order to have

legitimate positions in future arguments about the preparation and calibre of students, there must be accurate tracking. Some of the universities surveyed indicated that in their internal analysis of transfer students they found "very little difference statistically" (pearls - #49U). Only through concrete data will misconceptions be clarified as to the preparation and capability of those who seek to complement diplomas with degrees for enhanced job readiness. One university respondent indicated that their "experience has shown that there is no difference in students" and went so far as to admit that they "toyed with the idea of taking essays from college students and interspersing them with essays of university students to see if there is any difference" (comments - #25U).

Those who are concerned about inferior and inadequately prepared students attempting to gain entry to university should understand that the truly underprepared student will be unsuccessful at the college level and advised to complete compensatory study. Further, it is generally the better students, not the lesser ones, who possess the desire to continue their education and it is for those students that agreements should be considered.

With increased, valid data as a basis for future negotiations, perceived issues, which have hindered past negotiations, may not continue to be issues which needlessly impede progress. These other issues, such as curriculum and faculty credentials, which have been acknowledged by both sectors as stumbling points in the past, should also be considered priority areas for future research. A study of the level of education of college faculty in different areas is warranted, just as it is for university faculty, who don't all possess doctoral level qualification either. As well, a study comparing curriculum in related programs would alleviate some of the course-by-course comparison, which adds to the already lengthy process of negotiation of articulation agreements

- a major theme from this study. The length of time required to negotiate agreements from start to finish also merits research consideration.

Another recommendation for future research is a more in-depth investigation of the number and type of agreements, as well as other regional factors which affect negotiation of articulation agreements in different geographical locations of the province. For example, whether there are differences in the northern areas of the province, versus the southern areas, where there are more colleges and universities, requires such investigation as it was not the primary focus of the current study. Data from the past may be compared with results which emerge in the next few years with the implementation of the newly approved articulation template. It will be of interest to those most directly involved to document more conclusively if there are more (or better) agreements where a college and a university share physical space.

Since there are suggestions for new collaborative programs which combine diplomas and degrees, this will also require further study. Postsecondary educators and administrators will require detailed, accurate data on the success, or failure of such programs, both for the postsecondary sectors, and for the graduates of such programs.

In order for research to be conducted in all of these recommended areas adequate funding will be necessary. Funding must be considered a priority so that the road in front of us will not be as pothole-ridden as is the road behind us.

As previously mentioned, another implication from this study is that collaborative endeavours, which combine a diploma and a degree jointly, should be pursued. It was cautioned that "we need to stop trying to pound together diplomas and degrees which are square and round, but to design post-diploma degrees and joint programs" (new programs - #12U). This presents

another avenue to pursue; one in which some of the pitfalls of the past may be avoided. Both college and university faculty would have the opportunity to collaboratively plan the programs, thereby presenting one seamless pathway for the learners. The learners have become lost in the debate at some point along the way and it is time to focus on the important aspects again.

The suggestion of collaborative program planning merits very serious consideration and commitment by both sectors as it would be another means of breaking down traditional barriers, eradicating erroneous perceptions that each has of the other and may, in fact, facilitate serious attitude change on the part of those for whom it is most necessary.

Attitude change will not happen without positive experience on both sides of this issue, and as such requires both internal and external facilitation. Numerous respondents spoke at length in their comments of going down the road toward articulation, only to find it blocked by attitudinal barriers near the end of the process. As Fullan (1993) posited both top-down and bottom-up strategies are necessary for change to occur. This concept is applicable to the present study, in which the data has clearly shown that both administrative direction and faculty commitment are necessary for success. Further, Fullan's (1999, interview) recent thinking has shifted from the position held previously that change cannot be mandated. Now Fullan suggests that mandates are helpful. This point has also been confirmed in the data collected in this study, in which it is clearly emphasized that the government will have to intervene.

As already stated, it is unknown at this time if the newly approved template will generate new articulation agreements which will be of greater success than some of those from the past. Some of the respondents mentioned that current articulation agreements are not well-utilized, which raises the question of whether agreements are not used because they are not appropriate

.

levels of credit, or because they are not promoted. There is a circular argument possible on this point, as some respondents also claimed that agreements are useless if there is no space made available for transfer students.

If the current situation with regard to overall progress in terms of articulation is compared with that of 1993, when *No Dead Ends* was released, the question of how much things have really changed can be posed. In the *No Dead Ends* (1993) report it was cited that a wide variety of structural, policy and attitudinal changes were necessary if Ontario's postsecondary sectors were to meet the needs of learners more effectively. The results of the current examination indicate that the barriers to articulation continue to be those of structure, policy and attitudes. There is still resentment about the lack of formal recognition of college education that was cited in the Pitman report evidenced currently by college administrators, as well as complaints that there is more recognition given to college programs by American universities. This was continuously cited as the reason for the proliferation of agreements with out-of-province universities, which has caused the Ontario universities to take careful note.

The same admonitions as were made in *No Dead Ends* (1993) still apply today. Postsecondary education should be a "single system whose parts fit together to form a strong and coherent whole"; one which is "flexible and accessible" (Task Force on Advanced Training, 1993, pp. 82-83).

Additionally, the first of twelve perceptions cited by Marshall (1995) - that there is a continuing perception that the universities place significant and inappropriate barriers in front of students attempting to transfer from colleges to universities - is, unfortunately still a perception of college (as well as some university) administrators today. Again, the question bears asking:

Why is this so?

The barriers which have been identified in the past in various studies and discussion papers include: "organizational structure, start-up costs, funding and enrolment counting policies, and geography, as well as academic issues such as admission requirements and the assessment and granting of credit transfer" (COU Committee on Relationships Between the Universities and Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 1996, p. 11).

While CUCC was given the mandate the address these barriers in 1996, it only partially achieved the goals of its first two-year term. The report of the CUCC to the Minister of Education in 1998 clearly confirms that there are barriers which continue to exist, despite the concerted efforts of the Council members, who come from both university and college sectors. The work of CUCC in facilitating the Port Hope Accord, or the template, is commendable, however, as already stated, it remains to be seen whether or not it will facilitate change.

One clear indication from this study is that there must be action at the ministry level; action which includes both policy and funding. As Skolnik (1994) suggested "nothing in public policy indicates commitment like incentive funding" (p. 3). It is apparent that such incentive is required to persuade the postsecondary education sectors that the outcome will be worth the time and energy invested. Collaboration, according to Fullan (1993) "is becoming one of the core requisites of a postmodern society" (p. 17) and it is increased collaboration, for the benefit of the students, which is the current goal.

In addition to the specific implications of this study, there are also some general implications, which arise from this type of examination. Interpretation is obviously a factor which has affected the results of this examination of a current issue in postsecondary education.

The manner in which individuals interpret the numerous and complex factors which comprise this issue is totally subjective. Depending upon which side of the issue one resides, one will, undoubtedly, have opinions which are influenced by knowledge, experience, information (or lack thereof), attitude, and interest in the topic. Thus, the responses given to the survey questions are the result of the participants' interpretation - how they construe the information which is available to them. It should be noted, again, that the participants in this study were chosen on the basis of the positions which they hold in colleges and universities, and on the basis of the requisite knowledge which results from those positions. Additionally, the results of this examination are subject to interpretation both by the researcher, and by the consumers of the results. In both cases, the manner in which the information contained herein is interpreted and disseminated is subjective. However, the researcher has endeavoured to represent the opinions of the respondents as accurately and objectively as possible - thus the extensive use of quotes in the presentation of results, rather than merely the researcher's interpretation of what was said.

The overall result of the present study is a more comprehensive view of a set of complex, interrelated issues, which have impeded inter-sector collaboration in order that those involved in postsecondary education have an increased awareness of the true nature and extent of the problem at hand. As such, the researcher's intention through this examination to more clearly illuminate the problem and its component variables is both necessary and timely, given the increased attention to the need for, and pressure for, change in the status quo. Rather than furthering conjecture about what individuals in each postsecondary education sector think, the results of this examination clarify what, in fact, they do think. This information should be helpful in future discussion and in negotiation of articulation agreements which will benefit both

types of institution, as well as the students who attempt to move through them.

One of the most salient points which emerged from this study is that perception, attitudes, and culture seem to override factual knowledge and information on this topic, since they consistently ranked at the top of the themes for each question, as well as emerging as a metatheme. These perceptions, attitudes, and culture, as previously mentioned, are related to the lack of interest, incentive and understanding, which also emerged as a metatheme. This suggests, yet again, that individuals within postsecondary education are operating under perceptions, rather than with fact. The implication of this is that accurate, factual information is even more imperative for those who will affect the process and outcomes of articulation endeavours between colleges and universities in Ontario.

Finally, barriers in general, and their implications, must be considered. As has been stated, it is generally acknowledged that there are barriers to articulation between colleges and universities in Ontario. Given that it is generally accepted in the postsecondary education sectors that barriers exist (based upon the literature and data presented herewith), another aspect of this situation which requires further investigation is the degree to which people continue to subscribe to the perceptions of said barriers. This is beyond the scope of the present study, however, and is suggested as a topic for future study. As was stated in the present study the issue of barriers to articulation "is core to the broader issue of relationships between types of postsecondary institutions and the essence of those relationships has to be reciprocity and recognition of each other's institutions and of the fact that sustainable and productive relationships are based on a sense of equity and parity and somehow we have to build that into our relationships as it has been lacking to date; it's been the one weak element to our

relationship¨ (pearls - # 85C).

REFERENCES

ACAATO. (1996). *The future of Ontario community colleges: Recommendations to advisory panel on postsecondary education.*

ACAATO. (1999). *Report on ministerial consents by the college university relations subcommittee of the academic vice-presidents.*

Advisory panel on future directions for postsecondary education. (December, 1996). *Excellence, accessibility, responsibility, report of the advisory panel on future directions for postsecondary education.* Toronto: Ministry of Education and Training (Smith Report).

Bercuson, D., Bothwell, R., & Granatstein, J.L. (1997). *Petrified campus: The crisis in Canadian universities.* Toronto: Random House of Canada.

Byrne, P.J. (1999). Transferability and mobility - An overview. *College Canada*, vol 4, no. 1. Ottawa: ACCC.

Cameron, D.M., & Royce, D.M. (1996). *Prologue to change; An abbreviated history of public policy and postsecondary education in Ontario.* (Background Paper). Appendix B in Smith Report.

Cipres, E.L., & Parish, C.L. (1993). Transfer and articulation: Gaining institutional support and developing regional relationships. ERIC document ED354031.

Commission of Future Development of the Universities in Ontario. (December, 1984). *Ontario universities: Options and futures.* Toronto. (Bovey Report).

Commission of Post-Secondary Education in Ontario. (1972). *The learning society: Report of the commission on post-secondary education in Ontario.* Toronto: Queen's Printer.

Commission to Study the Development of Graduate Programmes in Ontario. (1966). *Report to the committee on university affairs and the committee of presidents of provincially assisted universities of the commission to study the development of graduate programmes in Ontario universities.* Toronto: The Commission (Spinks Report).

Committee of Presidents of Provincially Assisted Universities. (1962). *Post-secondary education in Ontario.* Toronto (Duetsch Report).

Committee on the Future Role of Universities in Ontario. (August, 1981). *The report of the committee on the future role of universities in Ontario.* Toronto: Ministry of Colleges and Universities (Fisher Report).

118

Council of Ontario Universities. (1995). *New credentials for the Ontario colleges? Background and options.*

Council of Ontario Universities. (1996). *Submission to the advisory panel on future directions for postsecondary education.*

COU Committee on Relationships Between the Universities and Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. (October, 1996). *Submission to the postsecondary education review panel.*

COU Committee on Relationships Between the Universities and Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. (1998). *The college credential issue in 1998.*

COU Task Force on Ministerial Consents. (1998). *Report of the COU task force on ministerial consents.*

COU Task Force on Degree-granting. (1999). *Access to degrees for Ontario's college students.*

College-University Consortium Council. (August,1998). *Report of the college-university consortium council submitted to the minister of education and training.*

CUCC. (February, 1998). *College-university collaboration - Myth or destiny?*

CUCC. (February, 1998). *Issues arising from the CUCC collaborative projects and other CUCC activities since April, 1996.*

Cummins, R.I. (1998). *Movement between Ontario universities and colleges: A study commissioned by the college-university consortium council.*

Del Missier, S. (1999). A vision of seamless education - Academic mobility in Ontario. *College Canada,* vol 4, no. 1. Ottawa: ACCC.

Duffy, M.E. (1986, May). Qualitative research: An approach whose time has come. *Nursing and Health Care.* pp. 237-39.

Ely, M., Vinz, R., Downing, M., & Anzul, M. (1997). On writing qualitative research: Living by words. London: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform.* London: Falmer Press.

Grubb, W. N. (1990). *Finding an equilibrium: Enhancing transfer rates and maintaining the comprehensive community college.* ERIC document ED324073.

Gottleib, E. (1995, Winter). Reconciling the university with the community college. *College Quarterly.*

Marshall, D. G. (1995, May 10). *Speech notes: Trends in university-college relationships in Ontario in the 90s.* A paper presented to the provincial meeting of University and College Advisors.

Marshall, D. (1998). *College-university relationships in Ontario.* Draft paper.

Marshall, D. (March, 1999). *Comments on the CUCC's proposed principles and template for degree completion.* Draft paper.

Minister's Task Force on College Growth (December, 1981). *Growth in Ontario colleges of applied arts and technology.* Toronto: Ministry of Education and Training.

Ontario Council of Regents for Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. (1990). *Vision 2000: Quality and opportunity: A summary.* Toronto: Ministry of colleges and Universities.

Ontario Department of Education. (1967). *Colleges of applied arts and technology: Basic documents.* Toronto: Ontario Department of Education.

Ontario Ministry of Education and Training. (1996, July). *Future goals for Ontario colleges and universities, discussion paper.* Toronto.

Ontario Ministry of Education and Training. (1985). *The report of the advisor to the minister of colleges and universities on the governance of the colleges of applied arts and technology.* Toronto: Ministry of Education and Training. (first Pitman Report)

Shapiro, B., J. & Shapiro, H., T. (1994). *Higher education: Some problems and challenges in a changing world.* Toronto: Council of Ontario Universities Discussion Series, Issue 4

Skolnik, M. L. (1994, Spring). Toward the creation of a CAAT-university partnership for an integrated baccalaureate program in nursing. *College Quarterly.*

Skolnik, M. L. (1995, W). Should the CAATs grant degrees? *College Quarterly.*

Skolnik, M. L. (1999, January). *CAATs, universities, and degrees: Towards some options for enhancing the connection between CAATs and degrees.* A discussion paper prepared for the College-University Consortium Council.

Susskind, T. Y. (1996). *Opportunities and challenges: Bridging the two-year four-year gap.* ERIC document ED399990.

Task Force on Advanced Training. (1993, April). *No dead ends. Report of the task force on advanced training.* Toronto: Ministry of Education and Training (second Pitman Report)

APPENDIX I - *Vision 2000 Recommendations*

Recommendation 1 -

The Government of Ontario and the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology should adopt the

following mandate for Ontario's colleges:

Preamble

Education has an essential role to play in the development of a world which is peaceful,

environmentally sound, equitable and economically viable. Education should help to balance

individual and community needs, and foster personal initiative and co-operation within human

relationships based on mutual respect.

Education should give people the opportunity to develop the skills and knowledge they

need to adapt to and make a constructive contribution to the world in which they live. Education

should enhance students' choices and opportunities, and promote the development of individual

potential. It should also assist learners in developing their commitment to social responsibility

and care for the communities in which they live, and respect for cultural integrity and self-

determination of those whose language and traditions may be different from their own.

It is the mandate of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario:

To provide high-quality career education that enhances students' ability to acquire

information, reason clearly, think critically, communicate effectively, apply their

knowledge and participate in society as informed and productive citizens.

To make a college education as accessible as possible. Accessibility should include

the opportunity to succeed, as well as the opportunity to enrol, and it must be provided

in a way that achieves educational equity.

122

To be responsible, as a system, for quality assurance through system-wide standards and program review.

To work together and with other educational institutions to offer students opportunities for educational mobility and lifelong learning.

To create a dynamic, learner-driven system by anticipating and accommodating the diverse needs of students, both full-time and part-time, enrolled in credit and non-credit courses.

To forge partnerships in and with their communities, including employers, labour, community groups and governments.

To be participatory institutions in which decision-making involves both internal and external stakeholders.

To be model employers in the manner in which they invest in and manage human resource development, in their commitment to equity and in the creation of a positive, healthy and supportive working environment.

Recommendation 2

There should be a significant increase in the generic skills and general education content of programs leading to a college credential to ensure an equivalence of learning outcomes between these components and specific occupational skills.

Recommendation 3

There should be system-wide standards for all programs leading to a college credential. Such standards must focus on the learning outcomes expected of graduates from a program.

Recommendation 4

All programs leading to a college credential should be subject to regular, system-wide program review for the purposes of accreditation.

Recommendation 5

A College Standards and Accreditation Council (CSAC) should be established, with participation of internal and external stakeholders and with executive authority in the areas of system-wide program standards, review and accreditation.

Recommendation 6

Every college should have in place:

- educational equity policies and formally defined measures for implementing and monitoring those policies;

- race and ethnic relations policies to promote tolerance and understanding between peoples of different cultures and races;

- mechanisms to monitor employment equity policies to ensure that college personnel, boards and committees are representative of the diverse communities they serve; and

- mechanisms for building and maintaining effective partnerships with special communities and for advocating on their behalf on issues of educational equity.

Recommendation 7

The Ministry of Colleges and Universities should require every college board of governors to include in the colleges's annual report to the Minister a specific "Serving Communities" section outlining college activities in the areas of educational equity, race relations, employment equity and community outreach activities.

Recommendation 8

The Council of Regents should develop system-wide guidelines to assist colleges in developing educational equity policies. The Council should also produce and disseminate an annual report on college initiatives in serving communities.

Recommendation 9

Every college should, where necessary, conduct assessments of the literacy and numeracy levels of applicants to college credential programs for the purpose of appropriate placement. The need for assessment of an individual student should be at the discretion of the college.

Recommendation 10

Ontario's colleges should provide preparatory courses designed to meet the needs of those with a secondary school diploma or equivalent seeking admission to college credential programs. These courses may be offered in conjunction with local school boards.

Recommendation 11

The Ministry of Colleges and Universities should provide explicit funding to the colleges for preparatory courses in a manner consistent with the funding of college post-secondary programs.

Recommendation 12

The college system should continue to be a major provider of adult basic education.

Recommendation 13

The provincial government should accept responsibility for the co-ordination of policy, planning and increased funding of adult basic education programs in Ontario.

Recommendation 14

An ad hoc task force on fee-for-service training by colleges should be established by the Council

of Regents to advise the Minister on policy guidelines which would foster the colleges' role in meeting the training needs of the existing workforce in a manner consistent with public policy goals.

Recommendation 15

Beginning from the current collective agreement, the parties should seek ways to facilitate the colleges' ability to provide fee-for-service activities.

Recommendation 16

Each college, in conjunction with faculty and staff, should develop strategies for establishing long-term relationships with local fee-for-services clients such as employers and labour organizations.

Recommendation 17

The Ontario government should adopt the principle that public funds, aimed at covering the costs associated with skills training, should be used primarily to support programs provided by or in conjunction with public institutions, including colleges.

Recommendation 18

In order to assure public accountability, any provincial body designated to foster more skills training should include employer and labour representatives and educators, and should produce a public, bi-annual report which:

- describes the training activities receiving public funds;

- shows the distribution of public funds (including federal funds allocated in Ontario) among the providers of training, be they public, private or joint activities;

- evaluates the effectiveness of such training, including an assessment of both quality and

cost; and

- identifies training needs which are not being met and which require greater investment.

Recommendation 19

To better support the needs of part-time learners:

- every college should provide a variety of flexible learning opportunities, though varying educational methods, greater use of customized instructional methods, off-campus teaching locations, variable course entrance and completion dates, and other innovative approaches to delivery of relevant and adult-based programming for part-time learners;

- each college should have an advisory committee on part-time learning; and

- provincial funding and the internal allocation of college revenues should explicitly recognize the nature and importance of programs and services required by part-time learners.

Recommendation 20

The government should establish the Prior Learning Assessment Network (PLAN), as recommended by the Task Force on Access to Professions and Trades in Ontario, with explicit inclusion of Ontario's colleges in the planning, implementation and operation of the system.

Recommendation 21

The Ministry of Education, possibly through the newly formed Teacher Education Council of Ontario, should ensure that all teacher education programs (both preservice and in-service) include components which furnish an in-depth knowledge of the educational services provided by the colleges. In particular, education about the colleges should be an explicit component of professional development for school guidance counsellors, teachers and principals.

Recommendation 22

The Ministries of Education and Colleges and Universities should jointly establish a Provincial Schools/Colleges Co-ordinating Council, with representation of all relevant stakeholders from the secondary school and college systems, to improve school-college links and foster initiatives at the local level.

Recommendation 23 (Bold titles are deemed to be pertinent to this study)

The Minister of Colleges and Universities should endeavour to expand and improve the opportunities for student to move between the college and university sectors, while maintaining the distinctiveness of each sector.

Recommendation 24

The college system should develop comprehensive programs of advanced training, on a selective basis, to address student needs. Graduates of such programs should receive a unique credential at the post-diploma level.

Recommendation 25

The government should establish a provincial institute "without walls" for advanced training to:

- Facilitate the development and co-ordination of arrangements between colleges and universities for combined college-university studies;

- Offer combined college-university degree programs, with instruction based at and provided by colleges and universities;

- Recommend, where appropriate, to the College Standards and Accreditation Council the development of college-based programs of advanced training with a unique credential at the post-diploma level.

Recommendation 26

A formal agreement of association between the Institute and one or more Ontario universities should be established, providing for the associated universities to grant their degrees to graduates of programs conducted under the auspices of the Institute.

Recommendation 27

In the event that an agreement of association between the Institute and one or more universities cannot be reached with eighteen months, the government should vest degree-granting authority in the Institute itself.

Recommendation 28

A College System Strategic Planning committee should be established by the Council of Regents. This standing committee would:

- undertake research on the quality-access-funding trade-offs facing Ontario's colleges;

- disseminate analyses and information across the college system; and

- recommend strategies to the Minister of Colleges and Universities for addressing trade-offs between quality, access and funding.

Recommendation 29

The Ministry of Colleges and Universities should review the structure of its funding to the colleges in order to provide a funding mechanism which:

- explicitly considers both access and quality;

- reduces counter-productive enrolment competition among the colleges;

- provides greater stability in the funding provided to each college by dampening the effects of enrolment changes on a college's grant' and

- continues to provide predictability and promote efficiency while strengthening accountability in the use of public resources.

Recommendation 30

The Ontario government should introduce a more participatory and co-ordinated system for developing government policies, initiatives, and funding arrangements affecting skills training provided by the colleges.

Recommendation 31

The government should initiate a study, encompassing both the college and university sectors, to assess the impact of alternative tuition fee and student assistance policies on access and institutional revenues.

Recommendation 32

The Council of Regents, through its Strategic Planning Committee, should develop and recommend a mechanism to co-ordinate information and plans relevant to the sharing of specialized resources among the colleges.

Recommendation 33

Every college's board of governors should reinforce Vision 2000's major objectives through its human resources planning by undertaking initiatives such as:

- setting clear budgetary targets for increasing the share of funds devoted to human resource development (HRD);

- including a section on HRD in the annual report to the Minister, which summarizes the college's progress in developing and implementing HRD policies and practices designed to achieve the objectives of the renewed mandate; and

- developing policy guidelines (to complement existing professional development leave policies) which provide regular opportunities and direct encouragement for external work experience, job exchanges or international activity for faculty, support staff and administrators.

Recommendation 34

The Ontario Government should work with all college stakeholders to establish and fund:

- a permanent Professional Development Fund to reinforce and expand upon the professional development efforts of the HRD in the Third Decade project; and

- an Instructional Development Task Force to provide leadership in helping the colleges develop learner-centred curriculum and alternative delivery.

Recommendation 35

The Minister of Colleges and Universities should provide sufficient funding to enable an Ontario university (or several, working in a consortium) to develop graduate-level programs for community college personnel.

Recommendation 36

The colleges should work together to introduce effective means for fostering applied scholarship as a way of enhancing the primacy of the colleges' teaching function.

Recommendation 37

Each college should experiment in developing reciprocal methods of performance review which are formative in nature for all employees. The process for developing these procedures should itself be collaborative in nature.

Recommendation 38

Each college's board of governors should further develop its capacity for strategic planning, especially on issues related to quality, access and funding, and for working in partnership with a range of stakeholders to meet student needs.

Recommendation 39

The Council of Regents should conduct an operational review of its board appointment responsibilities, employing a third-party process.

Recommendation 40

The Minister of Colleges and Universities should establish a Vision 2000 Implementation Committee to co-ordinate evaluation and development of detailed plans for implementation of Vision 2000's recommendations. This committee should involve all of the major constituencies, both internal and external, that participated in Vision 2000.

APPENDIX II - Task Force on Advanced Training (*No Dead Ends*) Recommendations

Recommendation 1

That the equal value of vocational and academic education be recognized by all the partners engaged in Ontario's postsecondary system.

Recommendation 2

That barriers to inter-sectoral transfer for postsecondary learners be eliminated. In order to achieve this goal, a mechanism must be developed to facilitate such transfer and to provide accessible, widely available, and comprehensive information on credit transfer opportunities in Ontario; membership on any body advising on transfer shall include equal representation from the colleges and universities as well as representation from the private sector and learners.

Recommendation 3

That the importance of the partnership of colleges, universities, and the employment sector be recognized in providing opportunities for individual development and in contributing to the economic renewal of the province through the provision of advanced training programs.

Recommendation 4

That an Ontario Institute for Advanced Training be established.

a) that the OIAT be created as an independent, provincial institute to initiate, negotiate, coordinate, promote, and allocate funds for advanced training programs at the first degree level;

b) that the OIAT be granted specific designated degree-granting power;

c) that membership on the governing structure of OIAT should be based on the principle of partnership and include equal representation from colleges, universities, employer and employee groups, and fair representation from the broader community including the secondary school

sector:

d) that the new advanced training programs organized by OIAT should:

a) be relevant to the workplace and timely to meet market needs;

b) have a balance of practical, generic, and theoretical study;

c) recognize for credit previous education and relevant work experience;

d) be provincially accessible on a part-time as well as full-time basis;

e) include a cooperative work experience component or supervised work project;

f) be subject to a regular sunset review;

e) be recognized for credit leading to a baccalaureate degree.

Recommendation 5

That the importance of faculty development in support of advanced training programs be acknowledged.

Recommendation 6

That the current funding arrangements for colleges and universities be adjusted in order to support college-university, university-college transfer agreements and new advanced training programs.

Recommendation 7

That in the implementation of advanced training and transfer initiatives, the needs of the francophone community must be identified and addressed.

APPENDIX III- Smith Report Recommendations

Recommendation 1

We recommend that Ontarians undertake to correct the current serious inadequacies in total financial resources available to postsecondary education. This undertaking is a shared responsibility that includes government, postsecondary institutions, students and their families, and the private sector.

Recommendation 2

We recommend that provincial government support of universities and colleges in Ontario be comparable to the average for other Canadian provinces and be reasonably in line with government support of major public university and college systems in the United States. This goal should be achieved by arresting reductions in government grants now and by building towards this goal over several years in ways that strengthen excellence and accessibility.

Recommendation 3

We recommend that the major features of the corridor system for distributing the government's core operating grants to universities be maintained with minor modifications to enhance flexibility.

Recommendation 4

We recommend that the method of distributing the government's core operating grants to colleges change to a form of corridor funding, reflective of circumstances faced by colleges, with attention to other issues such as the appropriate relationship of support for part-time and full-time students.

Recommendation 5

i) We recommend that the Government of Ontario increase the size of the Research Overheads/ Infrastructure Envelope from its current level of about $23 million to about $100 million annually.

ii) We recommend that Ontario develop a research policy. This development is urgent in view of the growing concern about Ontario's competitive position on research. The policy should cover both basic and applied research and should encompass research in both the public and private sectors.

Recommendation 6

i) We recommend that an institution should be free to set tuition fees at whatever level it regards as appropriate, program by program, on condition that if an institution chooses to set fees above the government-specified upper limit defined in (ii), it must distribute 30% of the incremental revenue as financial assistance to its students, based on need.

ii) We recommend that the government set an upper limit on fees used to calculate the amount of government-provided student assistance for which a student would be eligible. There should be a single limit used for all institutions, both publicly- and privately-funded, participating in the public student assistance program.

iii) We recommend that, with respect to compulsory ancillary fees, those initiated by student governments should continue to be determined by current processes, but all other ancillary fees should be incorporated in the overall tuition fee.

iv) We recommend that, along with greater freedom in setting fees, institutions should be sensitive to the need to protect students from substantial, unanticipated increases in tuition fees

for programs in which they are currently enrolled. Institutions are encouraged to set tuition fees on the basis of programs of study - rather than on the basis of courses or terms - wherever this can reasonably be done. Moreover, institutions should make special efforts to allocate their financial assistance funds in a way that does not preclude a student, with the motivation and ability, from pursuing courses or programs with higher fees.

Recommendation 7

i) We recommend that the government introduce an income-contingent loan repayment plan (ICLRP) that would have a number of helpful features to students, including:

- postponement of interest payments until after the student's program of study is completed or after a fixed number of years (whichever comes first); and

- several options for the student to choose from regarding the repayment schedule, including an option to repay faster at any time without penalty.

ii) We recommend that the income-contingent loan repayment plan be delivered as a joint federal-provincial student assistance plan, administered through the tax system, but that, if the federal government is not prepared to cooperate with Ontario in this task, the provincial government should take whatever steps are necessary to implement an ICLRP on its own. In this latter case, we would urge the federal government to provide appropriate assistance and support to this effort, including administering the tax aspects of the Plan under the Federal-Provincial Tax Collection Agreements and, if necessary, providing full compensation to Ontario to allow it to withdraw from the Canada Student Loans Plan and offer in integrated ICLRP option to Ontario students.

iii) We recommend that, in place of the current approach on loan forgiveness under OSAP which

creates uncertainties for students, a program of needs-based grants be introduced. Grants would

be provided only to students in publicly-assisted colleges and universities.

iv) We recommend that the Ministry investigate the causes for high rates of default on student

loans. It should explore the use of penalties that would make postsecondary institutions with

unusually high rates of default more responsible for the loss, but that would not weaken access

to postsecondary education.

v) We recommend that interest on money borrowed to pursue eligible postsecondary education

programs should be deductible from income in calculating income tax. It is a clear principle of

income taxation that interest paid on money borrowed to earn income should be tax deductible,

and taking out a loan to make an investment in education is analogous to taking out a loan to

make a business investment. This measure should be implemented by the Government of

Canada, and we urge the Government of Ontario to indicate to the federal government that it

supports such a change and is prepared to forego the provincial tax revenue involved.

vi) We recommend that the present Registered Education Savings Plans (RESP) be brought

closer to Registered Retirement Savings Plans (RRSP) in order to encourage saving for

postsecondary education. In particular, we urge that the federal government provide the same

tax deductibility for RESP contributions that is available for RRSP contributions, and that it be

possible to effect one-time transfers from RRSPs to RESPs within the total RESP limits. It

should be possible to effect accumulated investment income in RESPs that is not used for

postsecondary education into a RRSP. The Government of Ontario should urge the Government

of Canada to implement such a change soon. If the federal government is not prepared to

proceed with this change, the provincial government should provide at least a partial tax credit

for RESP contributions and the federal government should administer such a credit for the province.

Recommendation 8

We recommend that donations of assets be exempt from the capital gains tax. This change would benefit all charitable organizations.

Recommendation 9

We recommend that colleges explore more actively private and international training programs and that the provincial government's coordinating and regulatory role be supportive. The terms of centralized collective agreements in the colleges should take into account the need for flexibility to develop these programs. More broadly, there are growing opportunities for partnerships with private institutions on education and research programs. It is the responsibility of all colleges and universities to have guidelines that preserve the integrity of their institutions in such partnerships.

Recommendation 10

We recommend that government-defined catchment areas for colleges be abandoned. At the same time, colleges must continue to fulfill their obligations for education and training of their local or linguistic communities.

Recommendation 11

We recommend that the arrangements for credit transfer and cooperative college-university programming, as well as for shared services and facilities, should develop further with government encouragement rather than with government direction. The advisory body we propose in this report should be responsible for stimulating and monitoring the evolving

linkages.

Recommendation 12

i) We recommend that an Ontario College Diploma (OCD) be developed as a unique

designation, backed by a review process on standards, and allowing for modifications to the

credential to recognize particular specializations and accomplishments. The continued

development of standards should be treated as an urgent matter. At this time, the OCD should

be confined to Ontario's Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology and to programs of these

colleges that meet the established standards. We would not rule out the possibility that at a

future date a private vocational school or career college might satisfy the standards for an OCD

and be given authority to use this designation.

ii) We recommend that the awarding of secular degrees should continue to be a responsibility of

universities at this time. It should be possible, however, for a college to transform to polytechnic

degree-granting status and from there to a university.

Recommendation 13

We recommend the establishment of an advisory body to provide sustained, arms-length analysis

of postsecondary education to help assure governments, students, private organizations and other

groups that critical assessments, independent reviews and advice are an ongoing feature of

Ontario's postsecondary system. It should be able to probe more deeply than the Panel has had

time to do - and on a continuing basis - issues related to both colleges and universities. The

body should be responsible for improving the publicly available information on postsecondary

education and research. One of its responsibilities should be a regular report on the comparative

strengths and weaknesses of Ontario's system relative to those in other jurisdictions. Another

responsibility should be to monitor, assess and report upon the adequacy of quality assurance and accountability processes for both colleges and universities.

Recommendation 14

We recommend that, in order for colleges and universities to meet expected enrolment increases, the government should encourage institutional initiatives and arrangements for expanding the geographic reach of programs and for using existing physical facilities more intensively, and should not plan at this time the construction of a new college or university.

Recommendation 15

We recommend the establishment of a special matching trust fund for faculty renewal. For universities, the program should focus on special funding or endowments for hiring and retaining outstanding junior and senior scholars in areas of strength identified by governing boards. For colleges, the program should support academic development of existing faculty.

Recommendation 16

We recommend that governing boards of colleges and universities ensure that a high proportion of compensation increases is awarded in recognition of excellence in teaching and, in the case of universities, of research performance, and that, without becoming involved in individual cases, governing boards ensure that appropriate processes are in place to assess and reward performance.

Recommendation 17

We recommend that, with regard to the terms of academic appointments, governing boards must fulfil their responsibility for ensuring that processes are in place for the effective evaluation of performance in teaching and, in the case of universities, in research, and that processes are in

place to respond appropriately to the results of such evaluation, including corrective measures where performance is less than satisfactory.

Recommendation 18

We recommend that Ontario's policy precluding the establishment of new, privately-financed universities be amended to permit, under strict conditions, the establishment of privately-financed, not-for-profit universities with the authority to grant degrees with a secular name. Strict conditions and standards must apply to institutional mission and governance structures; institutional and academic quality, as determined by nationally or internationally recognized peer review; financial responsibility; and protection of students in the event of institutional failure. These conditions and standards should be developed by the advisory body on postsecondary education recommended in this report.

APPENDIX IV – Letter of introduction and request to participate in study

(on Fanshawe College Letterhead)

1999 02 02

Professor J. Robert S. Prichard
President
University of Toronto
27 King's College Circle
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1A1

Dear Professor Prichard:

This letter is intended to serve as an introduction and as a request to participate in a **research study** which will be conducted by telephone survey early in February of 1999.

The **study** - *An Examination of the Barriers to Articulation Agreements Between College and Universities in Ontario* - is being conducted as a doctoral dissertation for OISE/UT by a faculty member at Fanshawe College. Administrators at all colleges and universities in Ontario are being surveyed.

The survey will consist of six open-ended questions posed by the researcher and your responses will be entered into a database. If you choose, you are not obligated in any way to participate, but your responses will be helpful to the study.

Thank-you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Danielle Renaud, Ed.D. candidate   Dr. Howard Rundle, President
OISE/UT   Fanshawe College
Faculty, Fanshawe College

APPENDIX V - List of Ontario universities and colleges

Note- list of universities and colleges was obtained from the Ministry of Education (now the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities) website

Universities:

Brock University - St. Catharines
Carleton University - Ottawa
University of Guelph - Guelph
Lakehead University - Thunder Bay
Laurentian University - Sudbury
McMaster University - Hamilton
Nipissing University - North Bay
Ontario College of Art and Design - Toronto
University of Ottawa - Ottawa
Queen's University - Kingston
Ryerson Polytechnic University - Toronto
University of Toronto - Toronto
Trent University - Peterborough
University of Waterloo - Waterloo
University of Western Ontario - London
Wilfred Laurier University - Waterloo
University of Windsor - Windsor
York University - North York

Colleges:

Algonquin College of Applied Arts and Technology - Nepean
College Boreal - Sudbury
Cambrian College - Sudbury
Canadore College of Applied Arts and Technology - North Bay
Centennial College of Applied Arts and Technology - Scarborough
La Cite collegiale - Ottawa
Conestoga College of Applied Arts and Technology - Kitchener
Confederation College of Applied Arts and Technology - Thunder Bay
Durham College of Applied Arts and Technology - Oshawa
Fanshawe College of Applied Arts and Technology - London
George Brown College of Applied Arts and Technology - Toronto
Georgian College of Applied Arts and Technology - Barrie
College des Grands Lacs - Welland
Humber College of Applied Arts and Technology - Etobicoke

Lambton College of Applied Arts and Technology - Sarnia
Loyalist College of Applied Arts and Technology - Belleville
Mohawk College of Applied Arts and Technology - Hamilton
Niagara College of Applied Arts and Technology - Welland
Northern College of Applied Arts and Technology - Timmins
St. Clair College of Applied Arts and Technology - Windsor
St. Lawrence College of Applied Arts and Technology - Kingston
Sault College of Applied Arts and Technology -Sault Ste. Marie
Seneca College of Applied Arts and Technology - North York
Sheridan College of Applied Arts and Technology - Oakville
Sir Sandford Fleming College of Applied Arts and Technology - Peterborough

Appendix VI - Sample interview transcript

I - interviewer
R - respondent
Note - certain portions of the text are deleted where the information may identify the respondent

I - Good morning _____, I'd like to thank-you again for agreeing to participate in my study. As you know this study is an examination of the current barriers to articulation agreements between colleges and universities in Ontario and is being conducted as a doctoral dissertation for OISE/UT. I am a faculty member at Fanshawe College. In this study I am surveying all Presidents and Vice-Presidents, Academic at all colleges and universities in the province, and secondarily, I'm surveying Deans at colleges and universities in areas selected to represent, geographically, the entire province. I have six open-ended questions, which I will ask you in order. Should you begin to answer one question within the answer of another, I will not stop you, yet I will still ask the next question, which may seem redundant. For the purposes of transcription accuracy, would you allow me to tape record this interview? I am the only one who will listen to the tapes. Are you ready to begin? The first question is - What do you perceive as the current barriers to articulation agreements between colleges and universities in Ontario?

R - The sheer logistical effort and time required for a college to work out an agreement with a university, even when universities have the best of intentions (coded and categorized under Lengthy process to negotiate). The university structure is a huge barrier - each department has the right to veto any agreements - it requires vote by faculty and senate (coded and categorized under Governance structure). The structure of the Ontario postsecondary system is a huge barrier because historically it's not a part of our mandate (coded and categorized under History).

I - The second question is - In relation to the barriers identified, what do you suggest are the

146

reasons?

R - Well, the structure of the postsecondary system in Ontario - as I said, it's not part of the

original mandate of colleges. There are too many universities in Ontario of varying perceived

quality, lesser universities will be more open to agreements with colleges. Universities don't

need more students and don't care about those coming from colleges (coded and categorized

under Monopoly status of Ontario universities). So, most universities don't need students

(coded and categorized under Lack of interest). Ontario doesn't value or respect diplomas or

vocational training as does Europe (coded and categorized under Degree versus diploma).

I - Question 3 is - What do you suggest needs to occur to prompt change in this current situation?

R - Government action is necessary, nothing short of this will work. We've had enough studies

recommending this - it has been studied to death, enough committees working on it too - they

have only made microscopic progress while the need has increased. We aren't doing as well

now because we are not meeting a larger need (coded and categorized under Government policy

and funding incentive).

I - Question 4 is - What types of agreements do you currently have articulated, or in progress?

R - A few, one's a fluke with a university program that was dying and articulated to save itself

(coded and categorized under - Few) and some in social work and general arts.

I - The fifth question is - How were your agreements negotiated?

R - Individual programs (coded and categorized under - Bottom up).

I - The last question is - Do you have any summative comments, or pearls of wisdom, to add that

you think pertinent to this study?

R - Negotiations with foreign universities and out-of-province universities are relevant as they

are large and important universities, not lesser institutions as they are called by Ontario universities - that is badmouthing. If Ontario universities are concerned with the quality of curriculum they should look at their own - the measure of quality in universities is only paper qualification. When you are teaching something applied you have to be at the cutting edge and you don't have to get there by doing research, rather by knowing what it is - a different kind of knowledge rather than research within a very narrow scope.

I - Is there anything else you'd like to add?

R - You won't find any university people who will say that colleges should become degree-granting. The failure of nursing programs in Ontario hasn't happened elsewhere - good will is fine, but it doesn't get things done - senior admin can't control faculty and make this happen, that's why government action is necessary

I - Thank-you very much for your input, good-bye.

Note - this interview lasted just short of thirty minutes.

APPENDIX VII - Summary of comments to question 6 - pearls of wisdom

#5U - Articulation is inevitable, it is cheaper to cooperate than to fight it, there are more colleges and universities in Ontario than in other provinces and the Ontario universities are powerful. Ontario is in a time warp of postsecondary education with 3 curriculum reforms in 15 years, we have no distance ed to speak of, it will take a tough government to make change. Maybe there will be a new postsecondary ministry or a joining of colleges and universities.

#8C - Colleges move fast, universities move slow, we need a long range perspective. There are two different mentalities, so we should go out of province. Colleges shouldn't be obsessed with being universities, like late adolescents trying to be grown up, be who we are and take pride in our accomplishments. Colleges want to do, universities want to study - apples and oranges. Post-diploma and applied research should be the focus of colleges, respect will come with that.

#12C - We need to look at triggers for evolution of the relationship between colleges and universities - we never had a link - that is a major factor in the lack of willingness. Artificial laddering is breaking down and the universities are not coming to grips with reality yet.

#13C - Trying to negotiate within the province is a phenomenally torturous process - a lot of time and energy for little benefit.

#15U - A general template sets us up for failure, we need to celebrate and acknowledge progress, we need resources to enable people to do the work, we need to preserve our unique and complementary missions in Ontario postsecondary education - there is an area of overlap that was not recognized adequately by the original vision which has emerged over the last ten years or so - it is a clear imperative now.

#16U - The current template is an accident looking for a place to happen, it will be a catastrophic disaster, it is doomed to fail and the government will say see you couldn't do it (refers to first draft of template).

#20C - There seems to be a shift in opinion happening with a broader sense of responsibility for coming up with solutions, especially at CUCC - some levers for that are such things as ministerial consents issue. Things are changing and when thing change those who change most quickly get the most negative reaction from those who want things to change more slowly. One of the underlying causes is different mandates and the changing of mandate for both colleges and universities, they are trying to cope with societal change and the value of a liberal arts degree. A change in opinion has resulted in reverse articulation, universities are reluctant to change their traditional nature, so the context is not college versus university, rather it is postsecondary education itself.

#24U - Political masters refer to the UK and Australia as models for us to follow - it didn't work - degree-granting status for polytechnics increased snobbishness as it became more important to identify which institution it came from. Keep pursuing articulation agreements. Terminology is not valid today - terminal - nothing is now. We need to rephrase and reconfigure, rethink mandate. The credibility of college faculty is only an argument with blanket agreements, not with subject-based ones - if we work together the programs will be of high quality.

#27C - Our problem is famous outside of Ontario, universities know that Ontario universities don't play, it's very sad, not something to be proud of but universities seem to be. The public policy argument needs to be kept on a conscious level.

#28U - The world is changing and the original conception of colleges is not appropriate now, nor

was it then, this has been proven by student demand - one size doesn't fit all. Some universities will do this more readily than others, if York, Waterloo and McMaster do and UT and Queen's don't, that's okay. Geographical proximity is a factor for convenience and sharing of resources.

#34C - Minister's recent comment that the only way the government will get interested in this issue is the scream index - students and colleges had better make it a public and political issue. If it's not political then it's not on the radar screen - we are playing pure politics. We cannot continue to go the route we are, we have to become activists to the issues that are important to us, right now we aren't, we lie down to be killed before asked, we beg.

#35C - Degree-granting needs to be investigated, the system can't afford the costs of duplication, nor can the students be expected to repeat thing that have already been learned. The Ministry must take a stance on the priority of lifelong learning.

#36U - Articulation will be harder in the future with the double cohort and budget cuts. Skolnik's paper does a good job of getting at the nub of the issues, even though other university people don't agree. Change of entrenched attitudes is enormously difficult and the challenges outside the university pale in comparison to the challenges inside the university - i.e.- faculty, senate - I can understand why university president don't want to tackle this, but remember the dinosaur is extinct and the little thing that was yapping at it is still around. There's are reason why small business is growing.

#38U - I'm very favourable to increased articulation - we are moving to very useful innovation in postsecondary education. It's not a good idea to just tier the system and to put abstract credential labels on top of existing programs - not much value to that, although the champions of tiering will argue it. We need to work on both cultural and financial barriers in order to move

this along. Elite universities want to maintain tiers and are a big part of the problem, they want three tiers, two for universities and a third for colleges. The elitism is shocking and cultural barriers are hard to break down.

#65U - It depends on how much teeth the government is willing to put into this argument and given the current ideological climate my guess is they're going to come down pretty hard on the side of the colleges' argument, even though universities have a different history. Colleges have a provincial strength and universities are on their own, we have the colleges and each other to worry about. There is a growing perception that colleges do a better job of tacking grads and that grads are more likely to get jobs - the Tories like that - don't agree, but that doesn't matter. Colleges have been far more adaptable and flexible than universities who have been secure and isolated and need to learn - a steep curve - can understand the frustration of colleges. Tier ones don't think of students as pressure to publish becomes greater the less faculty will want to teach and to work on articulation. A student did a master's thesis on success of college grads and found that they were incredibly successful.

#67U - As we look at changes, for example in BC, a trend of cooperation , we have to take seriously and work quickly so the government doesn't legislate something that neither group likes - this government is pretty aggressive. Both carrot and stick will get the best and the quickest result.

#68C - Don't see attitudes changing quickly. Maclean's will soon rank colleges too - like KPI - the colleges came out well and Maclean's is now saying that colleges are the postsecondary education of choice - we must be doing something right since so many university grads come to college after.

#69C - Universities use the excuse of prep level of faculty when they don't even know what it is, for example, on person has a PhD and they cited it. Elitist attitudes of universities will make this a struggle continually especially in professionally related programs, when the agreements fall apart at the final stages they fall back on argument of faculty and curriculum problems when their faculty don't all have PhDs.

#76U - Attitudes change real fast when one's survival is at stake. History can be overstated - tired of having Alberta used as an example as it is different from CAATs, but people can be too defensive too. We have a lot to learn from them because the content of the debate is the same, we can be informed fro the dialogue there, there is room for everybody ant there is evidence that students do need a university degree and specialized training and that is born out by percentages of university grads at convocation who when asked say that they are going to college - in 1991 it was 2% and now 10-15%. Think this is a good and smart choice but regret that we aren't designing programs from the start that will give them both credentials.

VITA AUCTORIS

Danielle Renaud is a faculty member and Coordinator of the Educational Assistant Post-Graduate Program in the Human Services Division at Fanshawe College in London, Ontario.

She began her university career in 1979, studying Psychology at the University of Windsor. In 1981 she moved to British Columbia where she studied Special Education for two years at UBC and then returned to Windsor for B.Ed. and M. Ed. studies.

Danielle began teaching at Fanshawe College in 1987 and has taught courses in teaching and learning methodology, augmentative communication and professional issues. In addition to teaching responsibilities, Danielle has conducted several research studies, has published articles, and has presented her research at several conferences. She has also served on the Research and Development Subcommittee of College Council, which she will Chair beginning in the 1999/2000 academic year.

Danielle's program team for the Educational Assistant Post-Graduate Program is currently involved in a collaborative research project with OISE/UT (which is not related to this dissertation) and is one of the first college programs to obtain federal research funds from the Canada Foundation for Innovation.