

CUCC FORUM
SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS
MONDAY, MARCH 25, 2002

Introduction and Welcome
Dr. Douglas Auld, President
Loyalist College and Co-Chair, CUCC

Dr. Auld welcomed the participants to our forum on college/university partnerships in Ontario.

Dr Auld suggested that in the future, historians of education will look at the current period as a watershed in the emergence of a new structure of higher education in Ontario. From the 1960s to the early 1990s, colleges and universities advanced their own agendas within a general framework of very significant growth. The community colleges had not been structured as an alternative route to university study; but even so, colleges began to develop linkages as students looked to extend their educational opportunities. Some of these linkages were formal, some not. Initially some colleges created links with American universities but by the mid 1990s sufficient interest developed between colleges and universities in Ontario toward credit transfer that the Government agreed to provide funding for the College-University Consortium Council. The mandate of CUCC is to conduct research on credit transfer both in Ontario and elsewhere, to develop and maintain a transfer guide and encourage the development of articulation. The environment continues to change as applied degrees for colleges have recently been approved and there is speculation that in the near future polytechnic institutions may appear.

With all of this change, CUCC is asking the question – what should the role of the Council be in the future. This is an opportunity to hear your ideas and comments on the future and to assist in the process of change. The program is designed to provide a broad foundation for discussion, as it is important that we understand how colleges and universities have worked together for the benefit of students. Efforts to bring us together have one goal – to enhance post-secondary opportunities for students.

Now and in the Future – Questions for the Forum

Murray Genoe, Director
College-University Consortium Council

Mr. Genoe welcomed the participants to the CUCC Forum. He noted that this was the second conference which CUCC had sponsored, the first one being in Ottawa in 1997, held to report on the progress of the original college-university collaboration projects. At that time, the perceived barriers to success had been discussed and identified as funding, culture, expectations and accountability, commitment and decision-making and the interpretation of goals and objectives. But times have changed over that few years until now – some of the barriers may still be in place; many are not. The Port Hope Accord and the Ontario College-University Transfer Guide are demonstrations of that.

CUCC's mandate is to provide information, facilitate interaction and carry out research. All of this works into today's forum. The purpose of the Forum is to review the continuing development of college/university relationships in Ontario in light of an ever-changing environment; and with that development in mind, what is the role of CUCC within it. What are your views, ideas and suggestions which will assist CUCC in carrying out its basic mandate of providing a continuum of opportunities for Ontario's students?

We want to see where we are and where we might be going. We want to look at lessons from elsewhere and we want to speculate on the future.

Approaches to Articulation, Credit Transfer and College/University Collaboration in Ontario

University of Guelph/Humber

Mr. David Trick, Vice-Provost & Chief Administrative Office

Professor Michael Nightingale, Vice-Provost & Chief Academic Officer

Mr. Trick and Professor Nightingale presented a 'case study' on the University of Guelph/Humber collaboration emphasizing what is being done, how it is working and why it is working so far. Mr. Trick began by outlining the basis of the Guelph/Humber partnership, noting that the mission is to "provide a new option in higher education in Ontario and respond to an increasing number of students". A target of 2,000 students has been set in integrated honours degree programs, beginning with 200 students in September 2002. The collaboration is based on the following principles – student focused, joint design and development, and support from government via SuperBuild. Students will achieve both an honours degree from the University of Guelph and a diploma from Humber College over a 4-year period of study. The focus will be on Toronto-area students, an area that has demonstrated rapid short-term growth and projected rapid long-term growth.

Professor Nightingale outlined the academic mission of Guelph/Humber, a collaboration that had been under consideration since 1999. The academic themes include both a theoretical and applied dimension combining Guelph's established learning objectives and Humber's emphasis on employability skills. The study of program feasibility has brought together the best of both worlds. Guelph/Humber have developed an integrated degree/diploma program which incorporates the following factors – adoption of Guelph's admission standards, ensuring that each course is at university level with Humber providing the applied aspects, avoiding course content overlap, integrating theory and practice, integrating classroom and e-learning and introducing an experiential component that reinforces learning outside the normal timetable. Initial programs include computing, business administration and media studies, followed by family and community social services, justice studies, gerontology

and early childhood services in 2003. Credit transfer and articulation will be developed slowly to ensure success and build on experience.

Regarding structure and governance, Mr. Trick indicated that Guelph/Humber is a joint venture of the two institutions, achieved within existing legislation. An executive committee composed of the presidents, vice-presidents (academic), vice-presidents (administration) and the vice-provosts governs it. Academic governance ensures that each program is approved through the normal processes of both institutions and program development is shared. Non-academic responsibilities are provided through service agreements with the parent institution as applicable. With SuperBuild funding, a new building is under development for the Humber College campus.

In conclusion, Mr. Trick outlined the success factors, as they have become apparent so far. Externally, he noted the geographic and demographic aspects of the collaboration and SuperBuild funding. Internally, he stressed the importance of personal and institutional compatibility, the student-focused emphasis, a positive approach to labour relations, a 'fair play' approach to finances, a willingness to invest in the long term and an appropriate scale of growth.

Mohawk College/Wilfrid Laurier University – Brantford
Dr. Leo Groarke, Dean, Brantford Campus,
Wilfrid Laurier University
Ms Louise Bockner, Dean, Business Applied Arts & Access,
Mohawk College

Dr. Groarke began the presentation by noting that the real difficulty in collaboration between post-secondary institutions is getting them to do things, and see themselves, in different ways and to accept a good idea and be willing to change. Any collaborative effort must recognize this context.

Wilfrid Laurier University has become proactive in college/university partnership for a number of reasons:

- Laurier at Brantford is new, having opened in 1999 with 30 full-time students;
- there is no history or tradition;
- the objective is to establish a distinctive academic mission with an emphasis on interdisciplinary programming;
- a college-university partnership an objective with one-third of programming devoted to college-university collaboration.

The effort was motivated by that fact that it made sense to bring together the applied, practical, career orientation of a college with the more general theoretical approach of a university. Students have recognized this for some time. There are three basic principles to the cooperative endeavour:

1. an alternative to the 4-year honours program for students in the general program and for students not suited to honours programming through a mixture of liberal arts and careering-focused programming creating 2 x 4 schedule with a degree and a diploma over 4 years;
2. a desire to develop a cluster of programming instead of a single effort and learn from the development as work progressed;
3. collaboration that is more than an articulation agreement but an in-depth relationship that will be complex but based on mutual understanding.

Ms Bockner stressed that a good working partnership has developed between Mohawk College and Wilfrid Laurier University. She noted that proximity certainly played a role in success, and that a shuttle bus system between Mohawk's Hamilton campus and Brantford will enhance interest for students pursuing the joint program. It has been "a very easy and painless process" which has seen Mohawk students receive one year of credit at WLU toward the Contemporary Studies degree. Thus a 2-year diploma and 2 years at WLU-Brantford permits a student both a diploma and a degree.

The benefits of the collaboration have been an equitable, student centered agreement; teaching methodologies have not changed for the institutions, which makes adjustment easier; and there has been an economic development focus for the city of Brantford. The programs developed are '3 +1' for a degree and a post-diploma certificate and '2 + 2' for both a diploma and a degree. Promotion is the next challenge. It will include individual program brochures, joint liaison secondary school visits, open house opportunities, websites, calendars, mailings and a media campaign.

Ms Bockner concluded by pointing out what it takes to make collaboration successful – recognition of the integrity of college programs and mutual respect and trust.

Canadore College/Nipissing University
Ms Barbara Taylor, President, Canadore College
Dr. Robert Forrest, Vice-President Academic, Nipissing University

Ms Taylor and Dr. Forrest began their presentation by outlining the founding and history of both institutions. They share land and buildings but emphasized that each institution is distinct. They are two autonomous and different institutions with a common vision of "growing independently together". They noted that governing management is guided by the "larger user" principle in terms of shared functions. Partnerships are reviewed annually and sharing formulas adjusted annually.

There are a number of approaches to collaborative programming between the two institutions. There are articulation agreements in the traditional sense, examples including Business and Print Journalism. There are Blended Program Agreements that arose from early CUCC work. The logistics of developing these programs were difficult but much was learned from them. Canadore College delivers 45% of the program content and students achieve a diploma and a degree. Examples include the Bachelor of Business Information Systems and the Bachelor of Environmental Biology and Technology. Collaborative Program Agreements include the nursing program, an important aspect of which was community involvement. Lastly, there are Articulated/Blended Agreements such as Police Foundation/Correctional Worker articulated to an Honours BA in Criminal Justice and conversely, this BA program blended with Police Foundations or Correctional Worker diplomas.

Dr. Forrest and Ms Taylor next commented on new programming directions. Program development for the future includes hospitality/tourism degree completion, collaborative research opportunities, health sciences, in light of the new medical facility close by, special needs student support and a law clerk/criminal justice articulated/blended initiative.

The development of joint programming and working together has demonstrated the challenges such effort must overcome. Institutions must adjust to each other and recognize the differences in language and curriculum. The partners must recognize the strengths, different philosophies of education and institutional perspectives. The same terminology can mean different things and partners have to be conscious of that.

From the experiences of Canadore College and Nipissing University, the following points were stressed:

- the simpler the better;
- faculty to faculty accord is essential;
- keep the registrars happy;
- the devil is in the detail;
- don't force-fit;
- ensure that there is a paper trail;

In serving students, both institutions help in getting them where they want to go and preconceptions about both post-secondary sectors are broken down as people work side-by-side. Thus the institutions complement each other.

Laurentian University/Georgian College
Dr. Bill Gordon, Dean, University and Advanced Studies,
Georgian College
Dr. Donald Dennie,
Dean, Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences,
Laurentian University

Dr. Bill Gordon began the presentation by commenting that the Laurentian @ Georgian program represents a mesh of expertise and functionality brought by both institutions. Laurentian @ Georgian is a BA (honours) degree program which Dr. Gordon described as a 'franchise' model. Laurentian University provides the curriculum for three majors, psychology, political science and sociology which commenced in September 2001. Years one and two are taken at Georgian College in Barrie and years three and four are taken at Laurentian University in Sudbury. Students are provided with both a Georgian and a Laurentian identity card and have their own student government. Students apply to the program through the standard university procedures and the regular university standards, fees and scholarship opportunities apply.

The development of the collaborative program was precipitated by a number of factors. There is no university in Georgian's catchment area but there is a demand for the opportunity. In light of this, "the Georgian College Board of Governors gave direction to broker select programs through partnerships". A new Superbuild project is under way, providing an opportunity and it was recognized that there are capacity issues in view of the double cohort. For Laurentian University, collaboration with Georgian College provides access to students in the central region of the province, establishes a presence on the major north-south corridor and provided a means of dealing with the double cohort issue.

Dr. Gordon then went on to discuss the issues and resolutions which the two institutions dealt with, and are dealing with, in developing the collaborative program. Regarding faculty, Georgian College recruits from within the College and locally. Laurentian University reviews candidates and selections are made. Georgian College hires the faculty members based on union rates. Curriculum for the majors offered is selected by Laurentian. It is recognized that at this point choice is more limited than at the Laurentian campus but the minimum requirements are provided. In terms of learning resources such as the library, Georgian recognized that it was under-resourced. Laurentian assessed holdings and funding was allocated to upgrading them. Full access was provided to resources in Sudbury via the internet. Funding arrangements are currently being negotiated. At present, the program is sustained on tuition only and Georgian College infrastructure. The collaboration "drastically requires government grant consideration".

Dr. Gordon concluded by outlining future directions for Laurentian @ Georgian which are based on a number of factors. Firstly, an assessment of the student response is essential. Are students being served and are they being successful? The majority of

students are based in the Barrie region which provides a new student base. Further, can years three and four be added to the Georgian College offerings? Three additional majors are planned for 2003. The collaboration has led to discussions of other joint possibilities between the two institutions which need to be explored. Of particular importance will be the resolution of the grant funding issue.

York University/Seneca College
Dr. Rodney Webb, Associate Vice-President Academic,
York University
Ms Cindy Hazell, Acting Vice-President Academic,
Seneca College

Ms Hazell and Dr. Webb began their presentation by indicating that they would briefly introduce the two institutions, review current collaborative programs and then look at new and exciting arrangements that are just under way or upcoming. Both are large and comprehensive institutions which have been working together for up to 25 years. Each has three campuses, highlighted by Seneca at York, a Seneca campus which is located on the York campus at Keele St. and Steeles Ave. in North York. Ms. Hazell emphasized that over one-third of the part-time registrations at Seneca College already have a degree and the college has responded to this with the development of post-diploma programs to meet that demand. The fact that the two institutions are close neighbours has meant that programs have often evolved through faculty-to-faculty dialogue and initiatives.

Dr. Webb noted that many collaborative programs have developed because students want to upgrade their diploma to a degree and conversely, students with degrees want to add an applied dimension, thus enabling them to be more competitive in the work place. With this in mind, a variety of programs have developed between the two institutions. The multilateral agreement in nursing on a 2-plus-2 basis is an example of several institutions responding quickly to changing educational needs. Bilateral concurrent agreements are in place in the areas of Broadcasting (radio and television journalism), Creative Advertising, Rehabilitation Services, Social Services – Gerontology, Joint BA-General Arts and Science Diploma and Early Childhood Education. There are bilateral consecutive agreements in Civil Engineering Technology, Court and Tribunal Administration and Law Clerk, Civil Engineering Technology – Building/Construction and Municipal/Environmental Specializations. All of these programs integrate theory and applied learning strategies.

An important unique initiative is YSISTE, the York/Seneca Institute for Science, Technology and Education. The Institute has developed elementary school science and technology curriculum and secondary school science curriculum for the Ministry of Education, provides pre-service teacher education in mathematics, science and technology and delivers in-service teacher education. The Institute is located at the

Seneca at York site, but will be moving to the new Seneca/York Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL) building on the York campus in September 2003.

The TEL Building is a new venture in York/Seneca cooperation that builds upon established relationships and collaboration. This is a SuperBuild project, which will be in place for the double cohort. The building will be approximately 360,000 sq. ft. and house four York Faculty units and four Seneca Faculty clusters. The TEL Institute will be located in this building providing space and collaborative resources for joint research projects. The ABEL project (Advanced Broadband Enabled Learning) will investigate the technological, pedagogical and intellectual property issues surrounding the sharing of electronic learning objects. The Seneca wireless accounting project will examine the effectiveness of the use of hand-held devices as supplemental resources for first year accounting students and the Empirical Project allows Seneca Communications Arts students to contribute to the development of online curriculum for the University of Toronto and York University. Future collaborative developments under consideration between Seneca and York include a joint program in Biotechnology, Accounting and Finance, and Information Technology.

Ms Hazell and Dr. Webb concluded the presentation by stressing the need to pay close attention to administrative detail and logistics, and the need to have faculty-to-faculty confidence and credibility. While senior administration needs to get together to foster collaboration, even more fundamentally, there has to be a desire for faculty colleagues at the departmental level to work together to ensure success.

Keynote Address (Highlights)

Mr. Kevin Costante, Deputy Minister Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities

Mr. Costante expressed his pleasure at being at the Forum to discuss college-university collaboration, a topic that is one of the top three-to-five issues in the post-secondary world. In the global economy, it is important that people's prior learning be recognized, when education and learning is so important. It is important to have a seamless system of educational opportunities where there are pathways for students and workers to move between college and university and the workplace as easily and quickly as possible. One priority of government is to encourage cooperation between colleges and universities. One billion dollars in new capital has been invested in colleges and universities under Superbuild and \$145 million went to collaborative programming and innovative partnerships.

Government has been working with colleges and universities to cooperate on a voluntary basis. Success has been demonstrated by the creation of the CUCC and the Ontario College-University Transfer Guide; and institutions are encouraged to work with

CUCC in keeping the Guide accurate and up-to-date. Also, the Port Hope Accord has accelerated the development of agreements. Colleges and universities are urged to continue and to accelerate the development of agreements, using the timeframes specified in the Port Hope Accord as a guideline. Trust and mutual respect are the bases of collaboration.

The focus needs to be on students and learners, and information on opportunities must be available to assist students in planning their academic careers. This focus is important to reduce completion time, save time and money and reduce taxpayer cost. Mr. Costante challenged all Ontario colleges and universities to commit to making it clear up front to students/applicants what the pathways are and clearly identify how a student could appeal a transfer decision.

Mr. Costante noted that the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada will be directing its attention to credit transfer issues on a pan-Canadian basis at its April 2002 meeting

Mr. Costante noted that the Ministry intends to continue CUCC as an arms-length body which seeks to promote cooperation between the sectors.

Mr. Costante emphasized two possible issues for the sectors and CUCC to discuss. Firstly, to make a priority of developing more articulated programs in high affinity areas on a multilateral and cross-disciplinary basis. He noted that of the existing 103 degree-completion agreements in the CUCC database, 69 were available for the top twenty college programs by number of graduates in 2000. However, 43 of these agreements are in two programs - Early Childhood Education and Social Services Worker. In 8 of 20 programs, there are no degree completion opportunities and a further 4 of 20 programs have only one degree-completion arrangement.

Second, CUCC could explore the development of clear information on pathways for students by creating a course credit equivalencies guide. Mr. Costante committed the Ministry to help work on priority areas such as these in cooperation with CUCC. The prime goal is to assist students to get credit where credit is deserved and move forward without having to repeat things.

Articulation and Credit Transfer in Other Jurisdictions

The United States
David Baime, Vice-President
American Association of Community Colleges

Mr. Baime began his presentation with a discussion of the background of community colleges in the United States. He noted that they evolved from junior

colleges created for the transfer function. They were initially private colleges but are now predominately public. They were set up to be oriented to local needs, be inexpensive, and be easily accessible. Now they have an adult and basic education role as well as transfer.

There are now 1600 two-year community colleges across the United States that educate 5.4 million credit students every year that amounts to 40% of credit students. There are 5 million non-credit students. They are very much state-driven and so can be quite different. Articulation and credit transfer issues are addressed and resolved at the state level. Funding can vary greatly, from 80% state funding to 80% local funding. Tuition accounts for 20% of funding.

Regarding transfer, Mr. Baime noted that “we get a lot of flack for low transfer rates”. One of the reasons is the success of the associate degree that offers many career opportunities to college students, thus reducing the need for transfer. Another issue is that there is not enough information on transfer. This has created a barrier so that a seamless transition seems difficult. Overcoming this barrier has become a major initiative. More transfer is going on between 2-year colleges, between 4-year colleges and from 4-year to 2-year colleges, indicating a more mobile student body than has historically been the case. Also, there is a trend toward students enrolled in 2- and 4-year college at the same time.

Mr. Baime noted that institutions do guard their prerogative to set qualifications and standards for admission and this does impact transfer. Accreditation has become a key issue. It is important in the maintenance of institutional autonomy but it is becoming a political issue. For-profit institutions which are not accredited for admission to public institutions are attempting to resolve that via legislation and the colleges are resisting strongly.

Regarding transfer rates, the numbers vary widely, from 5% to 84% so there is no meaningful consensus. However, the number is dropping historically due to changes in the nature of community colleges as previously noted. In 1950, two-thirds of students indicated that they intended to transfer. In 1985, one-third so indicated.

A recent survey had 43 respondent states of which 34 indicated that data on transfer was available. The latter states have articulation agreements so that at least a minimum degree of transfer is available. It was also found that some institutions are resistant to making transfer easy. Mr. Baime gave some examples of states that have common course numbering, joint degree programs, tiered higher education systems and automated transfer guides.

Mr. Baime concluded by noting that measuring higher education performance is ‘a rising tide’ in the United States and that transfer will be looked at.

**Development and Status:
Articulated Programs in the Maritimes
Mireille Duguay, Chief Executive Officer,
Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission**

Ms. Duguay began her presentation by introducing the MPHEC and its role. The Commission is an agency of the Council of Maritime Premiers providing advice to Ministers responsible for post-secondary education. The Council reflects values of quality, accessibility, accountability, mobility, relevance and scholarship and research. Its functions are quality assurance, provision of data and information, stimulation of cooperation and the administration of regional programs. Its mission is to assist institutions and governments in enhancing the post-secondary learning environment.

The Commission looked at articulated programs with the intent of reducing the time and debt involved in students reaching the job market and at the same time ensuring that they had acquired both occupation-specific and general post-secondary education competencies. Such programs would involve the application of skills -- critical thinking and communication skills and the ability to transfer and articulate knowledge. The focus was on ensuring a breadth and depth of knowledge in a practical, applied environment. The programs would be provided by at least two organizations but often more and not necessarily post-secondary institutions (for example, hospitals) and generally grant two different types of credentials.

On submission of an articulated program, the Commission looked for 4 key dimensions – content, inter-institutional coordinating mechanism(s), labour market linkages and program evaluation. Program content required occupational, occupational-related and other academic elements. The coordinating mechanism included the identification of responsibilities and standards, transfer facilitation, cost and revenue clarification and evaluation. Labour market linkages included hands-on components and an advisory industry group. Program evaluation required policies and process at the front-end.

The first articulated program was approved in 1996 and there are now 21 approved programs, 15 of which are implemented. In the Fall of 2001 an assessment process was launched based on student success and satisfaction, program design and administration, program review and quality assurance and future plans. Ms. Duguay noted that few of the measures were in place in a program-wide context. For example, coordinating mechanisms clearly needed to be further defined to ensure that comprehensive program reviews were indeed conducted. Most institutions participating in the delivery of these programmes were nonetheless positive in their evaluation of the concept and would consider further development. Ms. Duguay indicated that it was too early to conclude how effective the programs are and that further review and data collection were necessary. A healthy sign is that enrollments have been maintained or increased – a sign that the students are finding what they are looking for.

Admissions and Transfer Policy Practice in British Columbia's Post-Secondary System

**Dr. Frank Gelin, Executive Director,
British Columbia Council on Admissions and Transfer**

Dr. Gelin began his presentation with an introduction to BCCAT. The Council works in an environment of 7 universities, 8 university colleges, 11 colleges and 6 other institutions. The major products of this work are the BC Transfer Guide and intense research and publishing. The Transfer Guide is now a web-based product for the first time this year, having been a print publication in previous years. There are 23 sending institutions sending to 12 receiving institutions. On average, for each sending institution course there are 6 course to course transfer agreements. There are approximately 600 block transfer agreements. In the case of associate degrees, credits are guaranteed for transfer.

BCCAT's mandate is "to provide leadership and direction in facilitating articulation, transfer, and admission arrangements between the College and Institution system and the University sector". The major role is "to facilitate transferability of post-secondary courses so that credit can be applied towards baccalaureate degrees in Universities, University Colleges and Institutes". In order to achieve this, BCCAT co-ordinates transfer through developing principles and guidelines, co-ordinating articulation committees, promotion and the mediation of disputes. Research is carried out in the areas of policy review, transfer study profiles, student satisfaction, student surveys and overall transfer effectiveness. Communication is achieved through publications, collaboration within the post-secondary system and student advising.

Dr. Gelin stressed the public policy questions that play an important part in BCCAT's work. He pointed out those questions as the following:

- do the graduating students of BC community colleges have equitable access to BC degree-granting institutions;
- can community college graduates transfer their credits efficiently and effectively;
- do transfer students perform well at degree-granting institutions;
- do we need a new approach to transfer in BC given the complexity of the current system;
- how should articulation occur between private and public post-secondary institutions.

An important issue has been to identify administrative barriers to student transfer. To review this issue, a Task Force on Standards and Processes has been established to examine administrative barriers to transfer. The emphasis is on identifying and removing barriers from the students' point of view. To further communication from a student-centred perspective, each institution has a "Transfer Liaison Person" to respond to transfer issue. The Transfer Liaison Network meets annually to discuss common concerns.

Dr. Gelin identified a number of critical success factors for the success of BCCAT:

- no legislative or regulatory authority;
- arms-length from the government;
- Council members are influential representatives from the system rather than representing particular constituencies;
- Council has strong support from the institutional Presidents and Ministry;
- assessment of transfer effectiveness based on solid research and policy recommendations based on thoughtful analysis;
- perception that if institutions don't make the system work, government could legislate solutions;
- Council members are appointed by the Minister but this is not a political process;
- BCCAT is the only agency perceived to represent the entire post-secondary system.

Also, the system has had 30 years to develop and work in achieving its mandate.

Finally, Dr. Gelin addressed the issue of improving inter-provincial transfer. BCCAT supports national protocols and promotes the development of national record and transcript guidelines. Dr. Gelin encouraged each province to develop its own structure to coordinate and improve transfer opportunities for students. He feels that Ontario is key to this initiative.

What Does the Future Hold?

MaryLynne West-Moynes
Vice-President Academic, Durham College and
Acting Provost, University of the Ontario Institute of Technology

Vice-President West-Moynes set an objective 'reflect and dream' for her talk. She moved from where we are today to where we may be going in terms of college/university collaboration.

In terms of where we are now, she emphasized the variety of models that we had seen today, the level of respect between the two post-secondary sectors, strategic commitment to collaboration, joint services and research, effective business practices and taking the best from both colleges and universities all of which have led to an attitude of cross-institutional acceptance. The two sectors have more in common now.

The University of the Ontario Institute of Technology will enhance college/university partnering in the Province and will particularly meet the needs of the

Durham Region. In the UOIT case, there will be a college and a university, which will share administration and the campus.

Experience has shown that we have a lot in common but there are differences too. Those may appear in values espoused, in mission, in language and in opportunities for people. But the guiding principle of academic integrity is common to both post-secondary sectors. High school students are still strongly aligned to the traditional college and university models but employed graduates see real advantages in how the college-university transition will assist them.

What are the influences of today? We have a 'savvy' student customer. We are faced with a decrease in funding per student and an increase in employer demand. There is a shortage of faculty. There is a demand for greater investment return by the taxpayer. We are close to the saturation point for students in terms of increased fees. All of this pushes for change.

In light of these factors, what does the future hold? More colleges and universities will work together – shared administration, space, programs, and courses. There will be an increasing need for seamless transfer and students will be prepared for it. There will be improved systems for students, including polytechnics, private institutions more like the U.S. in structure, varying from the small to the very large. Students may see a college-to-university route as a more firmly viable one. Perhaps we will see the development of a customized degree involving 4 or 5 different institutions. We must accept credit as credit is due. And we will see more university to college movement.

So, how much 'seamless' do we want and how much 'seamless' will Ontario society allow? Ultimately, we must continue to work at what we do well and what we can do better.

**Dr. David Marshall, President
Nipissing University**

Dr. Marshall focused on what he referred to as a time of unbelievable change. In his talk, he concentrated on the next 3 to 5 years. He identified four significant environmental constraints and will considered their impact on the college/university relationship from a university perspective.

Demand and Supply: a large expansion is expected. This expansion is due to demography and increased participation rate, and not to the double cohort. This growth is permanent. The universities can handle the double cohort. Both systems will experience no shortage of students. So what is the impact if neither system needs partnerships to attract students? Growth will not be equitably distributed. So there must be different motivations to collaboration.

Finances: the proportion of funding has changed. Government funding has declined and student fees have increased. This pattern will likely continue as the current model of post-secondary education is not sufficient to stop the slide in government funding. This factor, plus the need for internal spending, will result in new kinds of partnerships driven by mutual gain or perhaps even survival. Previous agreements have been ideologically and intrinsically motivated even as transfer students were unfunded. But financial matters are going to drive our decisions over the next while in terms of collaboration.

The Monopoly: the monopoly is gone to be replaced by competition in post-secondary education. Differentiation between institutions will increase. Dr. Marshall feels that there cannot be system-to-system collaboration or rules of order but that the future will be defined by institution-to-institution collaboration. There will be greater distinction between types of articulation. We should continue to work on the Port Hope Accord method to improve collaboration which students can take advantage of, but we should focus on joint degree. The next frontier of discussion will be applied degrees.

Good Will and Respect: many in the university community are feeling beaten up. Much has been accomplished in the college/university relationship even in light of university bashing. However, there must be recognition of the fact that we are the public post-secondary system in Ontario and nothing will work if it is not based on good will and respect.

So, the important role for CUCC is to get the two post-secondary sectors together.

Discussion and Summary
Professor Bonnie Patterson
President, Trent University and Co-Chair, CUCC

Professor Patterson directed the Forum to the basic questions the day began with: What is the future direction and role of CUCC and what areas of research should be explored?

In her comments, she noted major points which arose, or were implied, in the presentations and discussion:

- leadership, emphasizing enthusiasm, clarity, innovation in approach and how it has evolved over time in college-university collaboration;
- the recognition of differences in language and culture;
- tiering;
- a presidents' forum on college/university collaboration
- models – their variety and their distinctiveness;
- applied degrees and the possible implications of graduate work;
- efficiencies, such as joint service provision

What are the key success factors which presented themselves ?

- personal compatibility
- institutional affinity and alignment;
- institutional values around trust and respect;
- building on institutional strengths
- student focus is central;
- 'fair play' in financial arrangements;
- investments in the long-term and up-front risks;
- scale, as emphasized by evolutionary development and enrollment targets;
- the importance of having guiding principles before design;
- distinctiveness in academic programs which may develop from scratch or utilizing what is available toward new types of outcomes;
- the KISS principle;
- recruitment strategies.

Professor Patterson than reviewed the comments made by Deputy Minister Costante:

- CUCC has the support of government so how should the Council evolve in light of that;
- a call to accelerate, not just continue, in a context of shorter completion time for students
- support for CUCC to create a forum for sharing experiences, research and best practices;
- for the future, identify the top priority programs for multilateral articulation, a point that requires exploration;
- earlier information on credit transfer for students;
- regarding course credit equivalency, we need to talk about funding of joint programs, common standards for content of course curriculum and explore further what this really means;
- overall, the Deputy Minister made a call for further collaboration and more facilitation for students and knowledge of the pathways they have chosen.

So, what do we do? Following are some of the issues which present themselves:

- emphasis around double-credentialing;
- type of research – an emphasis on more facts;
- is it appropriate to look at admissions in a different way – a role for monitoring admissions policy;
- common course numbering
- the associate degree as a block transfer mechanism;
- expansion of communications activity;
- public/private articulation;
- impact of national endeavours;
- procedures and processes in other jurisdictions

Here is a list of ideas that have been raised so far in presentations and discussion:

- develop a general framework for credit transfer and articulation across the province;
- more research is needed but we need to identify what – data is required;
- perhaps we need a values and principles statement;
- the Port Hope Accord should be reviewed – is it appropriate or are adjustments needed;
- funding needs to be the number 1 issue;
- issues of student tracking from an early stage;
- bring the executive heads of post-secondary education in the Province together.

Professor Patterson than opened the floor to discussion.