

FROM DIVERSITY TO UNIFORMITY: A STUDY OF EAP COURSES

**FROM DIVERSITY TO UNIFORMITY:
A STUDY OF
"ENGLISH FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES"
COURSES IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF SOUTHERN ONTARIO**

**By
LYNN DIANE COURTNEY, B.A.**

**A Project
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Masters of Arts (Teaching)**

McMaster University

© Copyright by Lynn Courtney, June, 1995

**MASTER OF ARTS (TEACHING) (1995)
(History)**

**McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario**

**TITLE: From Diversity to Uniformity: A Study of "English for Academic
Purposes" Courses in Community Colleges of Southern Ontario**

AUTHOR: Lynn Diane Courtney, B.A. (University of Toronto)

**SUPERVISORS: Dr. C. Beattie
 Dr. R. Frager**

NUMBER OF PAGES: x, 115

ABSTRACT

The community colleges were established in Ontario in 1965 during a period of economic optimism, characterized by a spirit of innovation and diversity. Growth and a willingness to experiment were the order of the day. One very positive outcome of these features was the freedom of opportunity for the colleges to develop autonomously and according to the needs of their particular community. This independence or lack of government direct involvement has changed rather dramatically since 1990, however.

Pressures from the Ministry, for more systematic planning and centralized decision-making have been felt, initiated by the publication of Vision 2000. As a result, the former independent, innovative and diverse qualities of the colleges appear to be in jeopardy. Why this change in philosophy? Why at this time? What possible consequences might result? These are just two of the questions that will be discussed in the following project. A second and major portion of this project will trace the evolution, current status and future possibilities of one course in particular, English for Academic Purposes (EAP). This course or these courses were able to develop in the first place because the colleges had the opportunity for

diversification. They were able to respond to the needs of their community and to develop material that would assist the students within that community. In order to discern the specific implications of the change in government interest and activity vis-a-vis the colleges in Ontario, this project will trace the evolution of one EAP course as it developed at one particular college and compare its rationale, actual course contents and future direction with similar efforts made by some other colleges. It will quickly become apparent that the only reason for these courses to have developed in the first place and to have continually been available to the students is because of the heterogeneity that has been so characteristic of the college system in Ontario. But will this continue to be the case?

With the recent (1990-95) more active and direct government involvement in an attempt to establish system-wide outcome standards, this freedom of opportunity appears in jeopardy. This project will focus on EAP as but one example of the very positive features that make up the community college system that has existed in Ontario. It will also suggest possible consequences if this recent move toward conformity is played out to its dénouement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Catherine Beattie for her most valuable assistance throughout. Her critical suggestions, pedagogical inspiration as well as encouragement were significant factors in the successful completion of this project. I would also like to thank Dr. Ruth Frager, for her insightful input and thoughtful comments.

My appreciation also is extended to the many individuals who gave of their time and energy in providing me with information and/or suggestions on new approaches or avenues to follow.

I am also grateful to Sarah Fick of the Humanities Word Processing Department at McMaster University for producing the final draft of this project.

Creating and working on this project has been an invigorating and stimulating experience; it has made me appreciate the creative process as well as the dynamics of the system of which I am a part.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I - THE EARLY YEARS
(pre-1960's-1980's)

1. A History of Canada's Community Colleges 6

2. Commonalities Among Canada's Colleges 9

3. A History of Ontario's Community Colleges 12

Part A - Background 12

Part B - The "New Colleges" 13

Part C - The Philosophy 16

4. Administrative Structure of Ontario's Community Colleges 16

5. Changes in the System 20

6. The Effects of Change on EAP 21

PART II - CHANGES IN THE 80's AND 90's

1. The Search for Ministry Guidelines 27

2. The History of EAP at Mohawk 30

Part A - Its Evolution 30

Part B - The Model	34
Part C - Changes - How and Why	38
3. EAP Courses at Other Colleges	40
Analysis of Chart	43
1) Sheridan College	45
2) Centennial College	47
3) George Brown College	49
4) Seneca College	52
4. Some Predictions	53
5. Conclusions	56
 PART III - A LOOK AT THE FUTURE (1990-?)	
1. <u>Vision 2000</u>	59
Rationale	59
Recommendations	61
2. CSAC	64
A Discussion Paper of CSAC's Establishment Board	65
3. Learning Outcomes	68
4. General Education	71
5. Generic Skills	73
CONCLUSION	77

APPENDICES	79
ENDNOTES	110
BIBLIOGRAPHY	114

LIST OF APPENDICES

A.	Memo from Ana Gris	79
B.	Memo from Co-ordinator Co-op Department	81
C.	Memo from Steve Keyes	83
D.	Standing Committee on Student Admission and Evaluation .	86
E.	Criteria for Evaluating Exemption Tests	88
F.	Interview Questions	93
G.	George Brown College's Exemption Policy	96
H.	Resource Material Used For EAP	98
I.	George Brown College's Report to Generic Skills Council of CSAC	101
J.	Members of CSAC Establishment Board	104
K.	CSAC's Mandate	106
L.	Revised Generic Skills Learning Outcomes	108

LIST OF CHARTS

Chart 1 - Enrolment Statistics for EAP	37
Chart 2 - Curriculum of EAP, Fall '94	39
Chart 3 - Testing Instruments and Follow-up	42

INTRODUCTION

Innovations in the educational system in Ontario have generally reflected the fluctuating values and goals of society. Changes in the long-established public and university institutions are generally made as a direct response to public criticism or concern. Because these institutions are regarded as an integral part of our democratic system, the provincial government has always played a significant and active role in their evolution. The recent publication of the Report of the Royal Commission on Learning (January 1995) which dealt with the reform of elementary and secondary education, and the subsequent responses to some of its recommendations by the Ontario Ministry of Education and Training (February 1995), illustrate this point. A somewhat different approach and attitude have been displayed by the government in Ontario toward the community college system, however.

When the colleges were officially established in 1965, the mandate given to them was not as clear and apparent as it might seem. Initially there was a considerable degree of administrative freedom for the colleges; economic conditions were positive, expansive and prosperous; immigration was increasing. It was an exciting and innovative period during the 60's and early 70's. The government refrained from obvious, overt involvement in these early years of the colleges' evolution. Consequently, they were able to respond to the

needs of their community and create those programs that were perceived as necessary and important to prospective students. This apparent diversity within the college system has been one of its most noticeable and cherished features. "Canadian community colleges exhibit great diversity in purpose, program, student population, administrative structure and philosophical base."¹ However, this diversity, based on the autonomy which colleges have enjoyed, appears to be in jeopardy.

A noticeable and direct involvement by the Ministry of Education at the college level has become increasingly more overt in Ontario, as reflected by Vision 2000 (a report released in May 1990 by the Council of Regents in response to a government request to develop "a vision of the college system in the year 2000")² and the establishment in 1993 of The College Standards and Accreditation Council (CSAC) by the Ontario provincial government. The purpose of this council was to establish program standards, vocational and generic, on the basis of learning outcomes. The very existence of the council reflects a deliberate move towards a systematic, centralized approach by the government which will ultimately limit the independence of the college system.

Why this change in philosophy and at this time? Various reasons for this interest, at this time, will be examined. This rather abrupt change in attitude and activity by the provincial government will be illustrated through a detailed report on one particular course — English for Academic Purposes

(EAP). Its existence was predicated on the heterogenous quality of the college system; its evolution, growth and expansion were testimony to this feature; and now its possible demise or at the very least, its severe reduction in accessibility, will demonstrate one very costly consequence of the recent turn toward conformity to standards.

These EAP courses were created at the discretion of the individual college as a reaction to the needs of that particular institution in isolation from the others. The curriculum and the evolution of EAP owes its existence to the lack of direct government involvement. This particular attitude could be changing since the government has become more involved with the college system. The 90's political and economic climate is in sharp contrast to the 60's and early 70's; it is a period of economic restraint and cutbacks; public attitudes to encouraging or promoting immigration have also taken an abrupt turn to the right. The opportunity for autonomy, one of the major reasons for EAP, is also in jeopardy. There is a very strong possibility that the EAP courses offered at each college might be in the process of losing their distinctive, and unique qualities.

Part I of the project, **THE EARLY YEARS** (pre-1960's-1980's), will begin with an overview of Canada's community colleges and their evolution, in order to provide some perspective on the topic as a whole. The distinguishing features and the commonalities of the colleges will be investigated and then the

structure that has evolved in Ontario will be examined. This analysis will focus on how the provincial government has interacted and related to college administration, policies and curricula within an historical context. It will become apparent that, initially, the most outstanding feature of the community college system was its diversity. While a few common features are exhibited by the colleges, it is the differences among them that has been, until recently, their most distinctive attribute. In his text Community Colleges in Canada, Gordon Campbell suggested that each college in Ontario is unique in its purpose, programs, student population, administrative structure and philosophical base.³ But this was written in 1971. Is this impression still valid? Because of this diversity, the colleges responded to the community within which they exist, often creating curricula that reflect this association. For example, EAP courses have only evolved in those colleges where there is a need.

Part II of the project, **CHANGES IN THE 80's AND 90's**, will illustrate to what extent the implementation of EAP as it has occurred within some of Ontario's colleges has developed within the structure as outlined in Part I. The curriculum that evolved and is currently delivered at Mohawk College in Hamilton will be presented as one model. In order to demonstrate the diversity that has existed within Ontario's colleges, the EAP courses (or their equivalent) offered at a number of other southern Ontario colleges will be described and compared to the Mohawk model.

Part III of the project, **A LOOK AT THE FUTURE** (1990-?), will focus on possible changes that might reasonably be expected to occur in EAP courses because of the recent mandate of CSAC. Preparing working documents for learning outcomes has been just one of many consequences and to what extent these will influence specific curriculum at the college level is an interesting speculation. At this point it would seem that the emphasis on uniformity and standardization could alter the variety of approaches that the colleges have taken thus far in reaching the needs of the EAP students. Part III will analyze the objectives, activities and reports of CSAC specifically as they relate to EAP and will provide predictions about the future of such courses. In fact it will be suggested that the involvement of CSAC could threaten their very existence.

PART I - THE EARLY YEARS (pre-1960's-1980's)

1. A History of Canada's Community Colleges

An examination of the history of community colleges throughout Canada reflects our national tendency to initiate change through quiet evolution. The discussions and debates that took place through various commissions, committees and reports that occurred in the decade preceding the establishment of colleges in Canada in the 1960's, clearly demonstrate this approach. While records of "junior colleges" date back as early as 1635 when the Collège de Québec was founded by the Jesuits, this and similar institutions existed primarily to train clergymen and community leaders. Primarily, post-secondary education was limited to universities and degree-granting colleges or trade, technical and vocational training institutions. Community colleges throughout Canada, including Ontario, did not really begin until the 1960's. During this decade, there was both a demand by the public for more advanced education and a response by the government to meet these challenges. Suddenly, there was an increase in public pressure for greater accessibility to higher or post-secondary education throughout the country. Why?

Reasons for Evolution

First, statistics reveal that there was a rapidly growing number of young people between the ages of 18 to 24 wanting post-secondary education whose needs might not be met by the universities.⁴ Secondly, there was increasing emphasis on the impact of scientific and technological changes felt in the post-war period, requiring new skills from the workforce. Moreover, numerous studies were being published, primarily from the United States (where the college system had existed for over fifty years), that emphasized the importance post-secondary education would have as an investment in the future.⁵ In fact, in 1964, a Canada Economic Council Report specifically suggested that expanding post-secondary education would be an economic benefit to the country.⁶ One additional source of increased interest in expanding post-secondary education was the Federal Government. Although the British North America Act placed education under provincial jurisdiction, the Federal Government had been actively involved educationally, as early as 1910 when it provided grants and financial support to various educational institutions. In 1960 the Conservative government passed the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act. This provided, through a cost-sharing program with the provinces, training for workers in the vocational and technological fields. Earlier, The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences (The Massey Commission) had recommended

that the Federal Government provide direct grants to universities.⁷ And in 1951, the Liberal government under St. Laurent had begun this practice; the amount was increased in 1966 and 67, eventually so that 50% of operating costs of higher education was given to the provinces in the form of "transfer grants". These grants from the Federal Government would be directed to universities, colleges or health care, according to the provincial government's choice. (The amount originally given to the provinces dramatically changed in the 1990's.) Nevertheless, the provincial governments themselves, had definite incentives to seriously consider the possibility of creating something new at the post-secondary level.

Colleges exist today in all provinces and territories and include more than 160 colleges or institutes on more than 700 campuses offering a wide range of educational opportunities.⁸ According to a recent study, the present college system employs 25,000 full time instructors and an additional 150,000 part-time people. The total annual revenues of Canadian colleges are estimated at \$6 billion with capital assets at \$30 billion. Approximately two million Canadians enrol in college programs every year and 25% of Canada's workforce has graduated from college. Moreover, college graduates have lower levels of unemployment than the average Canadian.⁹

2. Commonalities Among Canada's Colleges

The term "community college" is a generic rather than a specific expression, and is used to identify a variety of institutions, including regional colleges, vocational centres, colleges of applied arts and technology, institutes of technology, college d'enseignement general et professionnel (CEGEP) and so on.¹⁰ These institutions listed above had been in existence prior to the "new colleges" which began appearing across the country during the '60's. How were these colleges "new"? They were different from one another but all possessed some features in common. A description of what these institutions had in common will be used as a backdrop, before examining the very apparent differences.

1) From their inception, the mandate for all colleges in Canada has been to prepare individuals to enter the workforce with training of quality and relevance.¹¹ 2) Colleges are an avenue of opportunity as they maintain a broad accessibility policy, in an effort to appeal to as many students as possible, particularly those who might otherwise be denied the possibility of a post-secondary education. 3) They are oriented toward community service; they are a resource for the local population and most colleges strive for close working relationships with various community agencies - business, labour and ethnic organizations. These affiliations vary, depending on the location and general composition of the area. 4) At the colleges there is an emphasis on

counselling services. All colleges offer one, two and three year programs. They operate during the day, in evenings, on weekends twelve months a year.

5) The makeup of faculty at community colleges reflects a commonality as well. They have generally been characterized "not so much for the degrees they possess as for knowledge of their profession and their skill in teaching".¹²

This particular feature of faculty teaching skill, as well as the emphasis on public service roles has recently been changed to include research within the institutions; indeed, it has been argued that the colleges have a legitimate applied research role to play.¹³ 6) There is a comprehensive or multi-purpose dimension to curricula. Within each of the colleges, indeed, within each campus of the same college, there is a amalgam of different programs, of student population and of educational goals.

In order to meet the needs of this diversity of students, the **curriculum** components of colleges share the following features:

- 1) a vocational and trades training program leading directly to employment;
- 2) apprenticeship programs;
- 3) career, technical and para-professional programs of two or three year durations (including areas of health science, social service, medical technicians, business, engineering);

- 4) university transfer programs, consisting of courses parallel or equivalent to those offered by universities (this varies from province to province);
- 5) general academic programs — not actually job-training;
- 6) personal interest and community development projects;
- 7) pre-college, up-grading or basic skill training.

Several colleges responded to this particular mandate by quickly developing **second language** programs in order to provide for increased variety and numbers of people with differing cultures and languages coming into the country.¹⁴

- 8) contract programs, initially begun in Ontario in which close ties were developed with businesses and industries through contracts with agencies or departments.¹⁵

In light of the focus placed in this project on the significance of the colleges offering EAP, it is interesting to note the following:

Similarly institutions in most parts of the country have recently become more sensitive to the changing ethnic composition of the communities they serve and are in the process of modifying their curricula and services in light of the dramatically changing character of many communities in Canada as a result of the federal government's immigration and multicultural policies.¹⁶

There remains one more common feature across the college system — its diversity. The distinctive quality of heterogeneity was apparent from the

beginning and nowhere was this more true than in Ontario. As one ministry spokesperson commented at the inception of the colleges: "We don't want twenty branch-bank, rubber stamp colleges in Ontario".¹⁷ This would appear to suggest that in the early stages, the emphasis on diversity came from the ministry itself; within thirty years this focus would change.

3. A History Of Ontario's Community Colleges

One of the objectives of this project was to try and discern to what extent the provincial government is actively involved in the operation of the community colleges. It is necessary, therefore, to examine the actual responsibilities that the government in fact possesses in relation to the colleges. The community colleges in Ontario have all evolved in slightly different ways but the focus of this project is to examine the structure and responsibilities of the system as it exists in Ontario as well as to examine how EAP fits in.

PART A - Background

As early as 1893, the Ontario Ministry of Education had proposed that the government implement a policy of vocational training and by 1914 vocational, technical and commercial education existed but it was of "minor importance".¹⁸ From 1935 on there was a major development of vocational training but generally at the secondary level. A few institutions had been

established that provided technical training beyond the high school level; for example, the Hamilton Institute of Technology was founded in 1914, and a Provincial Institute of Mining was established in Haileybury in 1944 (later to evolve into Northern College of Applied Arts and Technology). In 1946, a Provincial Institute of Textiles was founded in Hamilton, eventually to become Mohawk College. In 1948 Ryerson in Toronto was founded and in the same year, Lakehead Technical Institute at Thunder Bay. Similar institutions were established at Ottawa, Windsor and Kirkland Lake. The rather low enrolment at all of these facilities, prompted the following observation from one writer: "Clearly the technical institute represented a minor alternative to the universities."¹⁹

PART B - The "New Colleges"

In 1950 a Royal Commission on Education²⁰ published a report recommending the establishment of "junior colleges" in conjunction with the secondary schools in Ontario. These colleges would provide two-year university preparatory courses. While no specific action was taken on the Royal Commission's suggestions in 1950, at least a public acknowledgement of a possible development had been made. Four years later, in 1954, the Ministry of Education released a report prepared by the Grade Thirteen Study Committee.²¹ In its conclusions it noted the difficulty that grade twelve

graduates had to continue their education other than through the university-oriented grade thirteen. It proposed the establishment of "community colleges".

There was intense discussion as to whether these colleges should be geared especially to technical training or to be university parallel courses. As well, the issue of the relationship between universities and colleges, and particularly the question of university-transfer was fiercely debated and discussed as illustrated by various reports published during the early '60's. For instance, The Committee of University Presidents proposed that a system of colleges be created which would emphasize vocational courses and adult education. With the exception of Murray Ross, then President of York University, who supported the view that transfer for college students to universities be made available, the presidents of the rest of Ontario universities remained determined to maintain the status quo. This particular viewpoint is summarized by the following observation:

Above all, it was the presidents of Ontario's universities who seem to have most influenced the shape of the colleges. The recurrent themes in their report were: that the colleges should not interfere with the unique position of the universities in that only they should do degree-level work; and that any colleges should be created in such a way as to preserve the perceived superiority of Ontario's educational system as compared with the United States...²²

The decision was eventually made by the provincial government that the primary function of the colleges would be to foster the technical and

applied arts and that the curriculum would be occupationally oriented.²³ This position was vigorously defended by the government at the time under the former Minister of Education, William Davis. In October, 1965, Bill 153, a Department of Education Amendment Act was passed by the Ontario Provincial Government which established a post secondary system of education of Community Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. The government made its objectives very clear: the university transfer concept was not to be part of their mandate and the curricula were to be "occupationally oriented with an additional emphasis upon general adult education and upgrading."²⁴

Recently this debate has resurfaced and in an article in the November 1994 issue of Mohawk College's "Monthly Memo", it was reported that a task force of three college and three university presidents is proposing that a voluntary secretariat funded by the Ministry be established and be given the following mandate:

...to facilitate easier and better transfer of students between our respective systems, to pilot models of new concurrent and consecutive degree-diploma programs and to possibly consider the accreditation of some three year college programs for degree credit.²⁵

Originally 18 institutions were created but this number will have increased to 24 by September 1995, when the second Francophone college opens its doors.

PART C - The Philosophy

In 1965, at its inception, the colleges' operation was based on four principles:

1. to embrace total education, vocational and avocational, regardless of formal entrance qualifications;
2. to *develop curricula which meet the combined cultural aspirations and occupational needs of the students*;
3. to operate in the closest possible co-operation with business and industry and with social and other public agencies to *ensure that curricula are kept in step with changing society*; and
4. to address research in curricula and in pedagogical needs".²⁶

The sections in italics certainly provide the mandate for the implementation of EAP courses at the community college level.

4. Administrative Structure of Ontario's Community Colleges

To what extent does the provincial government control the operation of the colleges? There is a substantial degree of autonomy for individual colleges in Ontario primarily because of the political structure and relationship among the three central bodies of authority — the Ministry, the Council of

Regents and the Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario (ACAATO).

The first of these groups, the Ministry, has changed its structure innumerable times. In 1971 the colleges were moved out from under the Department of Education and placed together with the universities under a new Department of College and University Affairs. In 1979 the Ministry of Colleges and Universities was combined administratively with the Ministry of Education with one minister for both areas and one deputy minister with an assistant for the college sector. More recently this was changed so that the Minister of Education now is responsible for kindergarten right through to all post-secondary institutions and is the institution officially titled the Ministry of Education and Training.

The second element of administrative control is the intermediary advisory body, the Council of Regents. This is a group of 15 lay appointees of the government. Its primary role is to advise the minister and to recommend new programmes or the establishment of new campuses as well as appointments to the Boards of Governor (BOG).

The third regulatory component is ACCATO. This is formed by the colleges themselves, composed of representatives of the Boards of Governors and the Committee of Presidents. It combines a low-key lobby function as well as a professional approach to issues affecting the colleges. It also can make

policy recommendations to the minister on issues it deems important. Its responsibilities also include assessment of the operation and capital budgets. In the early 1980's, an assessment of the effectiveness of this dispersal of power was reflected in the following comment:

These three forces collectively create a climate of dynamic tension in the resolution of college-related issues and provide for diffusion of power within the system, an arrangement seen to be beneficial to the success of the system, the institutions, and their public image.²⁷

1984 changed this harmonious state of affairs, however. One consequence of the strike of faculty that occurred in that year in Ontario, was the development of an adversarial relationship between faculty and administration. This situation was not allayed by another strike five years later. One outcome of the 1984 strike was the introduction of four more positions to the board at each college — one each for faculty, support staff, administrators and students. As well, each college is required to have an internal Academic Council, but because membership rules are not laid down, both composition and size varies from college to college.

Each college is directed by a board of governors (BOG). The board is responsible to the minister of education and responsible for the development and operation of the college. It appoints the president and all faculty, establishes budgets, and publishes information about courses, etc. Advisory committees are formed to guide the operation of the BOG and are usually

composed of members from the community. Unlike some of the other provinces, Ontario's college system does not bind the colleges to local school boards (as British Columbia does) nor does it have close administrative links to universities (as Quebec does). A link of this sort has recently developed, however. Institutions such as McMaster University and Mohawk College both in Hamilton, have been taking steps toward increasing connections. In fact, on June 16, 1994, the Presidents of Mohawk College and of McMaster University released a communiqué announcing a new post-secondary partnership had been created between the two institutions, by developing a facility at McMaster which will be the Institute for Applied Health Sciences. They state that "Our goals are to develop alternatives to the current model of separate college and university programming" and will enable the students to "benefit from greater mobility among different layers and sectors of post-secondary education." We will have the "opportunity to develop curriculum which combines the analytical and reflective emphasis of university programs with the applied emphasis of college programs." The communiqué concludes with the suggestion that in the future "Faculty at McMaster and Mohawk will be asked to explore together the possibilities for new joint programs."²⁸

5. Changes in the System

As well as these institutional changes, there are other unresolved issues facing the colleges in Ontario; for instance, the place of General Education or "GenEd". In 1980, a report on GenEd was issued which pointed out that there was a great deal of confusion and divergence among the colleges regarding the availability and even the definition of general education. "While the employment-oriented curriculum has documented its value, the place of general education as a curriculum component remains under debate."²⁹ The original mission statement of the colleges included specific reference to GenEd and the Council of Regents stated clearly that one-third of the curriculum should be allocated to GenEd; yet, this goal had not been reached by 1980. In a report published in 1982 by ACAATO, "Background Papers on College Issues", it was suggested that not only was there a great discrepancy regarding any implementation of GenEd among the colleges, there was also no agreement as to what was meant by the term.³⁰ The importance of this aspect of learning was becoming more apparent when employers continually stressed how essential it was becoming for graduates to have cognitive and interpersonal skills in order to be successful in our rapidly changing workplace. This particular issue has finally been addressed by CSAC and will be the focus of Part III of this project.

The economic restraints of the 1980's also had an impact on the colleges; suddenly and dramatically, they were faced with the task of finding innovative means and ways to obtain money for programs, courses and equipment never attempted before. Competition from private institutions, such as DeVry Institute or the Toronto School of Business, increased at this time, forcing the colleges to re-think their goals and the means of achieving them. One source has suggested that this trend has meant that the colleges have started to "market" their programs and to sell them as "training packages".³¹

6. The Effects of Change on EAP

How does all of this relate to the topic of EAP and how or why it is offered in the college system? In part, EAP was initially made available because of two distinct features already mentioned: the accessibility feature and the broad curriculum mandate. These allowed the colleges to meet the needs of a number of students who had distinctive language and cultural backgrounds. In the late 70's and early 80's the social and political climate was conducive to such innovation; as a result, individual colleges were able to develop courses tailored to meet the distinctive needs of these students. This was also a time in which money was more readily available as well, to help finance innovation. In the 90's, the economic conditions as well as public attitude toward meeting the needs of "special" groups have changed.

Initially the needs of the immigrant were met through English-as-a-Second Language programs, many of which were taught at institutions connected to community colleges. At Mohawk College, for instance, the ESL Department was transferred from the jurisdiction of Adult Education under the auspices of the Wentworth Board of Education in 1970, at the request of the Board. This occurred for historical reasons; part of the colleges' mandate included the goal of providing adult education, in addition to post-secondary. As a consequence, some of the colleges in Ontario inherited adult education programs, one of which was ESL. This particular program expanded rapidly during the 1970's because of the substantial immigration. As a result, second language learning became an significant department within some of the colleges.

ESL departments operate on a very different basis from the rest of the college system. They rely heavily on federal funding, for instance; the government "buys seats" which permits students to study English as a reduced cost. As immigration patterns change or as numbers fluctuate, government sponsorship reflects this. Faculty tenure is never certain as a result. Another major difference with the ESL departments from the others, stems from the courses that are offered. ESL courses are primarily "preparatory" or "upgrading" and not part of the post-secondary system.

By contrast, the EAP courses are post-secondary and are offered exclusively to those students who have already been accepted into a program at the college. The subject of "admission" is a contentious issue and is often a topic for discussion. Do the second or third language students meet admission criteria? How do we know? How standard are such requirements? This concern for standardization was reflected in a thoughtful account, Report of Survey on English Language Training in Canadian Colleges,³² dated April 1984 that published the results of a Canada-wide survey that examined the curriculum, teacher training, resources, testing and screening programs, used in the instruction of ESL in the community colleges. Among the different contributions included in the publication were brief articles on "Towards a National ESL Policy" by Nicholas Elson, "ESL Testing for College Entrance" by Ellen Cray and "The Council of Second Language Programs in Canada" by Pierre Niedlispacher.

Of particular interest is the second article in which it was pointed out that in October, 1983 the Ontario Test of English as a Second Language (OTESL) Project was carried out. This project was funded by the Ontario Ministry of Colleges and Universities and the Council of Ontario Universities. It involved a survey of the Offices of the Registrar of all Ontario colleges to compare the admission requirements for students who spoke English as a second language. One interesting conclusion was the following: "It was

quickly apparent that English proficiency requirements for ESL students vary greatly among colleges and that there is no standardization procedure for determining adequate proficiency."³³ It was also learned that few colleges require students for whom English is not a first language to submit proof of English proficiency. Why? Because as long as a student has successfully completed grade 12 and has an Ontario Secondary School Diploma (or the equivalent) or has passed the Mature Student Test, he or she qualifies for college entrance. Some colleges do require a minimum period of residence in Canada; others ask for successful completion of one or more years of high school in Canada. Many colleges require students to write diagnostic reading and writing tests but this is mandatory for all first year college students.

This question of admission frequently comes up in discussions of EAP students in the college setting. In the conclusion to her article "ESL Testing" Ellen Cray strongly urged that a general language proficiency test be developed "which would test language use and reflect the needs of college students...it should be designed to test how well students can *use* the language encountered in college programs ...and provide diagnostic information about the students' *linguistic needs*."³⁴ This suggestion has yet to be carried out probably because specific tests to assess such skills have yet to be devised.

Another development occurred in the mid-1970's that had a direct and immediate impact on the necessity of offering either ESL and/or EAP - the

move to attract students from abroad. Mohawk College for example, became involved in international education in the early 70's and successfully completed projects with groups of students and staff from numerous countries including Kenya, Libya, Malaysia, Nigeria and Trinidad. These projects involved English language training, and designing special courses in technology as well as regular business programs. The International Projects Department was officially established in 1981 as one of the four departments within Mohawk's Contract Services Division; about four years ago it changed its title to International Education Services Department to more accurately reflect its diversity. Its mandate is: "To provide access to Mohawk's programs and training capabilities to an international clientele on a fee-for-service cost recovery basis."³⁵ In a conversation with Leo Barsony, the Co-ordinator of the department, he described the various functions and services that his department provides. The most significant ones include promoting the College's services and programs overseas; processing international enquiries and applications; developing and distributing College material; and recruiting English-as-a-second language students. These students are the Visa students who represent 25-30% of our EAP clientele. While most of them have taken some English in their native country, their general communication skills are weak and the majority of them are channelled into the EAP courses.

Leo also indicated that the department does not require the spending of Ontario tax dollars for its support, as all administration and staff salaries as well as operating expenses are fully recovered from generated revenue. He concluded by suggesting that the cultural benefits of Mohawk's international involvement might include an increased awareness of Third World problems and a better understanding of students who are experiencing a new and different culture.

One of the recognized Canadian agencies that Mohawk's International Education Department co-operates with is the International Studies Bureau of the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC). The latter, in the 70's, encouraged colleges to send exploratory missions first to new African and Caribbean nations and then later to countries of the Middle East and the Pacific Rim. By the mid- 1980's, international education had become a major growth area for several colleges in Ontario, including Mohawk.

This growth of international involvement increased the number of students at Mohawk who were in need of "special" or extra communication courses. Their presence was yet another catalyst in the evolution of what was to become the EAP courses at the college.

PART II - CHANGES IN THE 80's AND 90's

The evolution of EAP as it developed at Mohawk and other colleges demonstrates how provincial government involvement with the colleges has changed since their formation. The "laissez faire" attitude as reflected in the economic and social decisions of the 60's and 70's meant that the colleges were free to develop courses they deemed appropriate. The gradual evolution of EAP in some of the colleges clearly demonstrates the latitude given to the colleges during this period. Just how much interest and/or commitment was there initially for assisting in establishing EAP? An interesting search ensued while trying to answer this and other related questions.

1. The Search for Ministry Guidelines

Specific documents published by the Ministry of Education for Ontario regarding policy, procedure, curricula, etc. for English as a Second Language (ESL) at the primary and secondary level are readily available in libraries, such as McMaster, but there are absolutely none regarding EAP. Phone calls were made to Allison Prentice, of the Department of History and Philosophy of Education and Barbara Burnaby, Chair of the Adult Education Department, at the Ontario Institute of Studies in Education (O.I.S.E.) in Toronto to see if Ministry publications concerning this area would be available there, only to learn that again the answer was "no".

A different tack was then pursued. Surely the Ministry sends pertinent documents, memos and policy papers to the colleges? Who receives them at a college? What happens to them when they arrive? Thirdly, and most important, has there been specific communication from the Ministry regarding teaching EAP at the college level? A phone call to the secretary of the Vice-President Academic and then a second call to the secretary of the President of Mohawk College revealed that Ministry documents are initially sent to the President's office, where they are screened and sorted according to areas of interest and then sent to the appropriate departments or divisions within the College. If any documents concerning EAP arrived, they would be automatically sent to the Language Studies Department. A conversation with Ed Babiski, Chair of this department, revealed that in the last ten years, he had never received any documents from the Ministry regarding this issue. As he succinctly put it: "You and I are the history of the EAP programs offered at Mohawk."

Another approach was then attempted — phone calls directly to the Ministry itself. After making many calls to different people in different departments, it seemed to me that the Ministry is in a constant state of flux; its composition, organization, principal strategies and primary goals are constantly changing. The frustration of working in the organization surfaced time and time again, during phone conversations. One of the major reasons for the circuitous

route which an investigator is forced to follow stems from the fact that the organization within the Ministry, its departmental structure, position title, indeed the very name of the ministry itself has so often altered. Consequently, when a particular person's name is given as a potential source either that person no longer works in the department mentioned or the department no longer exists or the work previously done by that department no longer is being done.

For example, Peter Wright was suggested as a possible source for ideas. His position had been "Director of Program and Policy" when the "Ministry of Colleges and Universities" was in existence. After talking to his Administrative Assistant, Teresa, I was told that he longer was responsible for this area of interest and that perhaps Michelle Farrell could be of assistance. A phone call to her was of some interest. About four or five years ago she had been involved in administering a survey on ESL teaching for adults in Ontario. She had no idea what had happened to the report; her name would not be on the document; in fact, it had been published by different departments and had been under the auspices of Creative Research, a consulting group. While the age group involved in this project was appropriate, the whole project did not seem to apply to post-secondary institutions. Ms Farrell also reiterated a now familiar comment: that the Ministry probably has not done anything specifically in the area being pursued! An additional comment of significance was also made. A change in a program at the college and university level does not have

to face the same constraints as are imposed on the primary and secondary levels in Ontario. Basic program decisions are made by the colleges themselves; curriculum development does not come directly from the Ministry *for the time being*. This freedom enjoyed thus far would appear to be in jeopardy given the new directions from CSAC. With the recent activity begun by the province's College's Standards and Accreditation Council (CSAC), established in January 1994, designed to make the colleges more accountable through defining and establishing learning outcomes throughout the college system, this autonomy may not exist much longer. This is a subject that will be pursued and developed in Part III.

2. The History of EAP at Mohawk

What is the history of the EAP courses at Mohawk? How and why did they evolve? How have they changed and why? How effective have they been? The curricula developed at Mohawk will be held up as a model in order to make comparisons with other similar courses provided by other colleges in southern Ontario.

PART A - ITS EVOLUTION

In September 1984, I was approached by the Chair of the Language Studies Department, Ed Babiski, concerning the possibility of creating an English course for ESL students at the college who were registered full time, in

a variety of programs, and were able to handle the course requirements in all subject areas except for the Language Studies course.

They had generally performed poorly on the initial reading and writing diagnostic tests given at the beginning of the semester, but then this should not have been a surprise. As pointed out in the article "ESL Testing for College Entrance", these first language tests are not appropriate nor helpful for second language learners. In fact, "These generally penalize ESL students as they test cultural knowledge and vocabulary more than they test general language proficiency. Also first language tests do not give specific diagnostic information about the needs of ESL students."³⁶

Another impetus for instituting some form of change came from instructors in various departments, but particularly in Language Studies, who felt they were establishing "double standards" in their evaluation of native-born and second-language students. This meant that slightly "lower" standards were being applied in the evaluation of the second-language student in order for a certain percentage of them to pass the course; many instructors felt uncomfortable doing this. Moreover, the students were not benefiting in the long run. It was also becoming increasingly difficult if not impossible given the time constraints, to offer the supplementary instruction that these students needed to improve their English skills. For one Language Studies instructor's observations written in October 1985, on difficulties in evaluating these

students, see Appendix A. It is interesting to note her observations about the determination and effort that these students were putting into their work and also her acknowledgement that these students would never be successful in the regular English courses. Her request in the last paragraph about the need for additional curriculum for these students is interesting in light of the eventual creation of the courses I developed.

Another source of pressure for instituting change for these students came from certain other departments within the college; for example, other colleagues were voicing concern about students' difficulties in writing acceptable lab reports or presenting adequate oral reports. One example of how at least one department other than Language Studies, expressed concern was provided by The Co-operative Education Department, in February 1989. The Co-ordinator of that department sent a memo to the Electrotechnology Department about the difficulty it was having in successfully placing second-language students in co-op work placement, apparently because of inadequate communication skills. (See Appendix B). The Electrotechnology Department responded by sending a memo to the Chair of Language Studies, asking for an explanation as to why these students who had completed Language Studies 1 and 11 were unable to communicate in the workplace. An extremely thoughtful and coherent reply was prepared by the then Co-ordinator of the Reading and Writing Centre, Steve Keyes. (See Appendix C).

Attached to his memo was a two-page selection titled "Language Across the Curriculum". This particular policy had been outlined in the Final Report of the Academic Council Standing Committee on Student Admission and Evaluation, a document that had been prepared in April 1985. Steve drew attention to the following section of the Report: program chairs should make certain that "students in all program courses be assessed at least in part by written responses and not exclusively by short answer or multiple-choice tests."³⁷ The reason for this recommendation stemmed from the fact that prior to the issuing of this report, most program courses in fact did rely heavily on multiple-choice response. Moreover, many students didn't receive any English course after their first year at Mohawk and never had to maintain any standard of written expression until they were out in the workplace. It was suggested by Steve that these pre-1985 conditions and practices were still being used; students were still not getting much practice in writing. Unfortunately, in 1995 this is still the scenario!

Because of these concerns expressed by a variety of people, in October 1984, I was able to create the first of eventually six, new courses of English that would be offered exclusively to these second-language students.

PART B - The Model

Pedagogically speaking the focus of the EAP course, when compared to the regular Language Studies course, is on additional grammar applications, as well as on improving listening and speaking skills. While the student eventually covers all the required material in the regular Language Studies course (memo writing, business letters, resumes, informal reports, etc.) the second-language course provides supplementary material in reading, writing and review of grammatical rules and their application. Moreover, for one hour a week the students have access to the Language Lab where they have an opportunity to work on pronunciation difficulties as well as listening and note-taking skills. The work done in the lab constitutes 20% of the final evaluation. The lab time, the remedial grammar as well as vocabulary/idiom usage discussions, represent the most substantial differences between the two Language Studies courses.

At this time, the term "EAP" was not used and, initially, we only offered one course to these students. Within the space of two semesters, however, an additional course (parallel to the second mandatory course at Mohawk, Language Studies 2) evolved. Within the next year, a third course (parallel to the Report Writing course which some programs require) had been drawn up. Since then, additional changes have occurred as well. Originally, though, the first course offered to these students was a two-semestered

Language Studies 1 course that we labelled Developmental. This was a misnomer as we later discovered, since this is a term used to designate "remedial" work for native-born Canadians, not just second-language students. This Developmental pilot course was initiated in the Fall of 1984 and attracted a total of 51 students. Because the students came from all program areas in the college, classes had to be held at night or "twilight" as it was (and still is) euphemistically called.

Since there is more emphasis placed on speaking, listening and note-taking skills than in the "regular" Languages Studies I, this new course was extended to two semesters. Moreover, this course would be regarded as equivalent to the regular Language Studies I and the student would not be compelled to take the regular course after completing the Developmental one. This question of equivalency has been the focus of great pedagogical debate. Most colleges do offer some form of remediation for second-language learners, but very few regard these courses as equivalent to the regular English material. Those of us involved at Mohawk contend that most of these students will never reach the same level of communication fluency as most native -born students, nor should we expect them to. Certain linguistic groups have much greater difficulty in grasping some of English's finer points and sometimes age can limit the degree of success. Moreover, we have felt that the inclusion of additional components in all of the EAP courses at Mohawk justifies our assigning them the status of equivalent to the regular English courses. To quote from the memo referred to earlier, written by Steve Keyes:

The Language Studies Department supported and continues to support the College's position on this issue [referring to the eventual official approval of the "Developmental" courses], knowing that these students could not be given a legitimate pass in regular language courses and recognizing the impossibility of these students' mastering standard English (written or oral) given the relatively short time they are in attendance at the College.³⁸

In the winter semester of 1985, the second part of the Developmental Language Studies 1 course was offered, again at night. It was then realized that another equivalent course would have to be developed. All Mohawk students are required to take Language Studies 2, a literature-based course, and the second-language students needed an alternative. Consequently, an equivalent Developmental Language Studies 2 course was drafted and was offered in the fall of 1985. At this time, it was only a one-semester course, based on the assumption that perhaps these students' English skills had improved enough that a single semester would suffice. There was also the concern that if this course was also two semesters, the students would take longer to graduate. In the winter of 1986 a third Developmental course was offered — Report Writing. At Mohawk, this course is not mandatory in all programs, but there were sufficient students who did require it, (according to their various program requirements) to warrant its creation. It also, at this point, was a single semester course. The following chart provides an overview of the available figures on the enrolment of our second-language students in the EAP courses from the fall of '84 up to the winter of '95.

Enrolment Statistics for EAP

Semester	L.S. 1	L.S. 2	Report Writing
Fall '84	51		
Summer '85		45	
Fall '85	54		
Fall '86	58	49	
Fall '89	74	22	7
Summer '89		25	21
Fall '90	82	30	17
Winter '91	75		20
Summer '91		56	30
Fall '91	125	37	35
Fall '92	137	56	44
Fall '93	161	26	30
Fall '94	135	39	22
Winter '95	94	47	19
Summer '95		45	38

In 1986 the Standing Committee on Student Admission and Evaluation formed a sub-committee on the "Needs and Perceptions of Foreign Students" at Mohawk. (See Appendix D for its recommendations). The recommendations were approved by Academic Council and referred to the Vice-President Academic for implementation in the fall of '86. The term

"Developmental" was officially adopted as well as the new course numbers LL020, LI030 and LL040.

PART C - Changes - How and Why

In September 1994, all of the post-secondary ESL courses at Mohawk were re-named English for Academic Purposes (EAP) to more accurately reflect their post-secondary status and their particular intention. Secondly, it was decided that the Language Studies 2 and the Report Writing courses would be expanded into two sections, Part A and B, as had been the case with Language Studies 1 for ten years. The rationale behind this move was the realization that over the years there had been a significant increase in the numbers of both the strong and weak EAP students. The latter group's English skills were insufficient to successfully complete the EAP LS2 and Report Writing course within the timeframe of one semester each. It was decided that these students would benefit from a two-semester program. At the same time, there had been a gradual increase in the number of potentially strong EAP students who would not require both Parts A and B of EAP LS2 and/or Report Writing. Consequently, beginning in the Fall of 1994, diagnostic writing tests were initiated whereby students could attempt an essay writing test; if they succeeded in achieving a standing of at least 75%, based on an evaluation scheme (see Appendix E), they would be granted exemption from Part A and register immediately in Part B. This procedure was available for all three courses. This had the following ramifications: the EAP student with potentially strong communication skills could complete the required EAP Language Studies courses in just three semesters, the same as their native-

born colleagues. At the same time, however, the weaker EAP student might have to complete up to six semesters of English. The outcomes of this latest innovation have yet to be evaluated. When some students have questioned the "fairness" of such a system it is frequently pointed out to them that in almost every other college, EAP courses are mandatory and secondly, they are non-credit. Moreover, it is argued, if a student's English proficiency is weak, surely he or she would only benefit from more English courses. This last argument does not always have much persuasive power with these students affected, though it is acknowledged as valid by some.

The **curriculum of EAP** as offered in the Fall 1994 can be summarized by the following chart:

<p>EAP Language Studies 1</p> <p>LL026 ---> LL027 = 1 credit (2 semesters) OR</p> <p>LL027 (exempted from LL026) = 1 credit (1 semester)</p>
<p>EAP Language Studies 2</p> <p>LL011 ----> LL012 = 1 credit (2 semesters) OR</p> <p>LL012 (exempted from LL011) = 1 credit (1 semester)</p>
<p>EAP Report Writing</p> <p>LL058 ---> LL059 = 1 credit (2 semesters) OR</p> <p>LL059 (exemption from LL058) = 1 credit (1 semester)</p>

All of this curriculum development had occurred more or less in isolation, with very little input from other colleges or colleagues. The autonomy enjoyed by

the colleges was directly related to the lack of direction from the Ministry; consequently, we were able to respond to the specific needs of our community and students and create courses deemed appropriate. The political and economic changes that have become evident in the 90's might well see the loss of this autonomy and hence, the disappearance of these individual EAP courses. Both financial restraints and a change in the public's perception of the need for these "extra" courses could put EAP and other innovative programs in danger.

3. EAP Courses at Other Colleges

The focus of this project at this point will be to scrutinize the specific programs that are currently being offered at several colleges in southern Ontario. In order to discover precisely what is being done regarding EAP students at the post-secondary level, I prepared a list of questions which I sent to the following colleges: Algonquin, Centennial, George Brown, Fanshawe, Niagara, Sheridan, and Seneca. (See Appendix F). These particular colleges were selected because they have a substantial enrolment of EAP students and offer courses or some kind of remediation to deal with these students' needs. In four cases, I followed up the mailing of the questionnaire by a personal interview. In the cases of Algonquin, Fanshawe and Niagara, interviewing was difficult for geographical reasons (somewhat prohibitive in terms of distance) and no response has been returned. The following information is the result of the interviews I had with colleagues from four colleges.

1. Sheridan College: Trafalgar Campus On May 16, 1994, I initially met with Janet Gambrell, head of the Skills Development Department, Sheridan College. Because her department is involved in post-secondary remedial education rather than EAP, Janet suggested I interview Simin Meshginnaf, who had taught the EAP program for three years. Beginning that day, however, Simin was back with the Skills Development Department, because the EAP program at Sheridan no longer exists, for reasons to be discussed shortly. The EAP course had been developed by Judith Wyntonick, now Co-ordinator of College Access. An interview with her took place at the Davis Campus of Sheridan College on June 2, 1994.

2. Centennial College: Birchmount and Eglinton Campus. On May 17, 1994 I conferred with Nancy Phillips.

3. George Brown College: Casa Loma Campus On May 19, 1994, I had an interview with Kay Oxford of George Brown College, Casa Loma Campus. Kay is Co-ordinator of Remediation, for this and two other campuses.

4. Seneca College: Newnham Campus An interview with Rob Coulter of Seneca College, Newnham Campus, was held on May 30, 1994. Rob had been the Chair of the ESL Department, but is no longer involved with EAP specifically.

In my conversation with people from these four colleges, five general topics were discussed: 1) diagnostic testing; 2) specific courses offered to EAP students; 3) text and reference materials used; 4) number of

Visa students compared to landed immigrants enrolled in the "special" courses; and 5) possible changes in the near future. The following chart offers a comparison of responses on some of these topics. A brief analysis of its contents and additional observations follow.

Testing Instruments and Follow-up

MOHAWK	SHERIDAN	CENTENNIAL	GEORGE BROWN	SENECA
1) Gates-McGinitie Reading Test 2) writing sample - an essay	1) CAAT Reading Test 2) writing sample in response to reading an article	1) CAAT Reading Test 2) writing sample - an essay	1) Gates-McGinitie Reading Test 2) writing sample - an essay	1) CPT Reading Test 2) writing sample - an essay
1) L.S.1 OR LS EAP, Part A &/or Part B (credit) 2) L.S.2 OR L.S. EAP, Part A &/or Part B (credit) 3) Report Writing OR EAP R.W., Part A &/or Part B (credit)	1) College Access Program - EAP & remedial (non-credit) 2) ICE (credit) 3) One more from GenEd (credit)	1) AESL - 2 semesters (non-credit) 2) Bridging English - (non-credit) 3) CLE (credit)	1) College English (credit) 2) Development English (non-credit) 3) EAP (2) courses (credit) 4) One more from GenEd (credit)	1) EAC 140 EAP equiv. (non-credit) 2) EAC 149 remedial; (non-credit) 3) EAC 150 standard, mandatory (credit)
about 25-30% of EAP students are Visa students	there are no Visa students at the Davis campus	about 25% of the students enrolled in the "special" English courses are Visa	there are very few Visa students in the "special" courses; most are landed immigrants	there are some Visa students enrolled in the "special" courses

Analysis of Chart

Re. Diagnostic Testing - The primary purpose of requiring all first semester students to take these diagnostic tests is to identify those who are in need of remediation. In some cases the results are used as the basis for exemption from particular courses. Some colleges also use these tests as a "placement" strategy but not many colleges have dabbled in "streaming" at the present time. The question as to whether students should be streamed as a result of diagnostic testing has long been a source of professional pedagogical discussion. George Brown is one of the colleges that has streamed students for a long time; one of the questions asked during their diagnostic testing is whether English is their first language. Who knows what pressures in the future might be placed on faculty to expand this, however.

The instruments used to diagnose the students also varies. The four colleges represented on the chart above all use a free writing sample, but the Reading Test demonstrates the diversity available for the present time. There are at least nine other colleges in the province which are now employing the Computerized Placement Test (CPT), in place of both the writing and reading instruments mentioned above. When presented with the option of trying out this CPT in the spring of '95, those of us involved at Mohawk turned it down. Generally speaking this American and very costly package does not test students' writing ability as much as their knowledge of grammatical rules.

It is diagnostic rather than prescriptive. There is little interaction or opportunity for the students to actually create their own material, for example, to write an essay or even a paragraph. Moreover, the specialized and excessively challenging vocabulary favours the Canadian-born students and is a disadvantage to second-language students. But how long will we be able to justify our present (non-computerized) approach given the pressure to become more involved with technology and to utilize computers as an apparently cost-saving, fast and efficient tool?

Re. Remediation following testing - Remediation policies and approaches taken by the colleges once results of diagnostic testing are made available, varies a great deal. In most cases, those students who are discovered to be below a specific standard of competence must agree to work on improving or upgrading their reading and/or writing skills during the first semester. The colleges offer an intriguing variety of approaches in dealing with remediation for native-born and EAP students. Regarding the former, Mohawk College offers the services of a Reading and Writing Centre to assist students on a one-on-one basis to upgrade their skills while they are taking the regular English courses. The EAP students are given the opportunity to take the equivalent EAP courses. Other colleges, Seneca, Centennial and Sheridan, for instance, have required courses for both native-born and EAP students who have failing scores; moreover these are non-credit. George Brown, like

Mohawk, offers optional (it's the students' decision) EAP courses which are regarded as equivalent to the regular English courses. Like Mohawk, too, the EAP students receive credit for these courses. This discrepancy among the colleges might not last long, as the Ministry becomes involved in establishing stricter guidelines via the learning outcomes requirements from CSAC.

Re. Courses Offered - Again, there is an astonishing variety of courses made available to those students requiring remediation. Changes are constantly going on, especially at Sheridan and Centennial; George Brown appears to adapt gradually to student needs as they occur. If the Ministry follows through with its plan of more uniformity through CSAC, it seems unlikely that this diversity will continue.

A brief comparison of the courses offered in 1994 at the four colleges listed in the chart demonstrates the reality of diversity.

1) Sheridan College is going through major restructuring; the English Department was actually disbanded in January 1994, with department members being dispersed to different subject areas. Beginning in the fall of '94, all 45 full-time faculty began working within the four major faculty divisions — science and technology, arts, business and health sciences — losing any autonomy they had. English and humanities courses now have to be approved by the deans of those faculties. Consequently, the character of EAP is also undergoing significant changes, some of which are not yet finalized.

An entirely new program has been developed to replace the former EAP courses — a College Access Program (CAP). Its function is not only to replace the former EAP however. Its purpose is to assist the under-prepared students including first or second language English speakers; in other words, it is remedial in approach and it doesn't cater just to ESL people. It is offered to students who, because of results on the diagnostic testing, are required to enrol in this "prep" program. There is some student resentment about the non-credit aspect. It is a two-semester program. While the original EAP courses are no longer offered at Sheridan, the EAP students are assisted to the extent that separate classes within the CAP will be created, offering the following:

1st semester: Common English Core (L1) - six hours and one
Tutorial for one hour and three hours of Common ESL

2nd semester: Common English Core (L2) - six hours and one
Tutorial for one hour and three hours of Common ESL

The one hour tutorial is done at the Learning Centre. After completing this, the students can apply for any regular English program in which they would need to complete two credit courses and be assessed along with everyone else. This massive reorganizing of English at Sheridan seems to have overlooked what is going to happen to the English-as-a-second language student. In an article in the Toronto Star, January 1994, that described the

recent reorganization that had occurred at Sheridan, a student from the college, Jin Sun Kim, said that she was worried about having to enrol in the regular English courses. She had already tried a regular course twice without success. "I felt like I was completely ignored. They were not patient for me to finish my sentences and I couldn't handle the workload."³⁹

In summary, beginning in the fall of 1994 there were no more EAP courses at Sheridan College; they were replaced by the new Developmental or Remedial English which would include native-born Canadians whose English skills had been assessed as very weak. Is Sheridan ahead of some of the rest of us? Is this an example of what the future holds for EAP within all of the college system at the post-secondary level? There are a few other colleges that disbanded their English Departments in the past; Georgian College in Barrie eight years ago and Loyalist College in Belleville about five years ago.

2) Centennial College - EAP has been available at Centennial College for about 10 years. There are currently three different EAP courses being taught, but, as in the case of Sheridan, changes have been and are going on; some major ones began in the fall of 1994.

#1- Academic ESL (AESL) This two-semester course was instituted about four to five years ago. This course is offered to those students who failed the

original diagnostic tests. If students do well in AESL 1, they can skip AESL 2.

AESL consists of the following:

- sixteen weeks per semester; 25 hours per week (19 in the class room; six in controlled study);
- credit is given.

#2 - Bridging English This is more difficult than #1 (and seems to be similar to Mohawk's EAP Language Studies 1, Part A and Part B). It is offered to students who are already in a course but are weak. Interestingly, the students are told they must drop a course when they "pick up" this English course. No credit is given for this course. It runs for two semesters, six hours per week (until 1994 it was eight!). Taking this course means that the student is postponing taking the regular English courses (which are compulsory). There are two sections; 1) Reading, Listening and Speaking; 2) Grammar and Writing. When the students finish this, they go into En160 (see #4) or into a regular English course; this is the teacher's decision! I found this last statement most intriguing. Is there not some criterion used on which a student's proficiency could be measured so that he or she would know the basis on which a decision as important as this would be made? Evaluation of student success is an important part of any course curriculum. The fact that there is no apparent guideline in this particular case, perhaps explains the motivation for establishing CSAC.

#3 - College Level English This has been the first and generally compulsory English course offered to all first year students; there had been an EAP section culled from this course up to now. Because of a change in this course, however, this is no longer going to be available. Whether or not a student went into this EAP section was based on individual teacher assessment and evaluation. #4 - This is a new English course, that began in the fall of 1994. This course is for anyone weak in English; this appears to be very similar to what Sheridan is offering through its new College Access Program. The two English courses that are compulsory for all students must eventually be taken by anyone who has taken these other courses described above.

In conclusion, Centennial appears to be expanding AESL; apparently studies have been done that indicate that the AESL has been partially responsible for maintaining student retention rates. Other departments recognize this and are very supportive of the EAP courses, according to my informant; no actual data or proof was offered to support this view, however.

3) George Brown College - EAP courses were begun at the Casa Loma Campus just three years ago; in addition, they have Developmental Programs for native-born students. College English, Communication 120 is the first required English course offered at George Brown. There is an exemption

policy available that is most specific (See Appendix G). Based on the results of the diagnostic testing, few would qualify for exemption. Those students who score below the Grade Eight level, are put in Developmental Language (not EAP) where the number of English hours is doubled, mainly by requiring the students to use the Resource Centre. The first semester involves 45 hours of classes plus an extra 20 hours in the RC; this is compulsory; they are "encouraged" to continue in the second semester. EAP students do not have to go to the Resource Centre. The EAP course, Communications 107, which runs for six hours a week, is not regarded as equivalent to the regular English. It has run for only two years. Its course description has the following objectives: "This foundation course in communication focuses on the needs of second language speakers by concentrating on writing and speaking skills.They [the students] will be introduced to effective techniques for improving study, reading, speaking and research skills...[which] are required for effective communication in college and in the workplace."⁴⁰

In the fall of 1994, George Brown began offering a second EAP course (so that they will in effect be doing something similar in content and approach to Mohawk's LL026 and LL027). When the EAP students have finished the two EAP courses they go on to regular stream for their third course of English which is chosen from General Education.

In conclusion, precisely what the future direction will be for EAP at the Casa Loma Campus is, as in other colleges, a matter on which one can only speculate. Once again, the reality of government policies relating to monetary decisions has surfaced. The 90's seem to be a time when financial restraints are directly affecting the college system. Remediation money, for example, a form of governmental assistance, had been transferred directly to the English Resource Centre at George Brown until 1994. Now it is put into a general pot; thus, the financial resources provided to the Centre may decline.

4) Seneca College - Seneca traditionally has approximately 6000 first year students; 500 of these are given advanced standing for the first year English course. Historically, there has been at least one class of EAP for at least 20 years. It has always been regarded as remedial, and credit has never been given for the course. It has been offered for eight hours a week with 20-30 students per class and is "supposedly" EAP. As such, it focuses on developing learning skills and is offered to students who have been accepted at the college. Beginning in the fall of 1993 there were 18, eight- hour classes of EAP, titled "EAC 140" (an adaptation of EAP). They were non-credit; in fact, the students enrolled are required to drop one course from their regular program, to be picked up later! The students must eventually take the regular English courses. After EAC 140 the students are required to take EAC 149,

which is Developmental/Remedial (half are Canadian-born speakers). This is mandatory and there is no credit. This is followed by EAC 150 — three hours a week. This is the standard English credit course, now classified as General Education. There are four more Gen.Ed. courses; students take one per semester.

At the end of the interview it was pointed out that the faculty in other departments discount the need for English proficiency by eliminating the need for writing — point form is accepted in Lab Reports for example, and testing is in a True/False format. This particular practice seems to be growing - a similar situation occurs at Mohawk as well. Prior to CSAC, Seneca required every student to take one English and one Liberal Studies course per semester. Five to eight courses had been available for students to choose from. Now, however, choices and selection have been reduced, so that students are simply obliged to take one course from a much reduced list, per semester. While some colleges might be having difficulty in meeting CSAC's mandate for a minimum number of GENED courses, this particular requirement has worked in reverse for Seneca. It may be significant that in attempting to establish some uniformity across the colleges, CSAC may have helped to reduce the diversity of courses at Seneca, by limiting the number of courses for students. Re. Texts - see Appendix H for a detailed list. Texts and other resource material are constantly being changed.

Re. Visa Students - Visa students are those who are in Canada for a limited time, who are here for the sole purpose of obtaining a Canadian diploma from a college (or university) with the intention of returning home after. Knowing the background of the EAP students is, in fact, important because in a class composed primarily of Visa students, the instructor would be inclined to include discussions of Canadian customs, cultural attitudes, etc. Resources, assignments and actual course outlines would also reflect this difference. Students at the Davis Campus at Sheridan who take the College Access Course are landed immigrants or even Canadian citizens; many have gone through the high school system in Ontario. Consequently, Canadian cultural content and Canadian assumptions and so on could be considered unnecessary for these students. Similarly, the majority of the EAP students at the Casa Loma Campus are landed immigrants. Mohawk College has approximately 25-30% of its EAP students who are Visa. Course content and philosophy in the Visa classes, up to this point, have taken a different approach compared to the other EAP classes, to accommodate the needs and background of these students.

4. Some Predictions - Predictions about possible developments with EAP will be discussed with regard to only Sheridan and George Brown since they

appear to be the two colleges with particularly intriguing situations. Their situations may foreshadow reductions in curricula diversity at other colleges.

Sheridan is a most interesting case. Because not all of the student body are diagnosed as to whether or not Developmental English would be needed, the survival of the EAP course is questionable. For instance it is only a possibility that students in Business and Technology will be tested to see if Developmental English is needed. It was pointed out that since the English Department is no longer a separate entity, whether or not this kind of diagnosis and/or optional courses will be made available lies completely in the hands of the Deans of each program. Their decision would depend most likely on how seriously they perceived the English needs were among their students.

One other change that has arisen from the elimination of the English Department and the loss of some courses, was reflected in the Learning Centres at Sheridan. Because of funding cutbacks, the College was radically reducing previously established EAP support services; consequently, beginning in the fall of 1994, more use would be made of the Learning Centres. These appear to be areas similar to Reading and Writing Centres at Mohawk, where the students go for additional help. Up to this time, "tutors" (as they are designated) have been faculty; but it appears that as another cost-saving measure these tutors might be replaced by students or by teaching assistants. These rather serious changes reflect again, how financial cutbacks

are directly affecting the delivery of much needed programs traditionally made available at the community colleges. The centres had been funded through Ministry Remedial Funds; this money will continue to go to the Learning Centres but because the Learning Centres are expanding, salaries will have to be less and there will be less-qualified people in charge. Other cost-saving measures might be computer packages. There will be tutors for all subjects available for students; originally there were only English tutors, then math; in the Fall of 1994, there will be tutors for all courses.

At George Brown, in an effort to analyze the diagnostic test results, the faculty prepared a report which was subsequently sent to the Generic Skills Council of CSAC. (See Appendix I). After a brief introduction, this report states that their college frequently reports results of both the reading and writing tests in terms of grade equivalents. While acknowledging that there is some concern about the precision of the grade equivalents, the instructors feel that this does provide a skill level that most people understand.⁴¹ Appendix I, Table 1 shows the reading scores for ESL students, who constitute 24.2% of the student population. Table 2 shows the results of the native-born students who comprise 75.8% of the population. The difference between the two groups is much more noticeable at the highest reading level than at the lowest. For example, 19.6% of the 2,093 native speakers are reading at the grade 8 level or below, but 30.4% of them are reading above a grade 12 level.

This latter mark is in sharp contrast with the ESL students. 18% of these 670 students are reading at grade 8 or below but only 2.3% of them are above the grade 12 level. One outcome of these results is that remedial centres have been set up at all of the campuses of George Brown. Those ESL students with low English scores have had their hours of instruction doubled in the first semester. Special courses for these students are also being set up in the second semester. While the report's conclusion stresses the major challenge facing all instructors in view of the overwhelming English skills that the majority of all their students must improve, the report does make the following, interesting observation: "Success is a factor, generally speaking, of ability and will, and not just English skills. Second, competency in a vocational subject does not lead to skills in English."⁴²

5. Conclusions

What conclusions can be reached drawing from such diverse situations as are exhibited above? Are there any commonalities running through the colleges in terms of what provisions are made for the EAP student? One definite inference can be made: diversity is the most striking characteristic. The culture for each college is unique, driven by individual college concerns. The origins and goals and programs of each college are distinctive, and while this uniqueness has been one of the more interesting

characteristics of the college community in Ontario, this particular feature is probably not going to last much longer. An appropriate adjective to describe the college approach to the EAP student would be "volatile"; every single person who is or has been involved in the EAP program qualified the discussion with the comment that "Things are currently under review and changes are being made" or "What I am about to explain will not necessarily be the final situation come the next semester". While innovations in curriculum are a necessary and welcome part of education, it seems to be a particular and on-going feature of EAP. Why is this so? Perhaps because EAP simply is not needed nor offered in every college. Secondly the make-up, the background and the needs of these students seem to change on an on-going basis, according to immigration patterns. As well, because of time constraints and the energy required to establish even a semi-permanent organizational structure with which to keep in contact, most of our innovations occur in isolation.

PART III - A LOOK AT THE FUTURE (1990-?)

In 1988, the Ontario provincial government decided that after 25 years of operation it was time for the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology to evaluate their progress, to review their original mandate, to examine whether or not they were realizing their initial goals and to suggest changes in response to the needs of the next quarter-century of development. In October of that year, the Minister of Colleges and Universities, Lyn McLeod, requested the Council of Regents, the policy and planning agency responsible to the Minister, to develop "a vision of the college system in the year 2000".⁴³ It would appear that the government was suggesting that after 25 years, it was time for the colleges to re-assess their strengths and successes and to re-examine their purpose and direction. Since the inception of the college system in 1965, Ontario had undergone some profound and far-reaching changes, economically and socially; it was a propitious time to re-evaluate its mandate. The environment of the 1990's was very different from that of the mid-60's and the demographics had also changed significantly. The workforce was older, the traditional manufacturing industries were restructuring, and innovations in technology were developing at an astounding rate. These changes meant that the workforce would have to adapt and consequently, the college system would need to provide new, creative, high-quality and relevant career training

and education. In response to the government's request, the Council of Regents released its report, Vision 2000: Quality and Opportunity, in May 1990. The earlier, non-involved attitude of the government to college affairs took a dramatic and decisive turn in 1990 and has not looked back since.

1. Vision 2000

Vision 2000 has become the foundation for a variety of innovations which will have a significant impact on the direction of Ontario's colleges. As a result of its many recommendations, various committees and councils have been struck, discussion papers have been drawn up, pilot projects have been initiated and resolutions have been drafted. A brief analysis of Vision 2000's most significant proposals will now be described.

Rationale

While it was acknowledged that since their inception, the colleges had coped with tremendous growth and development as they responded to the fluctuating changes within society, the Vision 2000 report suggested that "many aspects of the initial mission of the college system remain to be fulfilled."⁴⁴ More opportunities than ever were needed for advanced retraining to produce highly qualified workers. There was a greater need for a dynamic, relevant, high-quality educational system to help people learn new technologies and adapt to the economic changes. The report also referred to

previously unacknowledged groups in society who could benefit immeasurably from changes in the college system. Since 1965 Ontario had become increasingly multicultural with many new immigrants requiring language training before they could participate in the workforce. The role of women had also undergone significant changes and it was recognized that they were underrepresented in many occupations where there was a labour shortage. People with disabilities also needed better access to education in order to realize their potential. All of these factors are summarized in the concluding paragraph of the report's preamble:

Together, the economic and social changes in Ontario are putting new pressures on the colleges. While the colleges have filled a much-needed role in career education in the last 25 years, they are being challenged to update their mandate in order to remain relevant to the real needs of the province and its people.⁴⁵

The Vision 2000 report was the product of extensive research and consultation and discussion with students, faculty, administrators and educators from colleges, employers, labour and government. The vision shared by all these groups was outlined at the beginning of the report and then later elaborated on. Some of the more pertinent assertions are summarized by the following:

1. There was a lack of system-wide standards and planning. Many programs with similar titles did not produce the same qualifications or skills.
2. There was insufficient general and generic education. General education (studies in sociology, world events or the environment) were supposed to constitute 30% of college programs and this simply did not happen. Generic skills (problem solving, critical thinking, basic literacy, etc.) needed greater priority to provide students with transferable skills.
3. There were limitations on accessibility, especially for those who reflect the multicultural society that Ontario has become. More English as a second language programs needed to be made available in order to enhance opportunities for student success.⁴⁶

Other considerations were addressed in this section of the report, but these three represent the major focus of concern in this project.

Recommendations

The actual report on the 23 community colleges contained 40 recommendations. The most significant for curriculum are quoted in the following:

- 1) A College Standards and Accreditation Council (CSAC) should be established ...with executive authority in the areas of system-wide program standards, review and accreditation.
(Recommendation #5);
- 2) There should be a significant increase in the generic skills and general education content of programs leading to a college credential...(Recommendation #2);
- 3) There should be system-wide standards for all programs ... Such standards must focus on the learning outcomes expected of graduates from a program. (Recommendation #3);
- 4) All programs leading to a college credential should be subject to regular, system-wide program review...(Recommendation #4).⁴⁷

The underlying goals of these recommendations were: to enhance the quality of and respect for a college credential; to increase the emphasis on generic skills in order for graduates to be able to continue to learn and grow; and to increase the emphasis on general education so that graduates would have a clearer understanding of themselves and of society.⁴⁸ The above represents the "official" purpose but perhaps there is more to this than meets the eye?

In order to realize these goals there will be an increased need for province-wide uniformity in all colleges. In a memo dated April 3, 1992

addressed to Paul Byrne, Vice-President Academic, Mohawk College, Ed Babiski, then Chair of Language Studies, outlined recent developments that had been going on at the college in light of the government's inquiries into the community college system. In this report, Ed stated that President McIntyre "expressed the opinion that the Ontario government was committed to implementing the Vision 2000 recommendations and... implementations across Ontario will involve *fundamental, substantial changes* rather than cosmetic ones."⁴⁹ Would his predictions prove to be correct?

Of all of the Vision 2000 proposals described above, three are of interest for this particular project: 1) "system-wide outcome *standards* and regular program review should be established based on learning outcomes" and 2) "improving accessibility and opportunities for success in college for a diverse range of learners, particularly those least well served in the past", and 3) programs should be "subject to regular, system-wide program review."⁵⁰ Regarding the first, the Report stated that the standards should focus on learning outcomes (the skills graduates would be expected to have acquired by the end of a program). Standards, it was felt, were necessary to monitor and improve the quality of education and "should not *unduly* restrict institutional autonomy."⁵¹ The second proposal includes second and third language students and therefore potentially has an impact on college delivery of the EAP curriculum. And the third recommendation appears to emphasize a

move toward more centralization of college curriculum and a reduction in the role and responsibility of colleges and their program advisory committees.

2. CSAC

Of the 40 recommendations contained in Vision 2000, the one that the Ministry acted upon immediately was Recommendation #5, the formation of CSAC. In January 1991, the Council of Regents was instructed to establish an advisory committee to recommend the terms of reference and implementation plans for the formation of CSAC. This committee met in the winter and spring of 1991 and, in April, the government announced its commitment to proceed with CSAC. In September 1991, the Government of Ontario announced the creation of a CSAC Establishment Board to be co-chaired by the Deputy Minister of Colleges and Universities, Bernard Shapiro and the Chair of the Council of Regents, Richard Johnston. Other members of the Board included: Jim Turk, Director of Education, Ontario Federation of Labour, Carol Gooding, Chair of the Board of Governors, Sheridan College, and Bill Kuehnbaum, Vice-President of Ontario Public Services Employees Union. (See Appendix J for the complete list.) This Board's mandate was to review the conclusion stated in Vision 2000 and to make recommendations for implementation. After approximately seven meetings, the Board produced "A Discussion Paper of the CSAC Establishment Board",⁵² in March 1992, for the purpose of receiving feedback from the colleges. They requested that

responses by the colleges to their proposal be sent by May 8, 1992. In July, the Board published the results of its deliberations.

A Discussion Paper of the CSAC's Establishment Board

The Board's initial paper clearly revealed the far-reaching and fundamental implications suggested by President McIntyre in June of '91. While it was quite apparent that substantial changes were in the offing, at the same time it really was not clear what particular form these changes would take or what impact these changes would have on the delivery of program or courses.

The report outlines the primary goals behind the recommendations of Vision 2000 and contains, in all, 25 suggestions; the principal one requested the Ministry to proceed with the creation of CSAC as soon as possible. On the advice of the Minister of Education and Training, the suggestion to create a CSAC Board was adopted by Cabinet and CSAC was established. The mandate of CSAC (reproduced in Appendix K), was included in an open letter to the college system sent by the Minister of Education and Training, Dave Cooke, February 18, 1993. In it, the scope, authority and governing board of CSAC was clearly laid out. The CSAC governing board was to be appointed by the government and would include 28 members including equal numbers of

internal and external college stakeholders, and representatives from provincial ministries and agencies.⁵³

CSAC would be regarded as an agency responsible to the Council of Regents, a decision which later created friction between the boards of governors of the colleges and the Council of Regents (CoR). By the spring of '95, as revealed in an article published by Ontario Public Service Employees Union (OPSEU), CAAT Contact, March 24, BOG was questioning Council's role vis-a-vis CSAC and was suggesting that CoR in fact was exceeding its *advisory* role. In the same article, an even more interesting observation was made:

Boards perceive the *centralized determination* of college *curriculum requirements* as a reduction in the role and responsibility of colleges and their program advisory committees.⁵⁴ (my emphasis)

Another recommendation from the Minister that was acted on quickly was that CSAC would create subsidiary bodies such as a General Education Council, a Generic Skills Council and other committees or panels as deemed necessary.

He began with the following statement:

I believe that the implementation of CSAC will bring significant benefits to the college system and to the people of Ontario. CSAC standards will provide employers, students and the public with clear information about the expected outcomes of college programs and will promote confidence in the quality of these programs. CSAC will also help facilitate articulation of college programs with secondary school and university programs. Increasing the emphasis in college programs on generic

skills and general education will prepare graduates better for lifelong learning and for success in their careers.⁵⁵

He concluded his letter by stating that the government would be providing the resources to finance the implementation of CSAC; \$1.4 million in 1993/94 for instance, and he was confident that all of CSAC's efforts would "contribute to the ongoing renewal of the college system".⁵⁶

CSAC's mandate, referred to earlier, included the request that clear definitions of vocational and generic skill standards needed to be drafted. In response, it was decided that this would be accomplished through the Generic Skills Council. In addition, it was recommended that by September 1994 each college program should include an average of one general education course of 45 instructional hours per semester.

One of the most interesting recommendations in the mandate, includes the following: " CSAC shall have the authority to define credentials, set standards, review and accredit publicly funded college programs."⁵⁷ This is a direct response to Recommendation #5 of Vision 2000. Does this imply that one of the purposes of CSAC is to try to eliminate or at the very least to limit the diversity that has existed within Ontario's college system? How are these standards to be established? How will this affect curriculum implementation? How will all of this development impact on the delivery of

EAP? Answers to these questions will be dealt with through an examination of three topics: Learning Outcomes, General Education and Generic Skills.

3. Learning Outcomes

In January 1994, CSAC published a report, Guidelines to the Development of Standards of Achievement through Learning Outcomes.⁵⁸ In its introduction it stated that CSAC had been working at developing procedures that would establish program standards, vocational and generic, based on learning outcomes. It had also been developing a framework for implementing GenEd. CSAC realized that it was necessary to develop a working document that would define learning outcomes as well as a procedure for developing them; hence the report. The Guidelines began by suggesting that in order for the colleges to implement the major components of CSAC's mandate, namely, system-wide program standards and accreditation, and GenEd and generic skills, it would be most helpful to "link all of these... through learning outcomes".⁵⁹ Moreover, CSAC was going to provide guidelines for developing the learning outcomes "in order to ensure a consistent approach to the development of (these) learning outcomes".⁶⁰

This document clearly defines the role of learning outcomes. They represent

...the basis for the definition of standards...the standards of achievement...intended to bring *consistency* and coherence to the various components of the initiative

[formation of CSAC]. [Moreover] It is anticipated that the selection of learning outcomes as the primary tool in the setting of standards, will promote the achievement of educational reform.⁶¹ (my emphasis)

Because it was established that learning outcomes could be written at the program level or the course level and could be expressed in terms of vocational or generic or general education skills, most colleges established a Generic Skills Council and a General Education Council to draw up some suggested guidelines for faculty. The Language Studies Department at Mohawk, formed its own Learning Outcomes Committee (of which I was a member) and spent almost a year, in preparing its own list of Learning Outcomes; those skills that they felt were the minimum requirements for a graduate to possess at the completion of a two-year program.

While the recommendations of CSAC regarding definitions for GenEd and generic skills are not directed specifically at English courses, there are potential difficulties. All of our English courses at Mohawk, including EAP, provide considerable emphasis on the generic skills of speaking, listening, reading, writing and thinking, as well as interpersonal skills. As well, some of our courses, particularly Language Studies 2, provide substantial general education content. Is it necessary to distinguish between these two areas since Language Studies courses contain both? A second dilemma appears to exist with generic skills particularly. Most generic skills are inherent within

career-based communication applications and students are more motivated when they can see the relevance of the courses they take to the careers for which they are training. There is a conflict between the students' desire to concentrate on career-related materials and their need for transferable generic skills. CSAC's "Discussion Paper" reflects this dilemma by asking Program councils to draw up generic skills outcomes particular to their area, while also setting up separate panels to oversee the needs of generic skills and GenEd.

Included in CSAC's many pilot projects was the ESL Pilot Project, which was titled "Skill Benchmarks" or "ESL Learning Outcomes". The initial draft was released in February 1993. It divided each benchmark into three sections: descriptor, characteristics and indicators. There are in fact 12 different benchmarks or indicators for each of the skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking. These benchmarks describe the **exit** competencies of the learner but they have not been endorsed by CSAC and are not necessarily related to Generic Skills. At the moment they are regarded as guidelines for preparing curriculum or for testing the effectiveness of course material. The next stage is to determine which benchmarks are suitable for entry into post-secondary but nothing has been done to reach this goal at the present time. Should this occur, with a directive from CSAC, then it is obvious that standards toward more uniform ESL courses, particularly as they relate to college-entrance will be imposed.

4. General Education

On November 15, 1993, the General Education Council, the advisory group of CSAC issued a document which proposed a set of guidelines for the implementation of general education in the colleges. It referred to the mandate from the government, that effective September 1994, all colleges had to include a minimum of one general education course of 45 hours per semester. Other criteria were laid out in the proposal, as paraphrased in the following:

- 1) The GenEd requirement is to be articulated in terms of learning outcomes;
- 2) The development of these outcomes and necessary curriculum development will be done by the colleges;
- 3) The courses are to be at a postsecondary not remedial level;
- 4) Implementation must be through discrete courses, not through infusion; and
- 5) Students must have choice and breadth in their selection.⁶²

The last point is interesting to note; does it reflect a recognition of the diversity of the community colleges' population and their needs?

Seven goals, many broad objectives and content framework were included in the proposal. A deadline of January 10, 1994 was given for the colleges to submit any recommendations. Accompanying this proposal was a

request for responses to those sections regarded as the greatest challenge in terms of implementation.

The inclusion of GenEd was part of the original mandate of the community college system in the province, but because its implementation was not followed through initially, some backlash to its incorporation now, has occurred. To some extent, GenEd has become a hotly contested issue. Many technology instructors have argued against adding literature and humanities courses to an already jam-packed technical curriculum. At the other end of the spectrum, there are instructors who are committed to the concept that students at the college level need to develop skills on how to deal with issues of societal concern. They need to develop insight into how to effectively meet the challenges they will face when they take their place in the community, family and working life.

At Mohawk College, a General Education Committee was formed in June of '93. In a memo to the department at this time, the Chair pointed out that because Language Studies 2 had been defined as GenEd, that LS2's specific learning outcomes would be decided by this new Committee, a body external to the department. Because of this concern, our Department has been quite active in drawing up a variety of discrete general education courses that would fall under the guidelines and would be offered through our department.

On February 1, 1994, CSAC's GenEd Council released its final document which had been officially approved on January 25 by the CSAC Board. The goals and a framework of broad objectives were part of this report, as well as implementation guidelines.

Generally speaking, the adaptation of GenEd has been much smoother than that of generic skills. Why? Perhaps because specific guidelines were given to the colleges from CSAC and a deadline was also applied. The guidelines for generic skills have gone through much more rigorous discussion and revision, as will be described shortly, and no deadline for setting the objectives in motion has been set down.

While it does not appear that there is much relationship between EAP and GenEd, nevertheless, by recognizing LS2 as a GenEd course, we are able to justify the inclusion of an appropriate EAP LS2 as part of our curriculum. In fact, by ensuring that EAP LS2 is part of the EAP students' curriculum, we, as EAP instructors, have an opportunity to broaden the horizons and knowledge of literature and culture, particularly as it reflects a Canadian way of life.

5. Generic Skills

The Generic Skills Council of CSAC was created to develop a set of learning outcomes that would represent the standards of achievement in the

five generic skills areas that all college graduates should be expected to attain. These five skill areas were originally: communications, mathematics, technological literacy, interpersonal skills and analytical skills. In March '94, the first draft of the "Generic Skills Learning Outcomes" was published and sent to the colleges. Throughout the spring, members from the Council held open meetings at the colleges to invite responses to the proposals.

During the fall of '94, the individual college Generic Skills Committees met to continue discussions and responses to this draft.

In March '95, a second and a noticeably-altered draft was released by CSAC's Generic Skills Council. This second-to-last draft integrated the outcomes into fewer, broader and more readily applicable skills. The original five skill areas were integrated into required performances, areas of overlap and congruence in the original outcomes were identified and some outcomes were discarded or re-worded. Levels of mastery of the generic skills were described under the new title of "Elements of the Performance", which all have to be met in order for a student to graduate. Remediation was still not included nor was assessment - two issues that have constantly been debated with members of the Generic Skills Council and interested faculty. Perhaps these two issues will have ultimately been dealt with in the final report which is to be released on May 15, 1995.

The issue of generic skill learning outcomes has the potential of affecting EAP much more so than does GenEd. If, for example, one looks at the first item of Learning Outcomes #1 (see Appendix L), which involves communication, how well would an EAP student about to graduate from a college program, compare to a native-born Canadian? Consider, for instance, the requirements under the heading "Elements of the performance" as shown in Appendix L. Several questions come to mind. First, does a student have to demonstrate all of these elements? Secondly, how would students be assessed? If our department follows its practice of the last ten years of assessing EAP students using a different set of criteria from that used for other students, what do we do with these requirements? Certainly EAP students would be able to "choose the format...appropriate to the purpose" and "produce material that conforms to the conventions of the chosen format". But how could we be certain that they would be able to "ensure that the material is free from mechanical errors" or "evaluate communications and adjust for any errors in content, structure, style and mechanics"?⁶³ Some would argue, most emphatically the government, that such learning outcomes are necessary in terms of today's demands from employers and expectations from the general public. Nevertheless, how realistic is it to expect second-language students to achieve the same standards as Canadian-born students?

In a conversation with Jim Jones, now the Chair of both the Language Studies and ESL Departments at Mohawk, he implied that the mandate from CSAC regarding learning outcomes will ultimately emphasize uniformity and in turn, jeopardise the future for any EAP curriculum. It is quite obvious that there is a need for some reliable tool or benchmark for evaluating students' achievements. Having accepted that, the question of precisely what form this evaluation will take is not yet fully answered. CSAC has still a long way to go to fulfil its mandate, but if carried to completion, courses such as EAP which have evolved as a response to individual situations, are very likely to fall under the scrutiny and ultimate control of a government appointed board.

CONCLUSION

What conclusion can be drawn? It seems apparent that the college system as it has existed in Ontario is in the midst of some major modifications, the most obvious and the one with the most far-reaching consequences emphasizing standards. How much of this will result in a loss of former independence and diversity, qualities that have made the community college system unique in the educational framework of the province? How much of this emphasis on uniformity will affect curriculum development and more specifically, how will it affect courses such as EAP ? Certainly some initial steps have been taken to achieve CSAC's mandate by the creation and activity of the GenEd and Generic Skills Councils of CSAC. And there are additional pilot projects in the wings. For example, CSAC has created a subcommittee to consider issues relating to college credentials, because currently credentials do not provide clear, accurate information about the level of achievement of college graduates. Another very major task still facing CSAC and the colleges is the development of a framework for program review that will form the basis for CSAC's accreditation function across the province. The work on this undertaking will have far-reaching implications. The effects that these will have on the future direction of the college system in the province are yet to be realized. It does appear that the next few years will be the most challenging

that the system has encountered. During the 27 years of its existence the colleges have been able to respond to numerous pressures for innovations. While it is hoped that the college system will be able to keep its tradition of resourcefulness and adaptability, this may no longer be the case. In fact, the opportunities to develop curriculum such as EAP in order to meet the distinctive needs of the community appears to be in jeopardy. Such possibilities are able to unfold only if the economic and social conditions permit. The climate of the '90's does not seem to suggest an atmosphere that is open for innovation, flexibility, acceptance of diversity and adaptability. It does appear that pressure from the government to create uniform standards will continue. Cutbacks in funding may make reductions in curricular diversity, both across and within the colleges, attractive to administrators. It is to be hoped that the colleges will, nevertheless, be allowed to continue to respond to the individual needs of their community, to fulfil their original mandate.

APPENDIX A

Memo from Anna Gris

APPENDIX A

The following memo was written by Anna Gris, an instructor in the Language Studies Department and was addressed to the Chair, Ed Babiski, dated October 25, 1985. The term "Visa" is used because she had been given a "special" group of students to teach, as she explains in the first paragraph, but her comments are applicable to second-language landed immigrant students as well.

1. Language Studies 1 Evaluation for Visa Students

I would like to bring to your attention the difficulty that exists in evaluating Visa Students in Language Studies 1. The group that has been brought together for a special class that parallels Language Studies for common Technology, have been in Canada for almost three years. Most of this time has been spent on E.S.L. or upgrading; nevertheless, these students find themselves behind native speakers in reading and writing skills. At times, the simplest vocabulary is difficult because it takes years to achieve the facility expected to succeed in college courses.

At least half of the students in my present course took language Studies 1 in the spring or summer session and received an Incomplete grade. This was to demonstrate that students made an effort but needed more time on basic writing skills. Presently, they continue to work hard and improve, often doing an assignment two or three times until it meets the requirements of a passing grade. This grade reflects some improvement in writing skills but especially their hard work. In comparison to native speakers, these students would barely pass. They remain weak and hardly capable to take regular Language Studies 11 and Report Writing as their programs require. Subsequent instructors may well wonder how students could have passed Language Studies 1. While the same standards should be applied in evaluating all students, the reality shows that Visa Students need separate consideration in evaluating them in Language Studies.

2. Follow-Up Courses

Upon completing Language Studies 1, the majority of these students expect to carry on with Language Studies 11 or Report Writing. Even if they do get a pass, I doubt that they could go into a regular course with their Canadian classmates. There have been several inquiries about the winter semester. I would appreciate a decision in this matter regarding the following semesters.

APPENDIX B

Memo from Co-ordinator, Co-op Department

APPENDIX B

This is part of a memo sent by the Co-ordinator of the Co-op Department sent to the Chair of Electrotechnology, February 20, 1989:

...there are 15 students in fifth semester Electrical Control, six are returning to their previous Co-op employers. Of the nine taking interviews, four are Lebanese visa students and three are Vietnamese.

...it is possible that many of these students may not obtain a work semester related to their program. The main reason for this involve communication skills. The poor English of these students hinders their interview performance and puts any number of concerns in the employer's mind about the job performance...This problem has also hindered their ability to get better jobs in past work semesters, so they lack the experience of a normal (my emphasis) senior student.

I have talked with all the students concerned several times about improving their English, but for several reasons...they have been unable to do so.

APPENDIX C

Memo from Steve Keyes

APPENDIX C

Parts of a memo written by Steve Keyes, then co-ordinator of the Reading/Writing Center, sent to the Chair of the Electrotechnology Department, in response to the original memo, Appendix C:

We share the frustration of anyone trying to offer the solutions to the language problems of the ESL students.

This has been a growing problem for many years now and most likely, as we get more and more of these students (which seems to be the trend), we are going to have to find more creative ways of managing it, educating not only ourselves but employers as well.

Language Studies has made some initiatives in order to address the problem in recent years, particularly by providing input into some fairly significant decisions made by Academic Council, but I'm not sure they are very well understood by the College community at large. (Of interest are) the relevant recommendations made by the Standing Committee on Student Admission and Evaluation, ratified by Academic Council in 1985/86. (See Appendix D)

Basically , the College has been given two mandates for improvement in this area...(1) more writing practice in all courses (via English-across-the-Curriculum) and (2) special treatment in their language courses (Developmental L.S.)...these by no means present a solution to the ultimate problem of graduating or placing students with substandard (non-standard?) speaking and writing ability.

...these students are qualified for college entrance...they generally make excellent students

...bringing them up to Canadian standards of language proficiency within 2 or 3 years they are at the College is not feasible...to expect such students to be as proficient ...as native English speakers is an unreasonable expectation.

Solution?...we could consider not graduating them. Since most will have passed their Developmental Language courses, the onus would be on instructors of core courses to include a sufficient language component to assist in making the determination of whether to pass or fail them based on literacy.

Is it morally defensible to accept students into the College who we already know have no chance of succeeding?

Is it fair or reasonable to withhold graduation from students who are obviously so technically competent?

...this is not a problem that is any one department's responsibility...it's an across-the-College concern. The real solution is to understand it, accept it as one of life's realities and find creative ways of adjusting to and coping with it.

APPENDIX D

Standing Committee on Student Admission and Evaluation

APPENDIX D

Excerpts from the Standing Committee on Student Admission and Evaluation's sub-committee on the "Needs and Perceptions of Foreign Students", 1986, chaired by Dean Tromm:

- 1. that the College officially recognize the necessity of applying a different standard to the assessment of the language skills of non-Anglophone students**

- 2. that the College continue to provide special language classes so that these students can upgrade their skills**

- 3. that identified students continue to be streamed into language courses tailored (in terms of duration, pace, and subject matter, etc.) to their special needs and abilities but, in most important respects, parallel to existing courses**

- 4. that the courses be given separate course designations and numbers**

APPENDIX E

Criteria for Evaluating Exemption Tests

APPENDIX E

Criteria for Evaluating Exemption Tests

CONTENT			
	7	8	9
	10	12	14
	16	18	19
	20		

ORGANIZATION			
	7	8	9
	10	12	14
	16	18	19
	20		

VOCABULARY			
	5	7	9
	11	14	17
	18	20	23
	25		

GRAMMAR			
	13	15	17
	19	22	24
	27	28	30

MECHANICS			
	2	3	4
			5

SCORE			
	20	35	40
	55	60	75
	80	90	100

See the next page for an explanation of the above criteria

An Explanation of the Evaluation Criteria

There are five units used for evaluation; they have the following percentage value:

- Content -20%
- Organization - 20%
- Vocabulary - 25%
- Language Use - 30%
- Mechanics - 5%

In order for students to successfully be exempted from Part A of the course they are writing the test for, they must receive an overall grade of 75% on the basis of the above criteria.

Each unit is divided into four levels (excellent to very good; good to average; fair to poor; and very poor). The difference for each level can be described in the following manner.

Content

- **excellent to very good** - knowledgeable - substantive - thorough - relevant to assigned topic;
- **good to average** - some knowledge about subject - adequate range - mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail;
- **fair to poor** - limited knowledge of subject - little substance - little detail
- **very poor** - does not show knowledge of topic - non-substantive - not pertinent OR not enough to evaluate

Organization

- **excellent to very good** - fluent expression; ideas clearly stated/supported - succinct - well-organized

- **good to average** - somewhat choppy - loosely organized but main ideas stand out - limited support
- **fair to poor** - non-fluent - ideas confused or disconnected - lacks logical sequence
- **very poor** - does not communicate - no organization
- OR not enough to evaluate

Vocabulary

- **excellent to very good** - sophisticated range - effective word idiom choice and usage - word form mastery
- **good to average** - adequate range - occasional errors of word idiom form, choice, usage, but meaning clear
- **fair to poor** - limited range - frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage - meaning confused or obscured
- **very poor** - essentially translation - limited knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form - OR not enough to evaluate

Language Use

- **excellent to very good** - effective complex construction - few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions
- **good to average** - effective but simple constructions - minor problems in complex constructions - several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning clear
- **fair to poor** - major problems in simple/complex constructions - frequent errors in the mentioned - meaning obscured
- **very poor** - virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules - dominated by errors - does not communicate - OR not enough to evaluate

Mechanics

- **excellent to very good** - demonstrates mastery of conventions - few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization
- **good to average** - occasional errors in the above, but meaning clear
- **fair to poor** - frequent errors in the above - meaning confused or obscured
- **very poor** - no mastery - dominated by errors OR not enough to evaluate

APPENDIX F
Interview Questions

APPENDIX F
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Part A - Statistics

1. How many communication courses have been designed specifically for post-secondary ESL students at your college?
2. How many of these are compulsory?
3. Are these courses regarded as equivalent to regular English (or communication) courses, or are students required to complete the regular ones as well?
4. What screening process is used to determine who is eligible (or not eligible) for your post-secondary ESL courses?
5. How many students are enrolled in each post-secondary ESL course, on average, per academic year?
6. How many instructors in your department taught post-secondary ESL courses during this academic year?

Part B - Curriculum

1. How are your post-secondary ESL courses different from regular communication courses in their general approach?
2. Outline the basic curriculum offered for each post-secondary ESL course.
3. How many hours per week and how many weeks are required for each course?
4. What texts have you used for each course?
5. Have you had any problems in finding generally accepted texts? If so, how were these difficulties resolved?

6. What additional resources are used? (language labs, videos, computers, etc.)
7. Have there been any changes in your curriculum, in terms of emphasis or focus? Examples?

Part C - Issues and Support

1. What pressures from outside the college, from other departments, from students, or from faculty within your department, have helped trigger the implementation of your specialized programs for post-secondary ESL students?
2. What have been the issues that prompted these pressures?
3. Was one of these issues concerned with the problem of having to apply different standards (compared to your regular communication courses)?
4. If so, how have these differences been handled?
5. How has the availability of these courses affected your standards?
6. Describe the support you have received for your post-secondary courses, within your department.
7. Have you had any support from other departments?
8. Describe the support received from the administration.
9. Have you had any support from the Ministry? If so, explain.
10. Have you received any financial or Professional Development funding? (or, how are your courses funded?)

Part D - Students

1. Describe the students' acceptance/attitude regarding your program.
2. Do you have documentation to illustrate your answer to #1?

APPENDIX G

George Brown College's Exemption Policy

APPENDIX G

George Brown College's Department of English and Liberal Studies Exemption Policy

(Students at the college are required to complete a reading and writing diagnostic test. After completing these, they may seek exemption from the required first semester writing course **College English**, if they meet one of the following criteria:)

Who is Eligible for an Exemption?

1. students with previous George Brown College credit in an equivalent, post-secondary communication course;
2. students with an equivalent communication credit from another community college;
3. students with university credit in writing, literature, or in courses that included a **significant and verifiable writing component**;

**NO GRADES BELOW 60% WILL BE CONSIDERED
in the above instances.**

4. students with an OAC credit in English who have earned a 75% or above (these students must complete a challenge test to demonstrate superior writing ability);
5. students with **extensive, job-related writing experience** and who can provide evidence of superior writing ability (a challenge test is required of these applicants).

APPENDIX H

Resource Material Used for EAP

APPENDIX H

Resource Materials Used for EAP

1. Mohawk College

- a) Azar, Betty, S. Understanding and Using English Grammar. Toronto: Prentice-Hall, 1989
- b) Adamoski, Eleanor. Canadian Stories: A Cultural Reader. Toronto: Prentice-Hall, 1994
- c) Matthew, Marie-Loise. Pattern and Practice. Toronto: Little, Brown and Co. (Canada), 1986

2. Sheridan College

- a) Lebauer, Roni S. Learn to Listen/Listen to Learn. Toronto: Prentice-Hall, 1993
- b) Azar, Betty S. Understanding and Using English Grammar. Toronto: Prentice-Hall, 1989
- c) Collins Cobuild Dictionary. London: Collins Publisher, University of Birmingham, 1988

3. Centennial College

- a) Lyons, J.T. Writing Fundamentals. Toronto: Prentice-Hall, 1993
- b) Ferster, T. The Least You Should Know About Vocabulary. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1985
- c) Markstein & Hirasawe. Developing Reading Skills

4. George Brown College

- a) Fawcett and Sandberg. Evergreen with Readings
- b) Smalley and Reuthen. Refining Composition Skills:Rhetoric and Grammar for ESL Students. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 1990

5. Seneca College

- a) Werner, Patricia K. et al. Interactions II. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1989

APPENDIX I

**George Brown College's Report to the
Generic Skills Council of CSAC**

APPENDIX I

Table 1

**George Brown College's Report to the
Generic Skills Council of CSAC**

Diagnostic Test Results for 1993-94

English as a Second Language Students

Grade Equivalent	Number of Students	Percentage of total population
1	3	0.1%
2	31	1.1%
3	60	2.2%
4	46	1.7%
5	65	2.4%
6	87	3.1%
7	81	2.9%
8	91	3.3%
9	50	1.8%
10	39	1.4%
11	33	1.2%
12	21	0.8%
Greater than Gr.12	63	2.3%
Total	670	24.2%

Table 2

Native Speakers of English Students

Grade Equivalent	Number of Students	Percentage of total population
1	5	0.2%
2	28	1.0%
3	37	1.3%
4	35	1.3%
5	32	1.2%
6	70	2.5%
7	115	4.2%
8	218	7.9%
9	191	6.9%
10	211	7.6%
11	164	5.9%
12	148	5.4%
Greater than Grade 12	839	30.4%
Total	2,093	75.8%

Grand Total

2,763

100.0%

APPENDIX J

Members of CSAC Establishment Board

APPENDIX J

Members of CSAC Establishment Board

Co-Chairs:

Richard Johnston
Chair
Ontario Council of Regents

Bernard Shapiro
Deputy Minister
Colleges and Universities

Members:

Ralph Benson
Assistant Deputy Minister
Ministry of Colleges and
Universities

Keith McIntyre
Chair, Council of Presidents
President, Mohawk College

Eileen Burrows
President, Local 558
Ontario Public Service Employees
Union

Penny Moss*
Ontario Council of Regents

Carol Gooding
Chair, Board of Governors
Sheridan College

Bill Summers
Manager, Program Services
Ministry of Colleges and
Universities

Brian Henderson*
Director, Education and
Accreditation Association

Ross Traub
Department of MECA
Ontario Institute for Canadian Dental
Studies in Education

Cathy Henderson
Vice President, Academic
Sheridan College

Jim Turk
Director of Education
Ontario Federation of Labour

Bill Kuehnbaum
Vice-President
Ontario Public Services
Union

Maurice Yeates
Executive Director
Ontario Council of Employees
Graduate Studies

* Resigned January 1992

APPENDIX K
CSAC's Mandate

APPENDIX K

CSAC's MANDATE

CSAC shall have the authority to define credentials for, set standards for and accredit publicly-funded college programs.

CSAC shall approve for each program a system-wide program standards document which will specify learning outcomes for both generic skills and program-specific vocational skills, and any specific admission requirements.

CSAC shall have the authority to define general education goals, a framework of content areas and broad objectives, and to require that programs accredited by CSAC include a defined amount of general education. The responsibility for defining specific learning outcomes in general education shall rest with those in the college developing general education curriculum.

CSAC shall oversee system-wide program review. Each program will be reviewed regularly. The purpose of program review will be to determine: (1) the extent to which program outcomes which have been established have been achieved by students, and (2) the appropriateness of program outcomes. Following the system-wide review of a program, CSAC will determine whether the program will continue to be accredited at a college and any conditions which might apply. The accreditation status of the program will be publicly reported.

CSAC shall operate in an open and democratic manner. The CSAC Board shall have an equal number of representatives from both external stakeholders and internal members of the college community.

The CSAC Board shall have the authority to create subsidiary bodies, as appropriate, the membership of which will normally conform to the principle that half the members be internal to the college system and half be external stakeholders.

CSAC shall not delegate to any external body or internal college group either authority or responsibility for the development of standards or for program accreditation. In undertaking its functions, CSAC shall develop processes to work conjointly with, and possible delegate specific tasks to, appropriate bodies, whether internal or external, in order to avoid duplication of effort.

APPENDIX L

Revised Generic Skills Learning Outcomes Draft

APPENDIX L

Revised Generic Skills Learning Outcomes

Draft

Learning Outcome #1

elements of the performance

- **Plan and organize communications according to the purpose and audiences.**
- **Choose the format (e.g. memo, illustration, multi-media presentation) appropriate to the purpose.**
- **Produce material that conforms to the conventions of the chosen format.**
- **Use language and style suitable to the audience and purpose.**
- **Ensure that the material is free from mechanical errors.**
- **Use computer technology to produce and enhance materials.**
- **Evaluate communications and adjust for any errors in content, structure, style and mechanics.**

ENDNOTES

1. Gordon Campbell, Community Colleges in Canada (Toronto: Ryerson Press, McGraw-Hill Co. of Canada, 1971), 3.
2. Ministry of Colleges and Universities, Vision 2000: Quality and Opportunity (Toronto: Ontario Council of Regents, 1990), 1.
3. Campbell, Community Colleges in Canada, 3.
4. E.F. Sheffield, Education in Canada (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1962), 64-66, quoted in John D. Dennison and Paul Gallagher, Canada's Community Colleges: A Critical Analysis (Vancouver: University of C.C. Press, 1986), 12.
5. John D. Dennison and Paul Gallagher, Canada's Community Colleges: A Critical Analysis, p.13.
6. *ibid.*, 13.
7. *ibid.*, 15.
8. Association of Canadian Community Colleges, "Multi-cultural Project Documentation", 1989, 1, quoted from Paul Gallagher, Community Colleges in Canada: A Profile, 36.
9. Human Resources in the Canadian Community Colleges and Technical Institutes: A Sector Study, Prepared by Price Waterhouse, Association of Canadian Community Colleges, June 1993, 6.
10. Paul Gallagher, Community Colleges in Canada: A Profile (Vancouver: Vancouver Community College Press, 1990), 2.
11. John D. Dennison and Paul Gallagher, Canada's Community Colleges, 69.
12. *ibid.*, 8.
13. Paul Gallagher, Community Colleges in Canada: A Profile, 6.
14. John D. Dennison and Paul Gallagher, Canada's Community Colleges, 72.

15. *ibid.*, 70-72.
16. Paul Gallagher, Community Colleges in Canada: A Profile, 5.
17. Gordon Campbell, Community Colleges in Canada, 38.
18. Carl Garry, Administrative and Curriculum Change in a Canadian Community College, (Montreal: Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, 1975), 3.
19. *ibid.*, 4.
20. John D. Dennison and Paul Gallagher, Canada's Community Colleges, 31.
21. *ibid.*, 33.
22. P.E. Bartram, "The Ontario Colleges of applied Arts and Technology: A Review and Analysis of Selected Literature", (Ph.D dissertation, U. of T. 1980), p 29, quoted in John D. Dennison and Paul Gallagher, Canada's Community Colleges: A Critical Analysis, 34.
23. John D. Dennison and Paul Gallagher, Canada's Community Colleges: A Critical Analysis, 35.
24. *ibid.*, 35.
25. Mohawk College of Applied Arts and Technology, Monthly Memo, November 1984, Volume 11, Number 2, 2.
26. Gordon Campbell, Community Colleges in Canada, 36.
27. John D. Dennison and Paul Gallagher, Canada's Community Colleges: A Critical Analysis, 99.
28. Communiqué from McMaster President and Mohawk College President
29. John D. Dennison and Paul Gallagher, Canada's Community Colleges: A Critical Analysis, 99.
30. *ibid.*, 99.
31. Jacob Muller, ed., Education as Work: Canada's Changing Community Colleges, (Toronto: Garamond Press, 1990), 18.

32. Donna Kemp, ed. Report of Survey on English Language Training in Canadian Colleges, (Ottawa: Centre for Second Language Learning, University of Ottawa)
33. Ellen Cray, "ESL Testing for College Entrance", D. Kemp, ed., Report of Survey on English Language Training in Canadian Colleges, (Ottawa: Centre for Second Language Learning University of Ottawa), 21.
34. *ibid.*, 22.
35. Mohawk College of Applied Arts and Technology, International Education Services Department, Fact Sheet
36. Ellen Cray, "ESL Testing for College Entrance", 21.
37. Mohawk College of Applied Arts and Technology, The Academic Council Standing Committee on Student Admission and Evaluation (The Tromm Report), Final Report, April, 1985, Recommendation 4D, quoted in Steve Keyes' Memo, Appendix C.
38. Memo to Clive Morgan, Chair, Electrotechnology, from Steve Keyes, coordinator Language Studies, March 16, 1989.
39. Rita Daly, Education Reporter, "Does it matter if they can't spell?", Toronto Star, January 9, 1994.
40. George Brown College of Applied Arts and Technology, Course Outline, Comm 107, EAP, 2.
41. Diagnostic Test Results and Generic Skills, 1993-4, A Report to the Generic Skills council of CSAC, George Brown College, 1.
42. *ibid.*, 3.
43. Ministry of Colleges and Universities, Vision 2000: Quality and Opportunity, 1.
44. *ibid*, 5.
45. *ibid*, 11.
46. *ibid*, 16-17.
47. *ibid.*, Appendix E, 170.

48. The Report of the CSAC Establishment Board, to the Minister of Colleges and Universities, July 1992, 1.
49. Memorandum to Paul Byrne from Ed Babiski, April 3, 1992, 2.
50. Vision 2000: Quality and Opportunity, 170.
51. *ibid*, 10.
52. The College Standards and Accreditation Council: A Discussion Paper of the CSAC Establishment Board, Council of Regents for Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, March 1992.
53. Ministry of Education and Training, Open Letter of the College System, Dave Cook. February 18, 1993, 3.
54. CAAT Contact, "College boards feuding with Council of Regents", March 24, 1995, 2.
55. Open Letter of the College System, Dave Cook, 2.
56. *ibid.*, 6.
57. The Ministry of Colleges and Universities, News Release, October 3, 1992.
58. CSAC, Ontario Council of Regents for Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, Guidelines to the Development of Standards of Achievement Through Learning Outcomes, February 1, 1994.
59. CSAC, Guidelines to the Development of Standards of Achievement Through Learning Outcomes, February 1994, 1.
60. *ibid.*, 1.
61. *ibid.*, 5.
62. CSAC GenEd Council, General Education in Ontario's Community Colleges: A Proposal for Implementation, 2-3.
63. CSAC, Revised Generic Skills Learning Outcomes, Draft, February 1995, 2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Black, Jean. "Performance in English Skills Courses and Overall Academic Achievement". TESL Canada Journal, Vol.9, No.1, Winter'91.
- CAAT Contact, March 24, 1995, "College Boards feuding with Council of Regents". CAAT Academic Division of the Ontario Public Service Employees Union.
- Campbell, Gordon. Community Colleges in Canada. Toronto: Ryerson Press, McGraw-Hill Co. of Canada, 1971.
- College Standards and Accreditation Council. A Discussion Paper of the CSAC Establishment Board. Toronto: Ontario Council of Regents, 1992.
- College Standards and Accreditation Council Pilot Project. ESL Benchmarks. Toronto, February 1993.
- College Standards and Accreditation Council. General Education in Ontario's Community Colleges. Toronto: Ontario Council of Regents, 1994.
- College Standards and Accreditation Council. Guidelines to the Development of Standards of Achievement Through Learning Outcomes. Toronto: Ontario Council of Regents, 1994.
- Communiqué from McMaster President, Geraldine A. Kenney-Wallace and Mohawk President, Keith McIntyre, June 16, 1994.
- Cray, Ellen. "ESL Testing for College Entrance", Report of Survey on English Language Training in Canadian Colleges, Donna Kemp, ed., Toronto: International Bureau, 1984.
- Daly, Rita. "Does it matter if they can't spell?" Toronto Star, January 9, 1994.
- Dennison, John D. and Paul Gallagher. Canada's Community Colleges: A Critical Analysis. Vancouver: U. of BC Press, 1986.

- Gallagher, Paul. Community Colleges in Canada: A Profile. Vancouver: Vancouver Community College Press, 1990.
- Garry, Carl. Administrative and Curriculum Change in a Canadian Community College. Montreal: Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, 1975.
- Generic Skills Council of the College Standards and Accreditation Council. Draft 1 and 2, March 1994 and March 1995. Toronto: Council of Regents, 1994 and 1995.
- George Brown College of Applied Arts and Technology, Toronto. Diagnostic Test Results and Generic Skills, 1993-4.
- Kemp, Donna, ed., Report on Survey of English Language Training Canadian Colleges. Toronto: International Bureau, 1984.
- Leki, Ilona and Joan G. Carson. "Students' Perceptions of EAP Writing Instruction and Writing Needs Across the Disciplines", TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 28, Number 1, Spring 1994.
- Ministry of Colleges and Universities. News Release. Toronto, 1992.
- Ministry of Colleges and Universities. Vision 2000: Quality and Opportunity. Toronto: Ontario Council of Regents, 1990.
- Ministry of Education and Training. Open Letter to the College System. Toronto: Ontario Council of Regents, 1992
- Mohawk College of Applied Arts and Technology, Hamilton. Academic Council Standing Committee, Final Report, April 1985.
- Mohawk College of Applied Arts and Technology, Hamilton. International Educational Service Department, Fact Sheet.
- Mohawk College of Applied Arts and Technology, Hamilton. Monthly Memo, November 1994, Volume 11, Number 2.
- Muller, Jacob, ed., Education as Work: Canada's Changing Community Colleges. Toronto: Garamond Press, 1990.