



Les cégeps. Exigeants, parce que le monde l'est.



CEGEPs : Spearheading Québec's Future
Public College Network Development Plan

Research contributors

Viviane Fiedos
Isabelle Laurent
Véronique Raymond
Lucie Varin

Secretarial work

Viviane Brouillard
Johanne Desmarais

Style editor

Christian Van Nuffel
Rolande LeBlanc Vadeboncoeur

Translation

Elise Boyer
Nicole Kennedy
Manon Lessard

Legal deposit
Bibliothèque nationale du Québec
National Library of Canada
1st quarter of 2003
ISBN 2-89100-124-9
PA 44-03

Fédération des cégeps
500, boulevard Crémazie Est
Montréal (Québec)
H2P 1E7
Telephone: (514) 381-8631
Fax: (514) 381-2263
comm@fedcegeps.qc.ca

The Orientations and proposals in this document were adopted by the Fédération des cégeps Board of Directors on March 13 and October 15, 2002.

© Fédération des cégeps

This publication is posted on the Fédération des cégeps' Web site at:
www.fedcegeps.qc.ca

The public college network development plan was drawn up by a Task Force chaired by **Mr. Alain Lallier**, who was Director General of Cégep du Vieux Montréal at the time. The other members were:

Mr. Roland Auger

Director General
Cégep de la Gaspésie et des Îles

Mr. Yves Blouin*

Director General
Collège François-Xavier-Garneau

Mr. Gaëtan Boucher

President-Executive Director
Fédération des cégeps

Ms. Nicole Boutin

Director General
Collège Montmorency

Mr. Serge Brassé

Director General
Cégep Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu

Mr. Rénauld Côté

Director of Student Services
and Communications
Cégep de Trois-Rivières

* At the time the Task Force did its work, Mr. Blouin and Ms. Laurin held the position of Academic Director at Collège François-Xavier-Garneau and Collège de Rosemont, respectively.

Table of Contents

Foreword	11
Introduction	17
A Changing Environment	21
Factors in the international situation	21
➤ Globalization	21
➤ Knowledge-based society	21
➤ Information and communications technologies	22
Factors in the Québec environment	23
➤ Demographic trends	23
➤ New student profiles	23
➤ Human Resources renewal	24
➤ Education system reforms	24
➤ Competition	25
➤ Accountability	25
Major Issues	31
The CEGEP Mission	33
Orientation	
Reaffirm the CEGEP mission and update it, taking into account Québec society's new needs and requirements	33
Course of action	34
College Training	37
Orientation	
Offer a response adapted to young people's and adults' needs for higher education.	37
Developmental direction 1	
Bring about more flexible and diversified technical training at CEGEP	38
Courses of action	38
Developmental direction 2	
Ensure a closer connection between pre-university and university education.	40
Courses of action	41
Developmental direction 3	
Improve Quebecers' access to higher qualifications through continuing education.	42
Courses of action	43

Developmental direction 4	
Introduce more organizational flexibility in CEGEPs.	44
Courses of action	44
The Educational Environment	49
Orientation	
Offer students a quality educational environment to foster achievement, stimulate personal and social development and support a process of self-discovery.	49
Developmental direction 1	
Consolidate colleges as living environments where students will benefit from guidance and encouragement to achieve and develop as citizens.	49
Courses of action	50
Developmental direction 2	
Adapt services to a more diverse student population.	50
Courses of action	51
Research, transfer and Innovation	53
Orientation	
Draw on colleges' full potential in the fields of research, transfer and innovation	53
Developmental direction 1	
Foster more active participation by colleges in research, transfer and innovation circles.	54
Courses of action	54
Developmental direction 2	
Increase the presence of college researchers in research networks.	55
Courses of action	55
Educational technologies	59
Orientation	
Enrich the collegial learning setting through broader utilization of educational technologies.	59
Developmental direction 1	
Facilitate the optimal integration of educational technologies in colleges.	59
Courses of action	59
Developmental direction 2	
Create network synergy in the field of educational technologies with a view to broadening accessibility to college education.	60
Courses of action	61

Opening Up to the World..... 63

Orientation

Increase the openness to the world of colleges, students and staff.63

Developmental direction 1

Better position colleges, staff and students in the international arena.63

Courses of action64

Developmental direction 2

Increase foreign student enrolment.64

Courses of action65

The Contribution of Employees and Work Organization 67

Orientation

Ensure the staff's wholehearted contribution in achieving the CEGEPs' mission.68

Developmental direction 1

Adapt college organization to the new demands and needs to which CEGEPs must respond.68

Courses of action69

Developmental direction 2

Encourage the professional development of all employees and the integration of the new generation of employees in CEGEPs.69

Courses of action70

Financing 73

Orientation

Ensure adequate, stable and equitable financing for the public college network73

Developmental direction

Obtain financing that is adapted to colleges' higher education mission.73

Courses of action74

College Development..... 77

Orientation

Obtain the leverage colleges need to ensure their full development potential.77

Developmental direction 1

Consolidate the quality of college-level teaching in every region of Québec.77

Courses of action78

<p>Developmental direction 2 Ensure the optimal development of colleges as institutions and as a network.78 Courses of action79</p>	
Conclusion.....	81
Summary of Proposals of the Public College Network.....	83
Appendix	95
<p>Appendix 1 The College Network at a Glance, a Statistical Portrait</p>	95
<p>Appendix 2 Individuals Consulted by the Task Force, March-April 2001</p>	97
Works Consulted	99

Foreword

How can CEGEP students best be served? What solutions can be put forward to meet new needs in Québec as a whole and in its regions? These basic questions were examined from different angles by a Fédération des cégeps working committee whose original premise was: the general and vocational college, or CEGEP, is one of the best means to develop Québec society and it must continue to evolve.

The distinctive CEGEP system, a model drawn on by other societies around the world,¹ is responsible for some remarkable progress in Québec. The gap between Québec and the rest of Canada in schooling at the first level of postsecondary education has been closed in the last 25 years.² Access to postsecondary education has increased substantially: from 16% in 1961, before the CEGEP network was set up, the figure jumped to 39.3% in 1975 and then to 58.7% in 2001.³ CEGEPs were a significant factor in Québec's becoming a front runner among the most highly educated societies in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), along with Scandinavia, Australia, Belgium, Germany, the United States, and France.⁴

With the advent of CEGEPs, students had access to higher education in the region where they lived. In the fall of 2001, 74.6% of newly enrolled students had spent the previous year at a secondary school located in the same area as their CEGEP.⁵ Accessibility to higher education is a determining factor in young people's decision to stay in their region or leave it. The Conseil permanent de la jeunesse wrote in a paper published in 1997: "For young people the situation is unambiguous: their studies are the first step on the road to exodus."⁶

A recent survey on migration among youth done by a research group from the Institut national de la recherche scientifique (INRS) produced the same findings: 49.7% of young people who left their region said their main reason for doing so was to continue their studies.⁷ In rural communities the trend was more pronounced: young people left home to continue their education or to lead independent lives, and only one quarter of them still lived in the same municipality as their parents.⁸

Two streams, a single quality education

In the fall of 2002, some 69,000 young people were enrolled in one of the eight pre-university programs offered at CEGEP.⁹ Their training is focused on the acquisition of broad, basic, multifaceted skills needed to pursue university studies. The future leaders of Québec's social, economic, scientific and cultural development will be drawn from the college-trained youth.

On the technical side, in the fall of 2002, a total of 76,000 young people were enrolled in one of the 125 CEGEP study programs.¹⁰ This stream of education in Québec was actually developed in the CEGEP network. CEGEP-trained technicians and

technologists have high-level skills and a solid body of general knowledge—which is precisely what employers look for. The unemployment rate among technical stream graduates aged 24 years and younger was 4.9% in March 2001,¹¹ as compared to 14.2% for all Quebecers of the same age at the same time.¹² Employers rated as competent close to 95% of the career stream graduates they hired.¹³

CEGEPs raise the occupational aspirations of students in the technical stream. In 2000-2001, 21.5% of students holding a technical Diploma of College Studies (DCS) entered university the following year, as opposed to a scant 3% in 1975.¹⁴ The system also allows for these students to mingle with their counterparts in the pre-university programs because they have courses and activities in common. In this sense, CEGEPs have always fostered social cohesion.

Colleges' contribution to qualifying the Québec population is not confined to training young people. Its role extends to continuing education, where present enrolment stands at some 33,000 adults. These students attend CEGEP to retrain, to upgrade their skills or to raise their level of education in order to be more versatile and adapt better to the job market.

What lies ahead

Looking back on what has been accomplished since the CEGEP network was instituted, it is clear that the original objectives of providing accessibility, education, services to the community and regionalization have been met. This doesn't mean, of course, that nothing remains to be done where education in Québec is concerned. More specifically, we must raise the population's level of schooling, which has been stagnant since 1993-1994. A child entering elementary school would be expected to spend 15.4 years in the Québec education system in 2000-2001, as compared with 15.7 years in 1993-1994. A drop in schooling of a half year was observed even for boys during this period. According to the Ministère de l'Éducation, all gains in level of schooling made in the last 12 years in Québec are attributable to adult education and postsecondary education.¹⁵

The number of college graduates must also grow, especially in key sectors of the economy, and we must achieve the target graduation rate of 76% for the network as a whole by the year 2010. The academic success rate of boys must be a particular focus of attention since fewer boys than girls graduate. In the 1998-1999 school year, the proportion of boys who completed their pre-university training with a DEC was 62.6%, as compared with 75.2% for girls. For the same year in the technical stream, the proportion was 47.8% for boys and 62.7% for girls.¹⁶

Finally, adult Quebecers' access to continuing education must improve. Their rate of participation in this kind of activity dropped from 27.4% to 20.6% between 1991 and 1997, whereas in Ontario, for example, it grew from 29.3% to 30.8% during the same period.¹⁷

These are societal issues that the CEGEP network acknowledges and shares. With the aim of addressing them more fully, the network conducted an in-depth analysis, the

conclusions of which are presented in this document. Year in year out, CEGEPs do as much as they can to prepare young people and adults to enter the job market or university, without losing sight of their objectives and prospects for development. Speaking plainly, they fulfil their mission of providing higher education—a mission more relevant than ever—in an ever-changing environment. In the following pages, they identify the direction to follow to move forward, and the way in which they intend to get there.

Notes

- ¹ To increase accessibility to higher education, community colleges in Alberta and British Columbia offer — in addition to technical programs — University Transfer Programs, which are similar to CEGEP pre-university programs. More and more students in Ontario are entering university after spending a year or two at a community college where they receive pre-university training. Colleges in parts of the United States offer preparatory programs for university in addition to programs leading directly to the job market. This is the case in Kentucky, for example, which set up a Community and Technical Colleges network where practical training for the job market and a program leading to university are offered under the same roof. Other states, Ohio among them, offer programs that are very popular with students; in these Joint Degree Programs the college is responsible for the first stage of training, which is more general, and then the university offers the second, more specialized stage.
- ² Fédération des cégeps, *Les cégeps, une présence essentielle pour la société québécoise*. Brief presented to the parliamentary commission on college education (Montréal, 1992) 17.
- ³ Ministère de l'Éducation, *Indicateurs de l'éducation, Édition 2002* (Québec City, 2002) 64-65.
- ⁴ Ministère de l'Éducation, "La scolarisation au Québec et dans les pays de l'OCDE en 1995-1996," *Bulletin statistique de l'éducation*, 13, Québec City, November 1999: 2.
- ⁵ Ministère de l'Éducation, *Fichier Distribution des nouvelles inscriptions, Système prévisionnel SIPEEC*, March 8, 2002.
- ⁶ Conseil permanent de la jeunesse, *Y'a pus d'avenir ici. L'exode des jeunes vers les centres urbains* (Québec City, 1997) 14.
- ⁷ Madeleine Gauthier, Marc Molgat, Serge Côté et al., Groupe de recherche sur la migration des jeunes, Institut national de la recherche scientifique/Urbanisation, Culture et Société, *La migration des jeunes au Québec, Résultats d'un sondage auprès des 20-34 ans du Québec* (2nd edition revised; Montréal, October 2001) 19.
- ⁸ Reported in *Politique nationale de la ruralité*, based on the INRS survey on migration among youth. Government of Québec, *Politique nationale de la ruralité. Une vision d'avenir* (Québec City, 2001) 9.
- ⁹ Student population data are based on preliminary information collected by the Fédération des cégeps at the start of the 2002-2003 academic year. The pre-university programs offered in the public college network are: Social Science, Natural Science, Science, Language and Literature, History and Civilization, Music, Dance and Fine Arts. In some programs colleges offer a double DCS, that is, two Diplomas of College Studies in a three-year period of pre-university studies. Some colleges offer an International Baccalaureate in certain fields. This is a two-year program that leads to a Diploma of College Studies and prepares students to take the International Baccalaureate examinations.
- ¹⁰ Student population data are based on preliminary information collected by the Fédération des cégeps at the start of the 2002-2003 academic year. The 125 technical programs are grouped into the following five major fields: Physics Technology, Biological Technology, Human Affairs Technology, Business Administration Technology and Arts Technology.

¹¹ Ministère de l'Éducation, *La relance au collégial en formation technique, situation au 31 mars 2001* (Québec City, 2002) 24.

¹² Emploi-Québec, "L'emploi au Québec en bref," *Bulletin mensuel*, 17, 3 (March 2001) 1.

¹³ Ministère de l'Éducation, *La formation technique au collégial : les employeurs se prononcent* (Québec City, 1998) 45.

¹⁴ Ministère de l'Éducation, *Indicateurs*, 165.

¹⁵ Ministère de l'Éducation, *Indicateurs*, 48.

¹⁶ Ministère de l'Éducation, *Indicateurs*, 74-77.

¹⁷ Statistics Canada and Human Resources Development Canada, *A report on adult education and training in Canada: learning a living* (Ottawa, May 2001).

Other source

Gordon K. Davies, *Créer une demande où le besoin existe*. Thematic paper presented at the IMHE General Conference, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Centre pour la recherche et l'innovation dans l'enseignement. Paris, September 11-13, 2000.

Introduction

In October 2000, the Fédération des cégeps Board of Directors set up a Task Force to carry out an in-depth analysis of the public college network's development. The committee's mandate was to elucidate the future issues for CEGEPs and determine action priorities for the next three to five years. This was a vast undertaking that the network's administration tackled with open minds, using their own experience, expertise and convictions, and counting on the colleges' collective resolve to move forward.

It was apparent from the start that the analysis had to take into account the reform in college education begun in 1993. The reform confirmed the CEGEPs' strategic role in Québec's educational system and boosted the quality of the training provided at these institutions. It also allowed colleges greater educational initiative and independence, as is appropriate in a higher education system. The past 10 years of implementation of the reform served as the basis for the committee's work.

The need to look beyond day-to-day preoccupations was a constant in the committee's analysis. In January 2001, approximately 350 senior staff members in the system filled out a questionnaire on their perception of future trends. The results served to enhance the committee's discussions. The committee also drew up a chart of important issues for the next few years and had it verified in the spring of 2001 by some 15 prominent figures in the education and socio-economic spheres who work here and elsewhere.¹ These meetings were an occasion to hear different points of view on Québec's college system and the possible means to develop it further.

Throughout the process, the system's managers followed the committee's analysis very closely. A tour of every region was made in the fall of 2001 to meet with the directors general and their staff, and with the chairs of boards of directors on their home ground. Consultations were held a few times as part of the directors general forum, the board chairs forum, the Federation's five standing commissions,² the board of directors and the general assembly. The exchange of ideas was rich and instructive, adding to the discussion and guiding the committee's choices. One thing is certain: the public college network development plan is the result of a collective process staged by the colleges and an accurate reflection of the consensus they reached.

Structure and content

This document begins with an overview of the main aspects of the current situation in the world and in Québec, the setting in which CEGEPs operate. The resulting issues are presented after that. These issues constitute a kind of backdrop to the rest of the document, which is organized around nine themes and 66 courses of action. The courses of action are aimed at adjusting the CEGEPs' direction to accommodate the new needs of Québec society, particularly those of students. Under each theme is an overall direction that sums up the general sense of the proposals presented therein; one or more developmental directions, each of which provides a more specific direction to the action; and last, concrete courses of action that should be followed.

The section on the **mission** mainly describes the powers vested in colleges by their incorporating Act. We will see that not only did the college network fulfil its original mandate but also invested energy in other ways to respond to new needs in Québec.

The next section, on **college education**, is a key piece of the development plan. Colleges maintain that training and school organization have to become more flexible and diverse. It is the only way to give young people and adults educational services adapted to their new needs, to increase academic achievement at CEGEP and to meet the expectations of the job market. The courses of action outlined in this section concern technical training, pre-university education, continuing education and school organization.

Then comes the section on the **educational environment**. From extracurricular activities to counselling, career counselling and job placement assistance, CEGEPs provide their students with a quality educational environment that should be developed further. Some courses of action are presented with a view to consolidating colleges as a living environment while others are aimed at adjusting the delivery of services for a diversified student population.

Under the theme of **research, transfer and innovation**, which are most certainly strategic matters for a higher education network, a set of suggestions is made to foster colleges' more active participation in these areas and to increase the number of their researchers in Québec and federal research networks.

The section on **educational technologies** presents priority actions to facilitate these technologies' optimal integration into colleges and create a synergy within the network in this field. The greater the use of these technologies, which may transform the entire higher education panorama in coming years, the more enriched learning situations at CEGEPs will be.

The part concerned with **internationalization** is based on 30 years of experience abroad and legal recognition of CEGEPs' international cooperation mission. The purpose of the courses of action presented here is twofold: to better position colleges, their staff and students on the international scene, and to increase the number of international students at CEGEPs.

On the subject of the **staff's contribution** and **work organization**, matters in which development is crucial, the purposes of the courses of action chosen are to adapt the CEGEP's organization to the new requirements and needs that must be met, to encourage professional development, and to make new staff integration easier.

The second-to-last section concerns **funding for CEGEPs**. A certain number of priorities are presented so as to ensure adequate, stable, and equitable funding that is commensurate with the colleges' mission of higher learning.

The last part deals with the tools CEGEPs need for their full **development**. The goals of the actions presented are to consolidate the calibre of college teaching in all regions of Québec and to combine in the best possible way the development of colleges as institutions and as a network.

In the conclusion, the major aspects of the development plan and the spirit in which it was drawn up are reiterated briefly. The implementation of the plan is also discussed.

Notes

- ¹ The names of the prominent people with whom the study committee met are listed in the appendix.
- ² The Fédération des cégeps' standing commissions, with close to 250 senior staff members, are the Commission des affaires étudiantes (student affairs), the Commission des affaires de la formation continue (continuing education), the Commission des affaires pédagogiques (educational affairs), the Commission des affaires de relations du travail et de ressources humaines (labour relations and human resources), and the Commission des affaires matérielles et financières (material and financial affairs).

A Changing Environment

The need for change does not arise all of a sudden, in a vacuum. In fact a context is what makes change relevant. By carefully assessing their environment, CEGEPs were able to establish a solid basis for their analysis. They shared their interpretation with a number of prominent figures in the education and socio-economic fields who helped enrich it.

The factors in the current situation discussed in the following pages emerged from the above-mentioned exchange. Whether the factors are worldwide or present only in Québec, they all bear witness to the changing environment in which CEGEPs operate and to the ongoing nature of those changes.

Factors in the international environment

■ Globalization

We can define globalization as the extension to the international level of economic, political and cultural relations and exchanges between nations, particularly through information and communications technologies.¹ Among its effects on education systems are heightened qualification requirements, strong competition between educational institutions throughout the world, and increased mobility of the work force. This poses a number of challenges in terms of comparing and recognizing academic credentials. Also important is the concern with building an international dimension into education, for example, learning a third or even fourth language as an extension of mastery of mother tongue and a good knowledge language.

The international free trade agreements and the eventual introduction of the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) may also have repercussions on Québec's education system. Among the potential challenges raised by the FTAA is how to ensure that academic standards and credentials in the education systems of the countries involved are comparable.

■ Knowledge-based society

Colleges and universities are at the core of the knowledge-based society's demands, since knowledge and skills play such a crucial role in their activities. A study published in 2001 by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) showed that, in the last 20 years, the rise in employment among 14 member countries for which data were available was stronger in intellectual and scientific professions, in technical occupations, and in those related to administration and management.² In Québec, the level of employment among postsecondary education graduates continues to rise faster than that of people with less education. According to Emploi-Québec, "Those jobs that require a CEGEP or university degree, at least in principle, account for one third of all jobs."³

The knowledge-based society exerts greater and greater pressure on individuals to acquire more education. It also requires people to develop diversified skills—for example, the ability to solve problems, to communicate and to work in a team⁴—and to acquire a scientific and technological culture.⁵ The Québec policy paper on science and innovation, *La Politique québécoise de la science et de l'innovation*, deems it imperative to arouse greater interest among young people in scientific and technological education, especially in fast-growing job sectors.⁶ The Conseil de la science et de la technologie agrees with this goal and states in a report published in November 2002: “The creation of a dynamic knowledge-based society is the business of everyone. The objective with respect to scientific and technical culture, therefore, is first to raise everyone’s level so that everyone can participate.” Nonetheless, the Conseil does consider youth to be the “priority target.”⁷

In the context of the knowledge-based society, it seems clear that the Diploma of College Studies should be regarded as the minimum level of schooling that the largest possible number of Quebecers should achieve. A trend toward raising the minimum level of schooling is seen in other countries, particularly Germany, France, Spain, Italy and the United Kingdom. Without having legally raised the level of compulsory schooling, these five countries seem to be leaning in the direction of “the idea that education is socially necessary up until the age of around 18.”⁸

Apart from raising the level of qualifications, which must continuously evolve, the knowledge-based society is particularly demanding in relation to technological transfer, research and innovation. This must also be a concern for the colleges’ mission, their programs of study and their technology transfer centres.

■ Information and communication technologies

The knowledge-based society and information and communication technologies (ICTs) are closely linked. The former relies on information and knowledge as engines of development that are themselves driven by technological development and innovation.⁹ According to the OECD, the steady progress of knowledge-based industries coincides with the growing investment in ICTs and the use of the Internet.¹⁰ With the development of these technologies, the panorama of education, especially higher education, may well change substantially in coming years. New means of accessing information, students’ new ways of relating to knowledge, new educational strategies, new needs for retraining, new ways of delivering educational and administrative services: ICTs are questioning established practices and are opening up new perspectives of transformation of teaching and services. They are also creating new forms of cooperation or competition between educational institutions around the world, be they public or private, independent or not, accredited or not. Networking, cooperation and circulating knowledge within and beyond national borders are becoming increasingly important.¹¹

Factors in the Québec environment

■ Demographic trends

The declining population in Québec and its consequent aging is a phenomenon that has an impact not only on the education system but on all major public services as well. Quebecers' average age has risen from 28 years in 1966 to 38.4 years in 2001, an aging process that is more significant here than in Canada as a whole.¹²

According to Emploi-Québec forecasts, between the years 2001 and 2041 the population will shrink in all regions of Québec except for Laurentides. The decline will be sharper in resource regions—an expected 35.7%—than in the whole of Québec, where the forecasted drop is around 14%.¹³ Between now and 2010, the college student population may plummet by 30% in some regions, especially the resource regions.¹⁴ Although colleges in some regions are experiencing a period of decline in student numbers, others are witnessing an increase. In CEGEPS in the regions of Laurentides, Outaouais and Laval, for example, the forecasted growth in the student population from now to 2010 is 21.8%, 19.7% and 16.4%, respectively.¹⁵

A number of concerns arise from these demographic trends: serving and developing Québec's territory as a whole; maintaining access to services in regions with declining populations and preserving the development capability of those that are growing; dealing with the increasing strain on public funds; ensuring a balance between the supply and demand on the job market, and, specifically for educational institutions, facing up to increased pressure linked to recruitment, financing, and stronger competition between them.

■ New student profiles

Youth is pluralistic. This axiom of the Sommet du Québec et de la jeunesse (youth summit) is particularly meaningful in the CEGEP environment. The Student Services departments in the system confirm this new reality: the profile of college students is increasingly heterogeneous.

For one thing, there is more ethnocultural and linguistic diversity. In the fall of 2001, students whose mother tongue was neither French nor English made up 7% of the student body in the public college system; 17.1% of them were attending a CEGEP in the region of Montréal.¹⁶ As well, young women have become the majority; they represented 56.4% of the system's students in the fall of 2002¹⁷ and are more successful than young men in earning their diploma, as seen in the figures mentioned in the foreword of this document. Thirdly, approximately 33,000 mature students attend CEGEP, and their needs differ widely: some of them are there for retraining, others for a career transition, and still others to raise their level of education.

College students face many different problems. For example, they must adjust to having greater independence and more responsibilities, they must develop their identity and make career choices. Some of them experience complex psychosocial problems such as drug addiction, poverty and violence. Many colleges hire a counsellor to detect and prevent these problems.

Young people's relation to school has changed as well. In a recent paper, the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation describes "a mostly utilitarian relation with school, that of a user or consumer of services," adding that for many students school is just one concern among many.¹⁸ According to a Léger & Léger poll conducted in 2000, 56% of young people had a job at the time of the poll or had had one during their studies. This did not include their summer jobs.¹⁹ A survey published in 2002 by the Service régional d'admission du Montréal métropolitain showed that six CEGEP students out of ten had paid jobs.²⁰

These changing values and characteristics lead colleges to want to adjust their services further. Specifically, they want to foster the harmonious integration of ethnic minorities; offer adults the services they need; increase academic success and graduation rates, especially among young men; and meet youth's expectations while providing them with as much support as possible.

■ **Human Resources renewal**

The Fédération des cégeps made public a statistical profile on human resources at CEGEPs in October 2002, during a conference it held on the subject. The study, done by the École nationale d'administration publique at the Fédération's request, showed that close to 50% of the 33,000 employees in the public college network could retire between now and the year 2010—an unprecedented rate in the history of CEGEPs. Among permanent staff in 2000-2001, executives and managing staff represent the oldest group of employees, averaging 52.9 years and 51.2 years, respectively. They are followed by faculty staff (50 years), professional staff (49.6 years) and support staff (46.9 ans).²¹ This situational factor gives rise to several issues: having to recruit new, qualified staff in sufficient numbers everywhere in Québec; identify the new occupational profiles required; coordinate the integration and orientation of the staff who will take over; ensure the transition from outgoing to incoming staff; maintain the expertise of the staff in place; and adjust management processes to these new realities.

■ **Education system reforms**

Being the critical link between high school and university, the CEGEP, logically enough, must take into account the changes occurring at both of those levels. Education in Québec has changed a good deal in the past few years. The system as a whole was transformed following the Estates General on Education in 1995-1996, and the CEGEP network, after the 1993 reform.

Due to the reform, what students learn as they progress through CEGEP has become more coherent, as a result of the program approach. The reform also helped

consolidate the quality of education because training was now organized around competences to be achieved, colleges had to take on greater responsibilities, and a more stringent external assessment mechanism was put into place.

At the primary and high school levels, the goals of the curriculum reform begun in 1997 are to consolidate and enrich learning of basic subjects—particularly language of instruction, second language, history, science and technology—and to develop children's core skills. The reform at the high school level, scheduled for implementation in the fall of 2004, should have a very specific impact on students' preparation and thus their choice to attend CEGEP and succeed there.

The policy on universities, made public in February 2000, is aimed at facilitating access to university studies—an objective that depends of course on the kind of education that went before. It is also aimed at consolidating the quality of training and research, and at enhancing institutional effectiveness.

■ **Competition**

Competition between CEGEPs is growing because of the population decline. Technological developments will also give rise to new forms of competition, originating both from here and abroad. As well there is competition from universities and high schools, private institutions, businesses, and independent trainers. A large number of players now share the same field, with a set of different rules. This is certainly the case in the continuing education sector, where there is overlap between CEGEP, university and now high school programs, without clear delineation area of responsibility. In continuing education, moreover, strong competition comes from private institutions and independent trainers, who are not bound by the same constraints as CEGEPs.

■ **Accountability**

Accountability is an integral part of the management framework for public education institutions. All colleges have drawn up an institutional plan for student success with a view to achieving concrete graduation targets within a specific timetable. Bill 123 to amend the *General and Vocational Colleges Act* and the *Act respecting the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial*, tabled in October 2002, stipulates that, as of the 2004-2005 academic year, every college must develop a strategic plan. The plan, which must be made public, will include the student success plan and will present the college's objectives and the means it will use to carry out its mission.

In addition, each CEGEP has a set of regulations on student success, a policy on the evaluation of learning, a policy on the evaluation of programs, and a human resources development policy. The colleges are also in the process of completing a complex institutional evaluation initiative assessing the responsibilities, activities and achievements linked to their respective missions.

It is nothing new, therefore, for CEGEPs to be accountable to the public insofar as achieving their objectives is concerned. They continue to be the only educational network that is subjected to scrutiny by an independent agency, the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial. What is new, however, is the emphasis placed on this matter, the priority it is being given and the public nature it will assume. In 1999 the Government of Québec adopted a public administration management policy, clearly focused on strengthening accountability and the obligation to show results. Everything leads us to believe, moreover, that this important tendency, which embraces both the civil service and the major public service systems in Québec, will only be accentuated in the next few years.

Notes

- ¹ Guy Rocher, quoted by the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation in *La gouverne de l'éducation, logique marchande ou processus politique?* Rapport annuel 2000-2001 sur l'état et les besoins de l'éducation (Québec City, 2001) 22.
- ² Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *Analyse des politiques d'éducation. Enseignement et compétences* (Paris, 2001) 115.
- ³ Emploi-Québec, "Les Indicateurs du CETECH," *Revue du nouveau marché du travail*, 2. 2 (Centre d'étude sur l'emploi et la technologie, Fall 2002) i and 19.
- ⁴ OECD 117.
- ⁵ Government of Québec, *Savoir changer le monde, Politique québécoise de la science et de l'innovation* (Québec City, 2001) 41.
- ⁶ Government of Québec 48.
- ⁷ Conseil de la science et de la technologie, *La culture scientifique et technique au Québec : bilan* (Québec City, 2002) 173-174.
- ⁸ Jean Vincens, "Dynamique de l'éducation et systèmes éducatifs," *Revue européenne Formation professionnelle*, 25 (Belgium, January-April 2002) 25.
- ⁹ OECD 114-115.
- ¹⁰ OECD 115.
- ¹¹ OECD 115.
- ¹² According to information provided by Emploi-Québec. The six resource regions identified by the Government of Québec are Abitibi-Témiscamingue, Bas-Saint-Laurent, Côte-Nord and Nord-du-Québec, Gaspésie-Îles-de-la-Madeleine, Mauricie, and Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean.
- ¹³ Emploi-Québec.
- ¹⁴ Fédération des cégeps and Ministère de l'Éducation, *Baisse de l'effectif scolaire dans le réseau collégial public. État de situation et voies de solutions* (Québec City, April 2002) 20.
- ¹⁵ Fédération des cégeps and Ministère de l'Éducation 20.
- ¹⁶ Ministère de l'Éducation, Direction des statistiques et des études quantitatives. March 2002.
- ¹⁷ According to preliminary data collected by the Fédération des cégeps at the start of the 2002-2003 academic year.
- ¹⁸ Conseil supérieur de l'éducation, *Au collégial, l'orientation au cœur de la réussite* (Québec City, 2002) 41.

¹⁹Élaine Hémond, "Attention! Jeunes au travail! Millénaire en construction," Réseau (Université du Québec, Québec City, Winter 2001) 13-19.

²⁰Service régional d'admission du Montréal métropolitain, *Données réseau 2002-2003 de l'enquête " Aide-nous à te connaître"* (Montréal, 2002) 33.

²¹École nationale d'administration publique, *Le changement de génération chez le personnel des cégeps : un état de la question*. Study commissioned by the Fédération des cégeps and conducted by Jean-Raymond Marcoux (Montréal, September 2002).

Other sources

Canadian Education Association, "Globalization: Education in a Shrinking World," *Education Canada* 42.1 (Toronto, Winter 2002).

Burton R. Clark and Allan M. Carter, *Créer des universités entrepreneuriales : l'organisation au service de la transformation*. Thematic paper presented at the IMHE General Conference, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Centre pour la recherche et l'innovation dans l'enseignement. Paris, September 11-13, 2000.

Burton R. Clark and Allan M. Carter, *L'université entrepreneuriale : nouvelles bases de la collégialité, de l'autonomie et de la réussite*. Thematic paper presented at the IMHE General Conference, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Centre pour la recherche et l'innovation dans l'enseignement. Paris, September 11-13, 2000.

Canadian Commission for UNESCO, *Rénover ensemble l'enseignement supérieur*. Facilitation document on the World Conference on Higher Education, Ottawa, 2001.

Conseil du statut de la femme, *Des nouvelles d'elles. Les jeunes femmes du Québec*, Information document on young women of Québec aged 15 to 29 years (Québec City, 2002).

Conseil du statut de la femme, "Jeunesse d'aujourd'hui." Special issue: Tribune Jeunes, *La Gazette des femmes* 22.6 (Québec City, March-April 2001).

Jacques Delors, "Former les acteurs du futur," *Le Courrier de l'Unesco*, Dossier "Une éducation pour le 21^e siècle" (Paris, April 1994) 6-11.

Government of Québec, *La jeunesse au cœur du Québec, Politique québécoise de la jeunesse* (Québec City, 2001).

Government of Québec, *Une école d'avenir, Politique d'intégration scolaire et d'éducation interculturelle* (Québec City, 1998) 3.

Guy Haug, *L'esprit d'entreprise à l'université et la convergence des réformes préconisées à Bologne : enjeux nouveaux et nouvelles possibilités*. Thematic paper presented at the IMHE General Conference, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Centre pour la recherche et l'innovation dans l'enseignement. Paris, September 11-13, 2000.

Claude Lessard, *L'obligation de résultats en éducation : de quoi s'agit-il?* Paper delivered at the Colloque international sur l'obligation de résultats, as part of the Entretiens Jacques-Cartier 2000 (Montréal, October 2000).

Pierre Lucier, "La ZLEA et l'enseignement supérieur : mythes et réalités," *Le Devoir*, April 19, 2001.

Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities, *Portals and Pathways: A Review of Postsecondary Education in Ontario*. Report of the Investing in Students Task Force (Toronto, February 2001).

Ministère de l'Éducation, *L'école, tout un programme, Énoncé de politique éducative* (Québec City, 1997).

Ministère de l'Éducation, *Pour mieux assurer notre avenir collectif. Politique québécoise à l'égard des universités* (Québec City, 2000).

Ministère de l'Éducation, *Prendre le virage du succès. Plan d'action ministériel pour la réforme de l'éducation* (Québec City, 1997).

Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la Science, *Des collèges pour le Québec du XXI^e siècle. L'enseignement collégial québécois : orientations d'avenir et mesures de renouveau* (Québec City, April 1993).

Jamil Salmi, *L'enseignement tertiaire au XXI^e siècle : enjeux et perspectives*. Thematic paper presented at the IMHE General Conference, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Centre pour la recherche et l'innovation dans l'enseignement. Paris, September 11-13, 2000.

UNESCO, *Higher Education for the Twenty-First Century: Vision and Action*. World Conference on Higher Education. Final report, I (Paris, October 5-9, 1998).

Major Issues

On the basis of the contextual factors already discussed, the CEGEPs identified a certain number of issues that serve as a backdrop for the proposals contained in the development plan.

■ **Adapting CEGEP services to the new needs and requirements of Québec society.**

The very first issue is of course to adapt college services to the new needs and requirements of Québec society. The world environment is changing as is Québec, and other circumstances are emerging that we must also take into account. We must therefore make adjustments, confirm some options and choose new ones, shift the emphasis from some areas to others, always bearing in mind the students' best interests so that they can find the tools they need at CEGEP.

■ **Maintaining accessibility to college education in all regions of Québec.**

This is a basic principle that gave rise to the CEGEP system and continues to be relevant today. All Quebecers should have access to quality higher education in their respective regions. This democratic objective must not be cast aside; quite the contrary, it must be upheld and reiterated more than ever, for riding on it are Québec's full participation in the knowledge-based society, the competitiveness of its businesses, and socio-economic and cultural energy in all regions.

■ **Increasing student success and graduation rates.**

There is a need for a greater proportion of young people to graduate. The CEGEPs are already working on this issue by implementing a set of measures designed to help their students persevere until they graduate with a DEC, a diploma that takes on greater importance in the knowledge-based society. A number of courses of action in this document are aimed at improving student success and graduation rates in CEGEPs through more flexible and diversified training, less rigid school organization and adequate services.

■ **Training graduates to be competitive and mobile on the job market in the Americas and throughout the world.**

The phenomenon of globalization together with the growth of information and communications technologies make this objective indispensable. Québec college graduates must be given the wherewithal to be mobile and measure up to the best in the world. This is even more crucial because of the eventual implementation in the Americas of a free-trade zone, with all the attendant new challenges. Colleges must also train enough graduates to meet demand in sectors with a labour shortages.

- **Ensuring the recruitment and retention of new human resources in all categories of personnel and in all regions of Quebec.**

This is an important issue for both colleges and their staff. At one and the same time, they will have to plan for mass departures due to retirement, recruit qualified staff, call on older employee expertise, take into account the new generation of employees' values and facilitate their integration. CEGEPs see this as an occasion to improve their organization and adjust it to the new realities they will have to face.

- **Strengthening professional development.**

Teaching and non-teaching staff, support staff and management staff are all affected, albeit in different ways, by the changing environment in which their colleges function. The changes call for new ways of doing things, which in turn calls for proper preparation. This is why CEGEPs consider it a priority to strengthen professional development and growth. They also want to enhance recognition for the teaching profession because teachers play such a prominent role in students' education and do their job in a constantly changing environment.

- **Adapting CEGEPs' processes and organization to the new reality.**

To meet the new needs of young people, adults and the job market, to help students succeed, to better fulfill their educational mission, CEGEPs want to develop processes and structures reflecting the need for flexibility and diversity. This applies to pedagogical organization, organization of work and the general operations of the institutions.

- **Meeting the expectations of Québec society and accountability.**

Being responsible public organizations, CEGEPs do their utmost to achieve the results that Québec society requires. Appropriately, they also pay close attention to accountability procedures. Many accountability practices are in place, and the implementation of college success plans and strategic plans will consolidate them. The courses of action formulated by the CEGEPs in this document are aimed at providing a response to the requirements of Quebecers and demonstrating as effectively as possible the public college network's results.

The CEGEP Mission

CEGEPs, according to the Act, were created primarily to implement pre-university and technical programs of study. CEGEPs have other powers conferred on them by law: they can contribute to regional development, devise and carry out technological innovation projects, conduct research, implement new technologies and ensure that they are made known, provide services and open their facilities to their community, and participate in devising and carrying out cooperation programs abroad.¹

A basic fact emerges clearly from even a cursory look at the list of these powers: the CEGEPs' mission is focused directly on Québec society; bound up with its reality, aspirations and needs; and closely connected with the socio-economic life of each region. That is how the CEGEP was conceived in the Parent Report 35 years ago and that is still how it presents itself today: as an indispensable part of its environment.²

Orientation

Reaffirm the CEGEP mission and update it, taking into account Québec society's new needs and requirements.

When the CEGEPs were founded, thousands of young people and adults had access to quality higher education regardless of where they lived, regardless of their background, and regardless of their financial means. Communities that would have otherwise been deprived used CEGEP services and equipment, and participated in cultural, scientific and sports events. Small and medium-sized businesses were able to carry out their technological conversion with the help of the collegial technology transfer centres, an essential link in the chain of innovation in Québec.

This is still true today. Because it is in touch with society's needs, the CEGEP network has on occasion asked for its incorporation act to be amended. That is how it obtained the power to conduct work force training and retraining, carry out international cooperation work, and organize technological innovation activities.

The time has come to strengthen colleges' mandate for a number of reasons: the decisive role of knowledge for societies to advance, the demands made on the work force, who must be qualified, of course, but must also continue training throughout their working life. These are basic issues addressed directly by the CEGEP's mission of higher education.

The mission also serves the main objectives Québec has set for itself in a number of areas: to qualify 100% of young people, to stop exclusion, to completely cover the territory and develop the regions, to support technological innovation, to stimulate young people's interest in science, to become a dynamic player on the international scene, and to foster the practice of informed citizenship among Quebecers.³

The analysis of CEGEPs, required to produce this document, was made within the framework of the current Act. The implementation of some courses of action may require amendments to the Act and to regulations. In this case, the colleges are asking the government to make all the necessary adjustments.

Course of action 1

To obtain assurances from the Government of Québec that it will proceed to make amendments to the Act and to regulations that may be necessary to implement the public college network development plan.

Notes

- ¹ Government of Québec, *General and Vocational Colleges Act*, R.S.Q., c. C-29 (last updated in September 2000).
- ² The expression used in the *Rapport de la Commission royale d'enquête sur l'enseignement dans la province de Québec*, better known as the Rapport Parent, was: "...l'institut... doit être la chose de la population régionale." In volume II, "Les structures pédagogiques du système scolaire" (May 1965) 176.
- ³ These societal objectives were taken from the following documents: the daily reports of the Sommet du Québec et de la jeunesse (Québec Youth Summit), *Québec Youth Policy*, *Québec Policy on Science and Innovation*, *National Strategy to Combat Poverty and Social Exclusion Policy*, *Politique gouvernementale de l'éducation des adultes et de la formation continue* (government policy on adult education and continuing education), *Politique nationale de la ruralité* (Québec rural policy), *Stratégie pour l'internationalisation de l'éducation québécoise* (internationalization of Québec education policy), and the government plan of action called *Horizon 2005, Prospérité et qualité de vie*. For bibliographic details see the end of the document.

Other source

Fernand Dumont and Yves Martin, *L'éducation 25 ans plus tard! Et après?* (Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture: Québec City, 1990).

College Training

Orientation

Offer a response adapted to young people's and adults' needs for higher education.

CEGEPs' primary concern is to offer programs of study that are challenging, are presented in various formats and are adjusted to the educational needs of the young people and adults enrolled in them. In 1993, college education was the focus of a comprehensive reform that helped enhance the quality of education and make it more coherent and rigorous. The courses of action discussed in the following pages represent an extension of the reform, taking into account the changing needs in Québec over the past 10 years.

The reforms in college education contributed, in the technical sector, to building closer ties with the job market. Programs of study are now developed and revised in close collaboration with the world of work using a skills-based approach. The choice of learning activities aimed at enabling learners to achieve the expected competencies is left up to the colleges. In the pre-university stream, the reform produced a stronger partnership with universities, in the process of developing and revising programs. The number of credits required in some programs was increased, particularly in social science, to make them equivalent to other programs. Last, the general education courses common to the pre-university and technical streams have been redefined and are now centred on the acquisition of a "common cultural foundation," aimed specifically at students' mastering their mother tongue and having a good command of their second language.

CEGEPs have been given greater latitude where continuing education is concerned so that they can respond quickly and appropriately to adults' many needs for short-term training. They have therefore been able to design and offer in-house programs in different fields, recognized with an Attestation of College Studies.

That isn't all. The reform also ensured better support for students arriving in CEGEP without enough preparation to make a career choice or hesitant about making such a choice. Colleges offer a bridging semester during which high school graduates can take prerequisite courses, and benefit from close academic supervision and extra career counselling. Moreover, admission requirements were raised in 1997, in order to promote student success as much as possible.¹ Colleges are now subject to an external evaluation process that is rigorous and demanding.

This work was completed for the sole purpose of improving the quality of college education and providing Quebecers with the best possible service. The reform includes important gains that deserve ongoing attention. This doesn't mean that the changes stop here. The CEGEPs want to continue making adjustments as needed.

Based on the concrete experience of implementing the reform colleges were able to put together a set of proposals on how to provide and organize education.

They also drew on their collective determination to maintain accessibility to higher education, to increase academic success and to respond to Québec society's new needs. Evidently, their underlying concern was to serve those for whom the education is intended: the students who have continued to change over the past 10 years.

Developmental Direction 1

Bring about more flexible and diversified technical training at CEGEP.

From the CEGEPs' viewpoint, the response to the new needs of students and the job market hinges on greater flexibility and diversity. Most particularly, initiatives to improve coordination between various levels of education must be encouraged. Bridges foster continuity and provide for an effective transition from one level to the next so that students can progress smoothly from high school to university.

Initiatives of this kind have been taken in the area of technical education. Some colleges, for example, have signed agreements with universities to offer DEC-BAC technical training programs, particularly in Business Administration, Computer Science, Electronics and Industrial Electronics. These programs are aimed at facilitating entry into university for students in the technical stream by allowing most of them to earn their Diploma of College Studies and their Bachelor's degree in five years instead of six. A case in point is the DEC-BAC in Nursing, where the college and university components of the education were drawn up in close collaboration, bearing in mind principles of complementarity and continuity.

Bridges were also built between some CEGEPs and school boards in the wake of a 1995 report by the working group on strengthening youth's vocational training in high school and the CEGEP technical stream.² The government and its partners reiterated their intention to bring vocational and technical training closer together, in February 2000, following the Sommet du Québec et de la jeunesse.³ Consequently, a certain number of vocational programs were chosen and their graduates will subsequently be given direct access to college technical education. upcoming pilot projects are scheduled to start in Computer Science and Mechanical Engineering. The CEGEPs are of the opinion that some vocational programs could be more closely connected with programs leading to an Attestation of College Studies; this warrants consideration..

Course of action 2

Strengthen the interface between the three levels of education, particularly by fostering greater harmonization of programs of study that are relevant to students and the job market. For example, colleges could design other DEC-BAC programs in technical education in conjunction with universities, develop Diploma of Vocational Studies-Diploma of College Studies (DVS-DEC) programs with high schools, and build bridges between the DVS and the Attestation of College Studies (AEC), when pertinent.

Another step is necessary. In order to give students the set of skills they need while keeping up with the changing job market, CEGEPs want to be able to offer DEC technical programs of varying lengths when appropriate. In some cases, these

technical programs could have significantly more credits attached to them than the upper limit of 91 ²/₃ currently stipulated in the *College Education Regulations*, and therefore could be spread over a period longer than three years; in other cases programs could have less credits attached to them. The requirements of professional associations (particularly in the health field) among others could lead to a significant increase in the number of credits assigned to a program—so as to include internships, for example—and a longer period of study.

Course of action 3

Have the Ministère de l'Éducation make it possible to set up technical DEC programs of varying lengths with a number of credits greater or lesser than 91 ²/₃, when relevant to the development of students' skills and the job market.

CEGEPs want to be able to offer their students advanced technological training in sectors where job market entry requirements are especially high and where university training is nonexistent. These programs, leading to “university degrees in applied studies,” could be longer than three years. Colleges in some Canadian provinces offer such programs. In Alberta, for example, they are called « Applied Degrees » and in Ontario, « Bachelor of Applied Technology degrees ». Underlying this approach, in both provinces, is the wish to increase colleges' flexibility so that they can more effectively meet needs and fulfill their mission. This is, moreover, a means of supporting regional development.

Course of action 4

Have the Ministère de l'Éducation authorize CEGEPs to offer programs of study leading to “university degrees in applied studies” in order to respond to the stringent requirements of the job market and the need for higher technological education in fields where university education is nonexistent.

The flexibility colleges are seeking in the technical sector should also take the shape of modular programs, organized by training stages. The competencies that students acquire as they advance toward their Diploma of College Studies must be recognized insofar as they correspond to well-defined job duties. One measure that must be implemented in this respect is to apply section 12 of the *College Education Regulations*, which allows the Minister of Education to recognize educational modules within technical DEC programs. The scope of this section should be broadened and the financial resources needed to implement it should follow.

Course of action 5

In order to improve students' access to certification and foster better recognition of the skills they acquire at CEGEP, recommend to the Ministère de l'Éducation that it broaden the scope of section 12 of the *College Education Regulations* regarding technical education modules and, as a result, adjust financing rules and study other relevant means.

The CEGEPs believe that they should be able to decide, at least in some fields, a portion of the competencies needed in specific training areas. At present, the Ministère de l'Éducation defines the set of skills that students must master to achieve the standards also determined by the Ministère. Colleges would like part of this responsibility to fall to them in very specific cases so as to better meet particular needs. For example, in some leading sectors such as Computer Science it might be advisable to tie in some competencies—not all—with the needs of the regional job market.

Course of action 6

As part of the design and review of technical programs leading to a DEC, convince the Ministère de l'Éducation to let CEGEPs define in some fields a number of skills involved in specific training, in response to particular needs.

CEGEPs also want to explore the possibility of adapting the general education courses in technical programs so that they fit more closely with the students' interests in this sector. The colleges think it is essential to provide future technicians and technologists with general knowledge, while ensuring a general knowledge that corresponds somewhat more to the particularities of technical programs. This may provide a means to help increase student motivation, perseverance and ultimately success in technical education.

Course of Action 7

Maintain general education courses in all CEGEP programs of study leading to a DEC and examine the advisability and feasibility of adapting these courses in the technical programs as a function of the qualifications and objectives sought in this stream. If necessary, review the goals and content of the ministerial exam in the language of instruction and literature in the technical stream.

Development Direction 2

Ensure a closer connection between pre-university and university education.

The best service that can be rendered to the 69,000 students in the pre-university stream is to approximate their education to that of university undergraduate education. Everything else is solidly in place: pre-university programs are quality programs with a comparable number of credits, following the 1993 reform. Diversity is present, as seen in differentiated exit profiles, the creation of the Combined Science and Arts program and the International Baccalaureate, and the introduction of double DEC's and intensive DEC's. Moreover, the success rates are as good as at university. The graduation rate in the pre-university stream for 1995 was 65.5%, as compared with 64.4% for university undergraduates.⁴ The CEGEP rate has been rising steadily for the past few years. According to the most recent data, it stood at 66.4% for 1996 CEGEP graduates.⁵

Now what needs to be achieved is greater coordination between pre-university and undergraduate education, especially in Social Science. CEGEPs believe that a closer connection between pre-university and undergraduate programs will raise the prestige of pre-university studies and increase students' motivation. This objective already

presides over the work to devise and review pre-university programs as the work is being done with the universities in a collaborative spirit. Undergraduate programs can therefore be based on what students learn as they progress through CEGEP. However, the harmonization effort must ensure that university courses systematically avoid content duplication and overlap, which always inhibits student motivation.

Thus the ties between CEGEPs and universities, as partners with a shared higher education mission, must become closer. This premise has been behind all the proposals made under this developmental direction. Here, pre-university studies are considered as the first stage in a five-year period leading to a bachelor's degree. This means that students start on the university path at CEGEP.

The colleges go even further. From the perspective of increasing access to higher education and contributing to development in regions where there are no universities, CEGEPs wish to examine the possibility of their offering some elements of undergraduate education. This is being done in some Canadian provinces, notably British Columbia, where five "university colleges" fulfill the mandate of providing undergraduate education in addition to their standard college mission. One feature of these colleges is that they develop programs of study and research projects that are closely related to the needs of their respective regions..

Universities are also thinking along these lines. In a joint brief presented at hearings before the Commission de l'éducation on clientele fluctuations, in September 2002, McGill University, UQÀM, Concordia University and Université de Montréal asserted that Québec CEGEPs and universities would do well to follow Alberta's lead in decompartmentalizing the two levels of education. In Alberta, they explained, colleges can offer the first and second year of undergraduate studies. Moreover, the government of that province adopted a policy in 2002 to strengthen such cooperation. The four Montréal universities contended that partnerships between colleges and universities, especially in the regions, should be strengthened, adding that lasting solutions to the problem of the decline in university student numbers in the regions must take into account the two postsecondary educational networks in Québec.⁶

Course of action 8

To bring about greater harmonization in pre-university and university education, examine more closely with university partners some courses offered both at CEGEP and in the first year of university, especially in Social Science. The aim is to eliminate overlap and to increase the knowledge of universities about their incoming students' prior learning

Course of action 9

In the pre-university stream, further develop career exploration activities, including practical work, for the purpose of increasing students' motivation, facilitating their success through education that is better grounded, fostering closer connections between programs and the outside world, and emphasizing the value of this stream.

Course of action 10

In some outlying regions and urban centres, and within disciplines, develop a closer approximation between CEGEPs and universities. In particular, examine the possibility that colleges in regions offer some elements of undergraduate education recognized by one or more universities.

Course of action 11

Recommend to the Ministère de l'Éducation that it value and strengthen the Comité de liaison de l'enseignement supérieur (CLES) as an excellent means of coordination between CEGEPs and universities, especially to avoid the proliferation of prerequisites specific to each university.

Developmental Direction 3

Improve Quebecers' access to higher qualifications through continuing education.

If we are agreed that knowledge is now the main building block of progress for societies, then we must also recognize the great importance of continuing education in this new context. Through continuing education, adults raise their level of scholarship and acquire new skills. Continuing Education is also instrumental in workers' retraining and upgrading.

In 2001, about 33,000 adults were taking continuing education courses at CEGEP. The majority of them (56%) were 30 years of age or older and were enrolled in an Attestation of College Studies program, a DEC program or a service course. Sixty-one percent of all students enrolled in continuing education credit courses were working toward an AEC. In AEC programs, 80% of the student body is made up of people aged 25 and over.⁷ According to data collected by the Fédération des cégeps, graduation rates in full-time AEC programs represented 74.5% in 1999-2000 and 77% in 2000-2001. The job placement rate of graduates from these programs was 85.6% in 2000-2001, when compared with the working population.

These figures clearly reveal that continuing education offered at CEGEPs meets a very real need of Québec's population. Over the years, colleges have strived to develop new training opportunities in such varied fields as health, computer science and multimedia to better meet this need. They have been equally concerned with responding quickly to regions' expectations through their training services for companies, among other things. They also see to the constant improvement of their programs, particularly the AEC programs, which are drawn up in close collaboration with partners in the job market. A number of these programs have been scrutinized by the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial.

To ensure the harmonious development of continuing education, colleges signed a memorandum of understanding among themselves on the development and management of AEC programs. The document, signed by all CEGEPs in March 2000, is part of the new regulatory framework allowing colleges to develop on their own AEC programs in all fields. It attests to colleges' determination to work together when

developing and revising these programs. After the document was signed, the CEGEPs, in collaboration with the Ministère de l'Éducation, set up a central information bank on AEC programs. The bank has been available on the Web site of Québec's Vocational and Technical Training Network (www.inforouteftp.org) since January 2002 and is updated regularly.

Continuing to build on their efforts in the area of adult education, CEGEPs have worked out a number of courses of action presented below. The latter often reflect concerns expressed on many occasions by the Fédération des cégeps; for example, those connected with funding, in relation to which the recent government policy on adult education and continuing education was silent. The policy does, however, appear to open up interesting prospects for job-related training and prior learning assessment, which are priority questions for CEGEPs.

In other cases, the courses of action explore new possibilities more thoroughly; for example, offering adults general education courses as part of programs leading to an AEC. Employers and adult students themselves have expectations in this regard, especially where mastering the language of instruction and knowledge of a second language are concerned. Colleges want to be able to meet these expectations and needs, in accordance with their conception of continuing education as not limited to serving the work force but to providing people with an overall education.

Course of action 12

Obtain from the Ministère de l'Éducation fair and adequate funding for continuing education in CEGEPs with an open envelope, as in the case of universities.

Course of action 13

Obtain from the Ministère de l'Éducation adequate funding for the buildings and premises needed to offer continuing education activities in colleges.

Course of action 14

Convince the Ministère de l'Éducation to reinstate access to CEGEP studies on a part-time basis through adequate funding, so that adults can enroll part time in any course, just as they can at university.

Course of action 15

Allow students in AEC programs to have access to the general education component, with the appropriate recognition and funding. Therefore, have the Ministère de l'Éducation ensure that programs leading to an AEC are not strictly confined to the specific training of a technical program.

Course of action 16

With regard to prior learning assessment, improve access to services by supporting colleges' particular areas of expertise; explore the channel of regionalized services, especially through closer cooperation with universities and school boards; and establish a fund to develop a standardized, coordinated set of tools for prior learning assessment of both formal and extracurricular learning. Also review the financing methods for prior learning assessment and assessment of education that is lacking.

Course of action 17

To improve the continuing education services offered, adjust the organizational and financing methods used so that this type of education can be provided to students in both day and night courses, seven days a week and all year round.

Course of action 18

To ensure better recognition of CEGEPs' ability to provide companies with expertise and customized training, and to have Québec companies profit from this, as such to convince the Government of Québec to authorize CEGEPs to present bids when it calls for tenders. In this respect, have colleges recognized as suppliers according to the meaning of section 3 of the *Regulation respecting supply contracts, construction contracts and service contracts of government departments and public bodies*.

Developmental Direction 4**Introduce more organizational flexibility in CEGEPs.**

In connection with the above proposals, it is essential to adjust some facets of school organization. CEGEPs, therefore, want to review organizational matters such as the academic calendar and how the year is divided, to better accommodate the situation of students and the job market, and to promote student motivation, perseverance and academic achievement.

Course of action 19

Adjust school organization by examining more particularly questions regarding the academic calendar and how the academic year is divided.

With the aim of fostering academic success, CEGEPs want to facilitate access to re-evaluation (at the present time very few supplemental exams are held at CEGEPs) and complementary learning activities. Such practices are found in some departments in some colleges, but they need to become more widespread through the removal of the existing obstacles, mainly associated with lack of funding.

Course of action 20

Facilitate student access to re-evaluation and complementary learning activities by ensuring the necessary financial means and regulations.

Last, CEGEPs want to re-examine the conditions required to obtain a Diploma of College Studies, because these conditions have become more numerous over the years. In addition to passing each of their courses, students have to pass a ministerial test in the language of instruction and literature (since 1997) and a Comprehensive Program Assessment (since 1998). A higher standard of second language proficiency is expected to be added in 2005. Colleges want to study all these conditions more closely.

Course of action 21

Re-evaluate the necessary and sufficient conditions to earn a DEC.

Notes

- ¹ Since 1997, to be admitted to CEGEP, high school students must pass the following courses: secondary 5 language of instruction and second language, secondary 5 mathematics, and secondary 4 history and physical science.
- ² Ministère de l'Éducation, *La formation professionnelle chez les jeunes : un défi à relever*. Report by the Groupe de travail sur la relance de la formation professionnelle des jeunes au secondaire et de la formation technique (Québec City, August 1995).
- ³ Out of the consensus reached by participants at the Sommet du Québec et de la jeunesse emerged the following statement: "That bridges be established to allow young graduates from a larger number of vocational study programs to access technical training programs directly." Government of Québec, *Déclaration commune faisant état des consensus dégagés par les participantes et participants associés au Sommet du Québec et de la jeunesse*, (Québec City, February 2000).
- ⁴ Ministère de l'Éducation, Direction des statistiques et des études quantitatives, *Système CHESCO, 2002 version* (September 2002).
- ⁵ Ministère de l'Éducation, Direction.
- ⁶ McGill University, Université du Québec à Montréal, Concordia University and Université de Montréal, *Fluctuations des clientèles dans le secteur de l'éducation*. Brief submitted to the Commission de l'éducation (Montréal, September 2002) 8, 10, 12.
- ⁷ Ministère de l'Éducation, *Effectif scolaire des établissements d'enseignement collégial selon le groupe d'âge, le type de formation, le type de programme et le sexe, de 1997 à 2001*. Statistiques de l'éducation 1997-2001. [On line] www.meq.gouv.qc.ca

Other sources

Fédération des cégeps, *La réussite et la diplomation au collégial. Des chiffres et des engagements* (Montréal, 1999).

Fédération des cégeps, *Les cégeps, une présence essentielle pour la société québécoise*. Brief presented to the Commission parlementaire sur l'enseignement collégial (Montréal, 1992).

Fédération des cégeps, *Miser sur la formation technique. État de la situation et plan stratégique de développement* (Montréal, 1998).

Fédération des cégeps, *Mémoire en réaction au projet de politique de l'éducation des adultes dans une perspective de formation continue* (Montréal, 2001).

Fédération des cégeps, *Pour une culture de l'éducation*. Brief presented to the Commission for the Estates General on Education (Montréal, 1995).

Fédération des cégeps, Fédération autonome du collégial, Fédération des enseignantes et enseignants de cégep and Fédération nationale des enseignantes et des enseignants du

Québec, *De techniques et d'avenir*. Proceedings of the forum on technical training held January 10 and 11, 2002 (Montréal, 2002).

Government of Québec, *Apprendre tout au long de la vie*, Plan d'action en matière d'éducation des adultes et de formation continue (2002).

Government of Québec, *Apprendre tout au long de la vie*, Politique gouvernementale d'éducation des adultes et de formation continue (2002).

Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la Science, *Des collèges pour le Québec du XXI^e siècle* (Québec City, April 1993).

UNESCO, *Lifelong Learning and Training: A Bridge to the Future, Recommendations*, Second International Congress on Technical and Vocational Education, Seoul, April 26-30, 1999.

Université du Québec, *Bâtir notre avenir*, Document de réflexion sur l'Université du Québec (Québec City, September 2001).

The Educational Environment

Orientation

Offer students a quality educational environment to foster achievement, stimulate personal and social development and support a process of self-discovery.

Colleges primarily address young people aged 17–20 who have arrived at a decisive stage in their lives: the passage from adolescence to adulthood. According to Québec's monitoring agency on youth, the Observatoire Jeunes et Société, young people at this time of their lives are confronted with the greatest range of choices they will ever have to face.¹ In addition to personal learning which can be quite complex—exercising greater autonomy, developing an identity, the first life choices—they are in transition from secondary to college-level education, which is a challenge in itself.

This is why colleges are much more than places where courses are taught. They offer guidance and placement services, organize conferences and entertainment events and are home to theatrical, scientific and athletic endeavours. Inter-collegiate events like *Cégeps en spectacle*, the *Festival de théâtre*, the *Exposition d'arts plastiques* and the *Festival de danse*, produced every year by Québec's inter-collegiate socio-cultural activities network, the Réseau intercollégial des activités socioculturelles du Québec (RIASQ), or the scientific and technical competition called *Science, on tourne!*, organized by the Fédération des cégeps, help to create an enriching environment in CEGEPs. Young people will find a variety of activities and services that complement their academic program and that are aimed at helping them to discover their interests while encouraging persistence and academic success. In this respect, CEGEPs are veritable places of learning.

Development Direction 1

Consolidate colleges as living environments where students will benefit from guidance and encouragement to achieve and develop as citizens.

In a recent paper, the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation noted that extracurricular activities provide added meaning to formal studies by providing students with opportunities to explore options, thus contributing to their orientation process and academic success.² The orientation process is indeed a central aspect of the CEGEP's role, since every year many students arrive without having settled on their academic or career choices.³ Through supervised activities and a bridging semester—in which some 5000 students were enrolled in Autumn 2002—CEGEPs help young people discover the path most suited to their aspirations and potential.

The connection between the quality of the educational environment and student success has been the subject of various studies. While not providing an exact assessment of the impact, studies highlight the fact that when students are involved in college life their chances of success are increased.⁴ The Conseil supérieur considers that

extracurricular activities reinforce students' interest in their studies and contribute to the development of a sense of belonging.⁵

Judging from their own comments, students believe that the educational environment is crucial to their progress. Whether in the context of discussion groups organized by the Fédération des cégeps, the Sommet du Québec et de la jeunesse (youth summit) or simply in their daily relationships with college staff, young people clearly express their attachment to student activities and services that are offered in addition to their formal studies. The Québec youth policy in fact includes a strategy for developing the full potential of young people based on the concept of making school a stimulating living environment and providing within it a key opportunity for citizenship development through extracurricular activities.⁶

The role of colleges to prepare students for active citizenship was also recognized by the Commission des États généraux sur la situation et l'avenir de la langue française au Québec (Estates-General on the status and future of the French language in Québec), presided over in 2001 by Gérald Larose. In its final report, the Commission affirms that colleges could become a Québec cultural hub, serving citizens of highly diverse cultures, backgrounds and beliefs. involving.⁷

Course of action 22

Develop a concept of student life based on the program of studies and aimed at fostering a closer link between formal education and extracurricular activities; facilitate students' achievement; encourage participation in college life and reinforce a sense of belonging.

Course of action 23

Increase opportunities for students to become involved in their college and surroundings and establish a way to recognize this involvement.

Development Direction 2

Adapt services to a more diverse student population.

As mentioned at the beginning of this document, the college student population is heterogeneous, with diverse needs. So that they may become more familiar with their clientele and adjust their services accordingly, CEGEPs are calling for more research, studies and surveys. These could be conducted by an agency like the Observatoire Jeunes et Société that monitors documentation and developments concerning youth.

CEGEPs also wish to examine the problem of academic success for males, whose college graduation rate is lower than that of females. Measures for helping young men to continue their studies and succeed, for example in the form of diverse pedagogical approaches, will be strengthened in the colleges. The issue of young men's academic success is also the subject of particular attention by the Carrefour de la réussite au collégial. This agency was formed by the public college network to support institutions

in designing their student success plans. The Carrefour assists colleges in learning about success and graduation rates and contributes to the furthering of thinking in this area.

CEGEPs also intend to implement specific support and supervision measures to promote the success of Aboriginal students and students for whom both English and French are second languages.* In accordance with the Ministère de l'Éducation's *Plan d'action pour la valorisation du français, langue d'enseignement*, an action plan to promote French as the language of instruction, Francophone colleges shall implement specific measures to assist Allophone students experiencing difficulties with French. Allophone students enrolled in French-language CEGEPs are indeed less successful than Francophone students in French courses as a whole, and in the ministerial French language and literature examination.⁸ In another vein, CEGEPs wish to strengthen suicide prevention programs for young people, since suicide is the main cause of death in males aged 15 to 39 in Québec.

Course of action 24

With a view to becoming more knowledgeable about the college student population and adapting services accordingly, promote the creation of a continuing research-action program on college life and encourage studies and surveys concerning this level of education and the students enrolled in it.

Course of action 25

Study the problem of young men's success rate in college and establish appropriate means for achieving a higher rate of retention and graduation.

Course of action 26

Obtain the support of the Ministère de l'Éducation to establish new measures or improve existing ones to support student success, in particular for Allophone and Aboriginal students.

Course of action 27

As a partner, ensure that the Ministère de la Santé et des Services sociaux (MSSS) and health and social services agencies are made aware of the psycho-social needs of college students, both young and adult, and that appropriate services are furnished to them. As a college network, commit to sharing this responsibility, notably by networking among colleges for mutual support and discussion, and with agencies of the health and social services network and community sector, with the goal of preventing suicide in young people.

Course of action 28

With respect to the preceding proposals, ensure the allocation of sufficient resources and means for the development of a quality educational environment in CEGEPs.

* The term used —mostly in Québec— for people whose mother tongue is neither French nor English is “allophone.”

Notes

- ¹ Cited by the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation in its paper, *Au collégial, l'orientation au cœur de la réussite* (Québec City, 2002) 42.
- ² *Au collégial*, 41.
- ³ In its paper, *Au collégial, l'orientation au cœur de la réussite*, the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation provides statistics about young people's "vocational indecisiveness." In particular, it states that a 1990 survey of college students revealed that 29.7% of the respondents affirmed they were undecided about their career choice. Among students in the pre-university sector, only 20% stated having a clearly established academic plan. The Conseil also notes that a survey conducted by the Conseil permanent de la jeunesse revealed that 59.4% of college youth had little or no idea of their career choice after completing secondary schooling. *Au collégial*, 126.
- ⁴ Fédération des cégeps, *La réussite et la diplomation au collégial, des chiffres et des engagements* (Montréal, 1999) 69.
- ⁵ Conseil supérieur de l'éducation, *Des conditions de réussite au collégial. Réflexion à partir de points de vue étudiants* (Québec City, 1995) 69-70.
- ⁶ Government of Québec, *La jeunesse au cœur du Québec, Politique québécoise de la jeunesse* (Québec City, 2001) 36.
- ⁷ Government of Québec, *Le français, une langue pour tout le monde*, Report of the Commission des États généraux sur la situation et l'avenir de la langue française au Québec (Québec City, 2001) 58.
- ⁸ Collège de Bois-de-Boulogne and Cégep Marie-Victorin, *La réussite en français des allophones au collégial : constat, problématique et solutions* (Montréal, 2000).

Other sources

Fédération des cégeps, *L'enseignement collégial vu par des étudiants*, Report of discussion groups on college education (Montréal, October 2000).

Ministère de l'Éducation, *Lire, écrire, communiquer... réussir!*, Plan d'action pour la valorisation du français, langue d'enseignement (Québec, 2001).

Research, Transfer and Innovation

Colleges and universities share the mission of curriculum-based higher education that is also associated with other activities that enrich the educational experience. Research is one such activity, a field in which CEGEPs have been active for nearly 20 years during which time their visibility has increased steadily as has their stature. This reputation is amply justified: with scientific production that meets standards of excellence and researchers whose work is comparable to that of their university counterparts, CEGEPs furnish, according to the *Québec Policy on Science and Innovation*, a valuable contribution to Québec's research efforts.¹

Orientation

Draw on colleges' full potential in the fields of research, transfer and innovation.

The public college network produces pedagogical, discipline-specific and applied research that contributes significantly to teaching and program content. When CEGEPs were created 35 years ago, an absence of models called for innovation and the development of pedagogical approaches adapted to this new level of education. This work enabled the network to respond rapidly and appropriately to the numerous challenges it faced from its inception. Today, teaching methods and practices are still the subject of a large part of pedagogical research at the college level.

For its part, discipline-specific research reflects the colleges' scientific potential and vigour. This activity advances knowledge in various fields, and enriches intellectual life at the CEGEPs : it contributes to researchers' professional development, it expands the knowledge of teachers and students, it stimulates young people's interest in pursuing scientific careers, it links the colleges with universities here and elsewhere, it is a means of outreach into their communities, and much more.

CEGEPs' contributions to development do not stop here. With their 28 technology transfer centres, grouped in the Réseau trans-tech, they participate directly in Québec's system of innovation. These centres conduct research and development in key economic sectors, conclude strategic alliances with industry, support businesses' competitiveness, particularly small and medium-sized businesses, and transfer basic research findings to applied research—all the while keeping in mind the best interest of the regions. A joint research project conducted in 2002 by the Institut national de la recherche scientifique (INRS) and the Canadian Institute for Research on Regional Development has in fact concluded that one way of making certain targeted regions more attractive would be to invest more heavily in developing centres for knowledge transfer and application, especially at the college level.² The activities of technology transfer centres also have positive spinoffs for the technical education offered by CEGEPs.

CEGEPs have thus become exemplary centres for technological research in Québec. The impact of the colleges' work in these fields also extends beyond Québec's borders:

recent cooperation agreements concluded with France and Mexico, for instance, are also concerned with technology transfer and applied research.

Development Direction 1

Foster more active participation by colleges in research, transfer and innovation circles.

Significant progress has been made in recent years in terms of fully recognizing the value of college-level research within Québec's scientific community. A good example is the *Québec Policy on Science and Innovation*: in it the government affirms its commitment to increased research activity in the CEGEPs and recognizes the contribution of colleges, including the strategic role of their technology transfer centres.

This recognition is also evident in the new mission of Québec research funds. Under the *Act respecting the ministère de la Recherche, de la Science et de la Technologie*, these three funds now have a clear goal of forming partnerships with colleges, and of issuing grants to free up instructors to pursue research activities. The public college network indeed sits on the board of directors of the Fonds québécois de recherche sur la nature et les technologies (Fonds NATECH), but is not however present on the board of directors or peer review panel of the Fonds de la recherche sur la société et la culture and the Fonds de la recherche en santé du Québec.

In light of the progress of recent years and especially the conviction that development in Québec also depends on the CEGEPs' contributions to research, transfer and innovation, a number of courses of action were identified.

Course of action 29

Obtain public college network participation on the board of directors and peer review panel of the Québec research funds where it is not currently represented, and with the federal research funding agencies such as the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council

Course of action 30

Persuade the Québec government to facilitate the creation of a corporation to promote colleges' technological research activities, similar to the corporations which develop university research, with a view to developing and commercializing the results of college research.

Course of action 31

Obtain the support of the Québec government for the spin-off efforts of CEGEPs and collegial technology transfer centres.

Course of action 32

Convince the Ministère de l'Éducation to implement support measures for college research promotional organizations and for the dissemination of research results.

Course of action 33

In connection with the *Québec Policy on Science and Innovation*, ensure the development of collegial technology transfer centres, meaning, in concrete terms:

- ongoing adequate core funding from the Ministère de l'Éducation and the Ministère des Finances, de l'Économie et de la Recherche;
- matching funding from the Ministère des Finances, de l'Économie et de la Recherche for research contracts obtained by each of the collegial technology transfer centres;
- the creation of new collegial technology transfer centres in regions where none currently exist or where there is a need for them. In this respect, the possibility of creating technology transfer centres in the field of applied social sciences should be considered.

Development Direction 2

Increase the presence of college researchers in research networks.

In the 1990s, the wave of college budget cuts meant a considerable reduction in the number of instructors assigned to research. While in 1992–1993, 121 teachers were relieved of their teaching duties in order to conduct research, they numbered only 26 in 1998–1999,³ representing a drop of 79%.

Currently, however, there has been a new boom in college research, due in large part to the guidelines of the *Québec Policy on Science and Innovation* and the new *Act respecting the Ministère de la Recherche, de la Science et de la Technologie*. Both acknowledge college researchers on the same level as university researchers. The openness of the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada to Québec colleges is another revitalizing factor. The colleges plan to build on this momentum by encouraging their researchers to maintain a stronger presence in research networks.

Course of action 34

Following the example of the existing programs of the Fonds NATECH and the Fonds québécois de la recherche sur la société et la culture, recommend that Québec and federal funding bodies create a research fund specifically designated for CEGEP and collegial technology transfer centre researchers, with a particular focus within this fund on the situation of less experienced researchers.

Course of action 35

Recommend that the federal government create applied research chairs in the colleges' fields of expertise.

Course of action 36

In collaboration with partners like the Association of Canadian Community Colleges, convince the federal government to give Québec college teachers direct access to its research grant programs—as is currently the case with the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada—and to award funding to colleges to cover their indirect research costs.

Course of action 37

In conformance with the *Québec Policy on Science and Innovation*, colleges should encourage the practice of releasing teachers to enable them to participate in the Québec research network; in particular, they should ensure that certain teachers be released and assisted in the preparation of research proposals.

Notes

- ¹ Government of Québec, *Knowledge to Change the World*, Québec Policy on Science and Innovation (Québec City, 2001).
- ² Mario Polèse and Richard Shearmur, with the collaboration of Pierre-Marcel Desjardins and Marc Johnson, *La périphérie face à l'économie du savoir*. Institut national de la recherche scientifique/Urbanisation, Culture et Société, and the Canadian Research Institute on Regional Development, *La dynamique spatiale de l'économie canadienne et l'avenir des régions non métropolitaines du Québec et des provinces de l'Atlantique* (Montréal, 2002) XXVIII.
- ³ *Knowledge to Change the World*.

Other sources

Association pour la recherche au collégial, *Historique de la recherche au collégial* (Montréal, 1999).

Conseil de la science et de la technologie, *Des catalyseurs de l'innovation, les centres de transfert et leur financement*, Québec, 2000.

Conseil de la science et de la technologie, *Pour des régions innovantes*, Rapport de conjoncture 2001 (Québec City, 2001).

Caroline Julien, « Le collégial, dans les plates-bandes des universités? », *Découvrir*, Vol. 23, No. 3, May-June 2002 (Montréal: Association francophone pour le savoir (ACFAS)) 54-61.

Educational Technologies

Orientation

Enrich the collegial learning setting through broader utilization of educational technologies.

Information and communications technologies will likely transform the learning environment in higher education in the near future. They eliminate issues of distance, provide ongoing access to information, facilitate networking and open a window on the world. And they have already changed how we approach learning and teaching. Their potential is immense when it comes to new ways of learning, teaching, supervising and assisting.

CEGEPs have in fact already begun to work in this area. Teachers use new technologies to prepare their classes and examinations, monitor students' academic records, guide the learning process and communicate with their students. These practices, too often contingent upon individual initiative, must be extended and systematized. This implies resources: equipment and financial means, naturally, but also training, technical assistance and professional support. An integrated vision must be developed.

Development Direction 1

Facilitate the optimal integration of educational technologies in colleges.

Quick action is called for. Québec still lags behind the North American average in terms of utilization of new technologies.¹ The use of information and communication technologies at work was slightly lower in Québec (55%) than in the other Canadian provinces (57%) in 2000, despite a surge in the 1990s.² The gap widens when it comes to use of the Internet in 2000 by people aged 15 and over: the proportion was 46% in Québec, compared to 61% in British Columbia, 60% in Alberta, and 55% in Ontario.³

Consequently, CEGEPs, among others, should be encouraged and given more support for their efforts in this area. The integration of these technologies with teaching, in particular, must be accelerated, because they spark the interest of students and increase motivation and achievement.

Course of action 38

In collaboration with the Ministère de l'Éducation, prepare an action plan to facilitate the optimal integration of technologies in college education. This plan should include, in particular:

- measures to facilitate access to or acquisition of computers by students and teachers;
- appropriate measures to ensure the renewal of the current computer resources in colleges;

- technical and professional support to ensure adequate utilization of technologies by students and staff, teachers in particular.
- a program to update and improve technological knowledge and competency, addressed to teaching staff;
- ongoing financial resources to support the integration of technologies in colleges, particularly in programs of study;
- financial measures to support research and experimentation aimed at improving knowledge about the strategies and pedagogical means that need to be implemented, and the effects of technology use in education.

Development Direction 2

Create network synergy in the field of educational technologies with a view to broadening accessibility to college education.

In order to take advantage of the full potential of educational technologies, colleges count on partnerships, collective efforts, and consistent and complementary actions. Notably, they can draw on the expertise of Cégep@distance, which offers the Québec public some 250 courses, 30 of which are online. Cégep@distance, now operating at an international level, is also associated with the development of an online DEC program in Natural Sciences, in which some 1000 college students are currently enrolled. With other groups such as Télé-université, it is part of the Centre de liaison de la formation à distance (CLIFAD), an association whose goal is to establish a developmental strategy for distance and online education in Québec.

Clearly, there must be broader availability of distance education courses, and better use of online education. These are effective means for personalizing the learning process and broadening accessibility to education. The colleges intend to intensify their collective efforts with groups in this network in order to further develop the availability of distance education—online learning in particular. This will be accomplished in a concerted manner, giving each organization the opportunity to participate in setting priorities for the planned development so that the concerns of each member are taken into consideration.

In addition, since 2002, Québec CEGEPs are connected with each other and with universities to the higher education and research information highway. This high-speed fibre optics network opens new educational and service opportunities. In this spirit, CEGEPs have developed a videoconferencing training project for which each institution will possess the infrastructure, equipment and resources needed to provide distance education, ensure the professional development of its staff and facilitate the organization of distance educational and administrative activities.

Finally, it would be appropriate to consolidate Québec's expertise in the field of online education and place it at the disposal of French-speaking countries. An international

market is emerging and colleges see this as a great development opportunity for themselves and for Québec society.

Course of action 39

Encourage partnership between colleges and other network organizations to coordinate delivery of distance and online education, and obtain financial support from the Ministère de l'Éducation for the public college network to develop diversified and more comprehensive online education.

Course of action 40

Acquire financial support from Québec and federal funds to develop Francophone content online that is accessible to French-speaking countries.

Course of action 41

Obtain financial support from the Ministère de l'Éducation for the creation of an educational video training network within the public college network.

Notes

- ¹ Conseil supérieur de l'éducation, *Éducation et nouvelles technologies. Pour une intégration réussie dans l'enseignement et l'apprentissage*, Rapport annuel 1999-2000 sur l'état et les besoins de l'éducation (Québec, 2000) 20.
- ² Conseil de la science et de la technologie, *La culture scientifique et technique au Québec : bilan* (Québec, 2002) 67.
- ³ These statistics, issued by CEFRIO in May 2002, are reported by the Conseil de la science et de la technologie in *La culture scientifique*, 69.

Other sources

Paul Inchauspé, *La formation à distance : enjeux et perspectives*. Speech given at a seminar on distance learning organized by Cégep@distance, Montréal, April 2001. Web page: www.cegepadistance.ca

Emploi-Québec and Comité national des services aux entreprises des cégeps et des commissions scolaires, *L'apprentissage virtuel au Québec* (Montréal, 2002).

Opening Up to the World

Orientation

Increase the openness to the world of colleges, students and staff.

At the end of the 1960s, the CEGEP network was born, providing general access to college education for the first time; the pioneers gave the new institution its open and democratic form. At the time, no one imagined the extent to which the CEGEPs would open up to the world. But they did, to the benefit of all Quebecers.

The colleges have had contact with the world for 30 years now, from the first student and teacher foreign exchange programs to the conclusion, in 1999, of cooperation agreements with France and Mexico. CEGEPs have participated in hundreds of projects in 40 countries in Africa, Latin America, Asia and Europe. All their expertise is drawn upon, especially with regards to the development and revision of programs of study, technology transfer and trainer training.

Language instruction is another way to increase CEGEPs' openness to the world. People in Québec and students from other Canadian provinces and foreign countries can learn English and French as well as Spanish, German, Portuguese and Mandarin. Some pre-university and technical programs comprise an international component, like the Monde et Société program offered in some CEGEPs' social sciences departments; other colleges have adopted an international vocation, offering the International Baccalaureate.

In addition, the agreements recently concluded with university technical institutes in France and technical universities in Mexico are mainly aimed at increasing exchange and internship opportunities for students and staff. Young Quebecers themselves welcome the educational travel, in which they benefit from a pedagogical structure and accredited instruction while being introduced to other cultures and ways of seeing the world. For college staff too, these are wonderful opportunities to bring their skills to other communities and for personal and professional enrichment.

Development Direction 1

Better position colleges, staff and students in the international arena.

Drawing on their 30 years of accomplishments and propelled by globalization and the expectations of students and Québec society, CEGEPs propose to take another step forward. In particular—by means of a simplified process—they want to be able to offer programs and grant DEC's abroad. In this way, their expertise in many fields could benefit other countries, particularly French-speaking countries of the Francophonie. This is a promising avenue of development, not only for CEGEPs, but also for the students they will be educating abroad.

The courses of action presented below are an extension of the colleges' international cooperation mission, legally recognized since 1997. They also fall under the Ministère de l'Éducation's new policy, announced in November 2002 (*Stratégie pour l'internationalisation de l'éducation québécoise*). The strategy incorporates an international component in instruction and encourages the mobility of individuals and the exportation of Québec's educational know-how.

Course of action 42

Convince the Ministère de l'Éducation to facilitate and simplify CEGEPs' efforts to offer programs and grant college diplomas abroad and enable them to grant a DEC that is adapted to situations abroad.

Course of action 43

Promote the internationalization of education and certain college activities, notably travel and exchange projects offered to students and teaching staff, and more initiatives to encourage students' awareness of international conditions.

Course of action 44

Convince the Ministère de l'Éducation to create a bursary fund for CEGEP students wishing to study abroad, based on the existing model for university students.

Course of action 45

Recommend to the Government of Québec that the staff of their general delegations, delegations, or foreign offices or branches include an education officer who would be responsible for facilitating communication between Québec education networks and institutions abroad.

Course of action 46

In association with the creation of the Observatoire québécois de la mondialisation, assume, as a public college network, a strategic monitoring role concerning issues related to an eventual agreement on a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) and its impact on higher education in Québec.

Development Direction 2

Increase foreign student enrolment.

With the exception of the Maritime provinces, Québec is behind other Canadian provinces in foreign student college enrolment. In the autumn of 2000, for example, there were 442 foreign students in Québec colleges compared to 6331 in Ontario and 8225 in British Columbia during 1999–2000.¹

The tuition fees demanded of foreign students account in large part for this disparity. In Québec, they are set by the Ministère de l'Éducation, and are higher on average than in the rest of Canada. In 2001–2002, for example, CEGEP fees averaged \$10,149 per year, compared to \$9800 in Ontario and \$8000 in British Columbia colleges.² Public

college fees are higher than private college fees in Québec; they are also higher than those for university undergraduate programs. In addition, the Ministère de l'Éducation retains 90% of CEGEPs' fees, leaving the institutions very little leeway for investing in the recruitment and enrolment of foreign students.

This vicious circle must be broken. Foreign students enrolled in CEGEPs make a cultural and social contribution to Québec life; they help prepare young people here for life in a pluralist society and encourage them to be open to diversity. The integration of foreign students may also become one of the solutions, in coming years, to Québec's shrinking population. The Ministère de l'Éducation's recent internationalization strategy affirms the importance of encouraging mobility, notably by re-examining the question of tuition fees imposed on foreign students.

Course of action 47

Convince the Ministère de l'Éducation to deregulate tuition fees for foreign college students and allow the CEGEPs to keep the entire amount.

Course of action 48

Obtain transitional financial assistance from the Ministère de l'Éducation to create services facilitating the recruitment and integration of foreign college students, in particular through Cégep international, and implement measures to facilitate their integration throughout Québec.

Notes

¹ Cégep international, *Les droits additionnels exigés des étudiants étrangers*. Brief presented to the Comité consultatif sur l'accessibilité financière aux études, Montréal, September 2002, p. 6 and 10.

² Cégep international 11.

Other sources

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and the Canadian Education Centre Network, *Ouvrir la porte aux étudiants étrangers. Comparaison internationale des politiques et pratiques d'immigration* (Ottawa, 2000).

Canadian Education Centre Network, "The Value of International Students," in *Perspectives* (Ottawa, 2001).

Cégep international, *La mobilité étudiante dans les cégeps*. Brief presented to the Minister of State for Education and Youth in Montréal, February 2001.

Cégep international, *Les étudiants étrangers dans les cégeps : état de la situation et pistes d'action* (Montréal, 2002).

Cégep international, *Profil des activités internationales des cégeps*. Survey conducted by Gisèle Bonin (Montréal, 2000).

Ministère de l'Éducation, *Stratégie pour l'internationalisation de l'éducation québécoise* (Québec City, 2002).

The Contribution of Employees and Work Organization

While students are naturally the main concern of CEGEPs, it is also clear that the staff members they encounter translate this concern into everyday action. Staff members accompany students on the demanding college journey and help them to succeed.

The CEGEPs' accomplishments over the past 35 years are mainly due to the contributions of their staff. Some 33,000 employees, including 21,000 teachers, 2000 professionals, 9000 support and 1000 management staff, work in the public college network.¹ Each of them, in their own way, participates in the development of the CEGEPs and their students.

In this respect, the particular contribution of the teaching staff must be acknowledged. Because of their numbers and their front-line role with students, teachers assume key responsibilities in the colleges. In the discussion groups organized by the Fédération des cégeps in the spring of 2000, the overwhelming majority of young people spoke of the competence of their teachers, whom they consider to be "specialists" and learned individuals. They were unanimous in appreciating the degree to which teachers make themselves available to students. According to the students, one of the greatest strengths of CEGEP teaching staff is their success in establishing good relationships that are founded on respect for their students.²

During the last 10 years, teaching staff have been directly involved in implementing the educational reform in colleges. This large-scale operation, for which much sustained effort was deployed, necessitated some adjustments in habits and practices. The colleges want to be able to continue counting on their teachers' commitment, today and in the future.

They must also be able to count on the contributions of other staff. Professionals and support staff are, in different ways, essential actors in students' college careers. By relying on the competencies of all their employees, CEGEPs will be able to make the necessary shifts, as outlined in this development plan. With the optimal contribution of everyone and with teachers, professionals, support staff and management all working in the same direction, it will be possible to adapt the CEGEPs' services to new conditions.

The courses of action presented further on are aimed at accomplishing just that. All the adjustments proposed here are only a means—inevitable, yes, but still only a means—of attaining the ultimate goal: to improve the response to people's needs in Québec.

Orientation

Ensure the staff's wholehearted contribution in achieving the CEGEPs' mission.

As we mentioned in the beginning of this document, colleges are carrying out their mission in an environment that has changed a lot over the last few years. This is indeed one of their main reasons for adapting programs and adjusting services. In order for them to succeed, the immediate environment must also change. Work organization must progress and be modernized, and college staff must contribute in the most useful and most appropriate ways possible. Institutions' capacity for initiative must be increased, as must employees' capacity to adapt. Staff must be offered more opportunities for professional development and resource acquisition. Furthermore, in light of the new demands now confronting them, CEGEPs want to continue renewing teaching practices and to review the functioning of different departments. Last, they wish to have the means to carry out the vast operation of staff renewal, already under way in some of the network's institutions.

In a word, CEGEPs want to set up the conditions necessary to improve the manner in which they meet their responsibilities. Obviously, all this cannot happen without dialogue and coordination with their trade union partners. Both at the local and Québec-wide levels, colleges wish to discuss with their staff the internal organizational changes they hope to make and the resources that will be needed to accomplish their mission. One occasion for doing so will be the next round of collective agreement negotiations, when these issues will be debated. This is a rendezvous CEGEPs are certainly not going to miss.

Development Direction 1

Adapt college organization to the new demands and needs to which CEGEPs must respond.

The courses of action presented here are all meant to advance college organization with respect to new demands and needs that are connected to, among other things, globalization, technological advances and changes in education. An example of this would be the implementation of the educational reform in colleges and pressures respecting accountability and reporting which necessitate a number of adjustments in CEGEPs' organization.

So that each staff member, in all job categories, may participate fully in accomplishing the educational mission, the colleges want first and foremost to make use of their resources in the most appropriate and effective manner possible. Among other things, this means there must be greater mobility of teaching staff, professionals and support staff, both within and between job categories, in accordance with each individual's skills.

Course of action 49

Ensure the optimal utilization of the competencies of all college staff.

In addition, CEGEPs wish to continue the renewal of teaching practices begun in recent years in response to various events, including the educational reform in colleges. Teaching is a complex endeavour, which should evolve along with the changing environment in colleges. In this context, the continued renewal of teaching practices is essential; it should be conducted with a view to professionalization, as stipulated by the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation. According to the Conseil, professional teaching practice comprises not only the tasks, responsibilities and duties inherent to teaching, but also those connected with the development of CEGEPs, the education system and society. To this end, in addition to teaching-related activities, teachers' professional practice includes activities connected with program development, college life and collaboration outside their particular program. This is clearly the direction in which CEGEPs want to advance.

Course of action 50

Pursue and support the renewal of teaching practice for enhancing professionalization.

Last, while they acknowledge the relevance of the departmental structure, CEGEPs believe that its role and functioning should be reviewed. A number of factors necessitate this examination, including the reform of college education, which instituted the program-based approach. According to this formula, teachers from various disciplines who are involved in the same program will now be working in close collaboration. The departments, representing a more discipline-based structure, co-exist today with program committees that cover a multidisciplinary field. To make optimal use of their resources, colleges wish to examine this question from the perspective of closer departmental involvement in college life and an adaptation of department functioning to meet new professional and institutional responsibilities. They also intend to encourage the responsible involvement of departments in college organization, with the aim of greater accountability.

Course of action 51

While acknowledging the relevance of the colleges' departmental structure, assess its role and functioning—including departmental coordination—in order to increase its relevance to college life, improve overall control of professional and institutional responsibilities, and ensure a more shared responsibility with program committees.

Development Direction 2

Encourage the professional development of all employees and the integration of the new generation of employees in CEGEPs.

The context in which colleges are carrying out their mission and college staff are exercising their professions is undergoing major change. As we have already observed, the student population is diversifying, knowledge is expanding, technologies are

changing and the demands on education systems are growing. These new realities necessitate ongoing training for all college employees. CEGEPs therefore plan to increase their efforts at the institutional level so that all employees can further their skills and practice by means of professional development and resourcing activities.

Course of action 52

Reinforce professional development and resourcing activities for all CEGEP staff and obtain sufficient funding from the Ministère de l'Éducation to do so.

Moreover, in the next few years the public college network will be undergoing a period of massive staff renewal. Appropriate means will be needed to encourage the social and professional integration of the new generation of employees and enable existing staff to share their expertise with junior employees. This renewal phase will also be a good occasion to review the profile and qualifications expected of new employees who will be working in an environment different to that of their predecessors.

Course of action 53

Facilitate the socio-professional integration of the new generation of employees in all job categories and ensure the relaying of information between generations.

Notes

- ¹ Statistics from the Ministère de l'Éducation, *Système SPOC* (an information system on college employees), 2000–2001.
- ² Fédération des cégeps, *L'enseignement collégial vu par des étudiants*. Report of discussion groups on college education (Montréal, 2000) 4–6.
- ³ Conseil supérieur de l'éducation, *Enseigner au collégial : une pratique professionnelle en renouvellement* (Québec City, 1997) 11.

Other sources

Conseil supérieur de l'éducation, *La formation du personnel enseignant du collégial : un projet collectif enraciné dans le milieu* (Québec City, 2000).

Ministère de l'Éducation, *Rénover notre système d'éducation : dix chantiers prioritaires*. Final report of the Commission of the Estates General on Education (Québec City, 1996).

Financing

Orientation

Ensure adequate, stable and equitable financing for the public college network.

Together with work organization, financing is one of the inevitable conditions for progress in the college system. Without adequate, stable and equitable financing, development will be difficult for the public college network.

Yet, as we know, CEGEPs' capacity in this respect is extremely limited. In 2000–2001, 80% of their revenue came from the Ministère de l'Éducation. CEGEPs' financial dependency on the Ministère de l'Éducation, and their consequent vulnerability to the fluctuations of their main source of income, is exacerbated by the fact that, unlike school boards, they lack the power to levy taxes, and unlike universities, they may not collect tuition fees.

An added difficulty is the fact that CEGEPs' costs are mostly tied to the payroll of teaching staff and other employees—costs that cannot be reduced for the most part because of existing job contracts. The payroll of unionized staff represents 80% of college budgets, with the remaining 20% going to operational and teaching support expenditures.

With such little leeway, the public college network was hit hard by the wave of budget cuts of the 1990s. Between 1992 and 1999, it assumed cuts totalling \$265.5 million; the impact was even greater than that suffered by other networks, due to a negligible room to manoeuvre. The years of cuts placed the CEGEPs in a critical position, forcing them to make difficult choices. Some colleges were even forced to run deficits, despite strict budget control and their substantial self-financing efforts.

In 2000–2001, following the Sommet du Québec et de la jeunesse (Youth Summit), the government began to reinvest in education. However, this was not enough to enable the public college network to re-establish its position. The level of financing by the Ministère de l'Éducation is still lower—by almost \$50 million constant dollars—than it was 10 years ago, before the cuts. In addition, government reinvestment has been targeted, so that CEGEPs have been unable to make budget choices based on their priorities.

Development Direction

Obtain financing that is adapted to colleges' higher education mission.

As we have seen, the public college network's financial situation needs to be improved. The future of both the young and the regions depends on the vitality of CEGEPs, which in turn depends on adequate financial resources. All institutions must be ensured financing that is adapted to their mission of higher education. In this respect, transferable core financing, in particular—"one college, one cheque"—must be

provided by the Ministère de l'Éducation so colleges can make budget decisions based on their priorities and institutional situations. This must of course respect the teachers' payroll funding model.

There must also be an examination of possible adjustments to the college resource allocation model, known as FABES, instituted 10 years ago. A number of factors contribute to the need for this review, including fluctuations in College network enrolment and technological progress.

Finally, CEGEPs must diversify their sources of revenue to reduce their financial dependency on the Ministère de l'Éducation. The budget cuts of the 1990s forced colleges to develop independent sources of revenue, but these are still minimal: roughly 5% of their overall budget in 2000–2001. Among the possibilities for diversifying their sources of revenue, CEGEPs are examining the avenue of other government ministries contributing to financing particular components of their mission.

Course of action 54

Obtain transferable core funding from the Ministère de l'Éducation so that colleges can make budget decisions based on their priorities and institutional situations, in compliance with the teachers' payroll funding model.

Course of action 55

Study possible adjustments to CEGEPs' financing, including the FABES allocation model, with a view to preserving the accessibility, quality and development of college education in every region of Québec.

Course of action 56

Broaden the definition of allowable expenditures set out in Bill 90, to enable businesses to provide more financing for college technical education. For instance: funding for upgrading of technical training on an individual basis and contributions to support a given technical program.

Course of action 57

Obtain direct access, as universities have, to federal and other funds, including foreign sources, for activities complementary to teaching.

Course of action 58

Obtain matching funding for sums collected by CEGEPs through their foundations.

Course of action 59

Recommend to the Government of Québec that it examine the possibility of other government ministries contributing to financing colleges for a particular component of their mission.

Course of action 60

Recommend the maintenance of funding for activities set up by CEGEPs as part of the "Une école ouverte sur son milieu" program, funded by the Québec Youth Fund.

Sources

Fédération des cégeps and Ministère de l'Éducation, *Baisse de l'effectif scolaire dans le réseau collégial public. État de la situation et pistes d'action* (Québec City, 2002).

Ministère de l'Éducation, *Politique québécoise de financement des universités* (Québec City, 2000).

Ministère de l'Éducation, *Rénover notre système d'éducation : dix chantiers prioritaires*. Final report of the Commission for the Estates General on Education (Québec City, 1996).

College Development

Orientation

Obtain the leverage colleges need to ensure their full development potential.

The form that tomorrow's CEGEPs will take is becoming more sharply defined. In this document, CEGEPs have described the direction they intend to follow. But this overview would be incomplete without the following prospective actions, which constitute levers to further the development of the public college network.

Development Direction 1

Consolidate the quality of college-level teaching in every region of Québec.

The first essential lever is adequate financing. The previous chapter described how the severe wave of budget cuts of the 1990s damaged colleges' financial well-being. The reinvestment instituted by the government in 2000–2001 must continue and be intensified in coming years. This is simply the investment of a cost-effective society that will provide dividends to all Quebecers.

The second lever, which calls for a shift on the part of government, is to make technical education a Québec-wide priority. The knowledge-based economy and the labour market demand it, as do the regions and Québec students. In particular, the implementation of revised technical programs and the authorization of new programs in CEGEPs must be accelerated, especially in sectors with a labour shortage. Not only must the government provide more vigorous support for the development of technical education, it should also propose an overall vision of the services provided by the education system in this area.

Parallel to this, efforts to rationalize the offer of programs should continue where this is called for. The CEGEPs have just agreed with the Ministère de l'Éducation that certain programs can no longer be offered in several institutions in the same region, meaning that some will have to be cancelled.¹ This was viewed as being in the students' interest, as they should have access to a quality education. Colleges are also in some cases practising resource sharing with school boards and universities—an avenue that should be encouraged.

Last, to recognize the quality of their services, CEGEPs believe there should be new indicators, in addition to graduation rates. This is being done in other Canadian provinces where quality indicators include, for example, student satisfaction, graduate job placement rate, employer satisfaction and graduates' success rate in the first trimester of university.

Course of action 61

Obtain the agreement of the Québec government to continue and intensify — as of the 2003-2004 fiscal period — its reinvestment in the public college network, based on the CEGEPs' share of the educational budget, which is approximately 15%. This reinvestment should take the form of transferable core funding.

Course of action 62

Persuade the Government of Québec to make college technical education a priority, in particular by accelerating the implementation of revised programs; giving colleges new program authorizations where appropriate, notably in sectors marked by a labour shortage; assuring colleges adequate financing for their implementation; and supporting program rationalization efforts.

Course of action 63

Support initiatives to pool vocational and technical educational resources at all educational levels in certain regions and urban centres, and in particular fields, with a view to enhancing educational accessibility and optimizing resources

Course of action 64

In order to recognize colleges' performance as fully as possible, new quality indicators, established jointly by the Fédération des cégeps and the Ministère de l'Éducation, should be added to graduation rates.

Development Direction 2**Ensure the optimal development of colleges as institutions and as a network.**

In the coming years, the CEGEPs' development concept will lead them to form more alliances with each other and make more precisely targeted institutional choices. One of the goals of more strategic targeting, to be developed by the colleges themselves, is to have CEGEPs play a larger role in niches of expertise, gaining more recognition as leaders not only regionally, but also nationally and even internationally in some fields.

In its action plan *Horizon 2005*, the Government of Québec specifies its intention to make higher education institutions major poles of economic and social development. The path it has chosen to take, indeed, is to develop niches of expertise in teaching, work force training and research. Colleges and universities will then exercise an even greater influence on the vitality of their communities.²

Several examples spring immediately to mind: Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean and aluminum processing; Mauricie and pulp and paper technologies; the Bas-Saint-Laurent and marine sciences and technologies. The aim is to mobilize energy and resources around specific forms of expertise, intensify intersectoral partnerships, establish a critical mass of Québec and foreign students, teachers and researchers in a given field, attract high-performance businesses and encourage synergy. The result will be a solid reputation in the field in question.

This is definitely a promising prospect for Québec's regions. A niche of excellence helps to attract students from all over, retain the best researchers, stimulate investment, encourage the emergence of a qualified local labour force and encourage the implantation of innovative businesses. The *Politique nationale de la ruralité* (Québec's rural policy) in fact invites rural regions to identify economic niches with development potential.³ The same policy stresses the importance of research, technology, science and innovation in generating a new dynamic for the development of Québec's rural areas.⁴ CEGEPs, offering pre-university and technical higher education in every Québec region, are directly concerned by these issues, as are their business services and their 28 technology transfer centres.

While they wish to pursue the path of greater differentiation from one another, which in some cases will take the form of establishing niches of expertise, CEGEPs are also determined to continue to act as a network. The network structure allows them to harmonize a number of their practices, to deal more effectively with student mobility and to take united action on issues of common concern. These are advantages, especially for students, and colleges wish to maintain them.

Naturally, not all colleges are committed to following the path of greater differentiation. While some institutions will decide to concentrate on particular teaching fields or develop a niche of excellence, others will make the justifiable choice of maintaining a relatively broad range of programs, because this corresponds to their students' and communities' needs. No matter what the chosen direction, the idea remains the same: focus on excellence, take maximum advantage of the college's assets and strengths, increase the regions' potential for innovation—all with a view to offering the best service possible to Quebecers.

Course of action 65

Promote more targeted institutional development in some regions and urban centres in order to create or consolidate niches of expertise.

Course of action 66

In connection with the preceding proposal, explore the conditions and incentives to enable colleges' increased differentiation, and examine the means to continue functioning effectively as a network.

Notes

- ¹ Fédération des cégeps and Ministère de l'Éducation, *Baisse de l'effectif scolaire dans le réseau collégial public. État de la situation et pistes d'action* (Québec City, 2002) 13.
- ² Government of Quebec, *Horizon 2005, Prospérité et qualité de vie, Plan d'action pour un Québec meilleur* (Québec City, 2002) 21.
- ³ Government of Québec, *Politique nationale de la ruralité, une vision d'avenir* (Québec City, 2001) 33.
- ⁴ *Politique nationale de la ruralité*, 39.

Other sources

Commerce, "L'année de tous les projets," Special issue, Montréal, June-July 2002.

Conseil de la science et de la technologie, *Pour des régions innovantes, Rapport de conjoncture 2001* (Québec City, 2001).

Fédération étudiante collégiale du Québec, *Avis portant sur les fluctuations de clientèle dans le secteur de l'éducation* (Montréal, 2002).

Fédération étudiante collégiale du Québec, *Baisse de clientèle dans les cégeps de région*. Brief presented to a joint committee of the Ministère de l'Éducation-Fédération des cégeps on the decrease in public college enrolment. (Montréal, 2001).

Government of Québec, *Horizon 2005. Un Québec fort de ses régions, Plan d'action Québec-Régions, Synthèse des engagements* (Québec City, 2002).

Conclusion

In some ways, this development plan constitutes both the finish line and a starting point. It is the finish line because it marks the conclusion of work that the public college network began in autumn 2000, and reflects the consensus that was reached. But it is also a starting point, because the CEGEPs' partners will be invited to respond to and discuss the proposed solutions.

In undertaking this review exercise, which began by an assessment of the public college environment and the identification of issues, followed by the selection of priority actions in nine areas, CEGEPs were thinking first and foremost of Québec's young people. The new perspectives described in this document should improve the manner in which their situation is taken into account and their needs are served— in short, they should help Québec youth better prepare for the future.

How will this translate into concrete terms for young people in Québec? In the technical stream, for instance, realization of this development plan will mean that students have access to programs that take into account the skills they need in accordance with the demands of the labour market. It will also give them access to advanced technical training in different cutting-edge fields, recognized by a "university degree in applied studies." Further, there will be an overhaul of the general education courses currently being offered.

In the pre-university sector, it will permit students, especially in Social Science programs, to acquire an education that is more closely attuned to, and recognized by, the universities. For all colleges, implementation of the plan will give rise to extracurricular activities that are relevant to programs of study, increased access to supplemental examinations, and more support to foster academic achievement in young men. It will generate continuing education programs that will better meet adults' expectations.

These are just a few examples. With this development plan, CEGEPs also aim to serve the new needs of Québec's regions and of Québec as a whole. In this vein, they wish to have a greater presence in niches of expertise; continue developing distance learning programs; increase their presence in research, transfer and innovation circles; and better position themselves globally.

To accomplish all this, colleges' work organization needs to be dynamic and modernized. Each college must have the means to meet new situations and the demands made of them. This is why they want to ensure that all their employees participate fully in accomplishing their mission, foster professional development of staff, and integrate the new generation of employees. In addition, they are determined to obtain adequate, stable and equitable financing for their network: development will be difficult without it.

This constitutes a huge program. . The Fédération des cégeps will quickly form a follow-up committee to supervise its realization. Implementation will proceed in different ways:

some courses of action require the formation of structures, while others require more immediate action. Clearly its success depends on the openness and collaboration of partners of the public college network, commencing with the government, particularly the Ministère de l'Éducation, and with college employees and their representatives.

One thing is certain: the quality of Québec's response to the needs of young people and adults in the next few years depends entirely on choices being made today. CEGEPs have taken the initiative to examine their field of intervention with the goal of improving the manner in which they accomplish their mission. They are proposing a vision of their network's future and a range of strategic choices that have been carefully considered, debated and fine-tuned. The colleges are convinced that these choices are relevant and necessary—now, more than ever before.

Summary of Proposals of the Public College Network

The CEGEP Mission

Orientation

Reaffirm the CEGEP mission and update it, taking into account Québec society's new needs and requirements.

Course of action 1

To obtain assurances from the Government of Québec that it will proceed to make amendments to the Act and regulations that may be necessary to implement the public college network development plan.

College training

Orientation

Offer a response adapted to young people's and adults needs for higher education.

Developmental direction 1

Bring about more flexible and diversified technical training at CEGEP.

Course of action 2

Strengthen the interface between the three levels of education, particularly by fostering greater harmonization of programs of study that are relevant to students and the job market. For example, colleges could design other DEC-BAC programs in technical education in conjunction with universities, develop Diploma of Vocational Studies-Diploma of College Studies (DVS-DEC) programs with high schools, and build bridges between the DVS and the Attestation of College Studies (AEC) when pertinent.

Course of action 3

Have the Ministère de l'Éducation make it possible to set up technical DEC programs of varying lengths with a number of credits greater or lesser than 91 ²/₃, when relevant to the development of students' skills and the job market.

Course of action 4

Have the Ministère de l'Éducation authorize CEGEPs to offer programs of study leading to "university degrees in applied studies" in order to respond to the stringent requirements of the job market and the need for higher technological education in fields where university education is nonexistent.

Course of action 5

In order to improve students' access to certification and foster better recognition of the skills they acquire at CEGEP, recommend to the Ministère de l'Éducation that it broaden the scope of section 12 of the *College Education Regulations* regarding technical education modules and, as a result, adjust financing rules and study other relevant means.

Course of action 6

As part of the design and review of technical programs leading to a DEC, convince the Ministère de l'Éducation to let CEGEPs define in some fields a number of skills involved in specific training, in response to particular needs.

Course of Action 7

Maintain general education courses in all CEGEP programs of study leading to a DEC and examine the advisability and feasibility of adapting these courses in the technical programs as a function of the qualifications and objectives sought in this stream. If necessary, review the goals and content of the ministerial exam in the language of instruction and literature in the technical stream.

Developmental direction 2

Ensure a closer connection between pre-university and university education.

Course of action 8

To bring about greater harmonization in pre-university and university education, examine more closely with university partners some courses offered both at CEGEP and in the first year of university, especially in Social Science. The aim is to eliminate overlap and to increase the knowledge of universities' about their incoming students' prior learning.

Course of action 9

In the pre-university stream, further develop career exploration activities, including practical work, for the purpose of increasing students' motivation, facilitating their success through education that is better grounded, fostering closer connections between programs and the outside world, and emphasizing the value of this stream.

Course of action 10

In some outlying regions and urban centres, and within disciplines, develop a closer approximation between CEGEPs and universities. In particular, examine the possibility that colleges in regions offer some elements of undergraduate education recognized by one or more universities.

Course of action 11

Recommend to the Ministère de l'Éducation that it value and strengthen the Comité de liaison de l'enseignement supérieur (CLES) as an excellent means of coordination between CEGEPs and universities, especially to avoid the proliferation of prerequisites specific to each university.

Developmental direction 3

Improve Quebecers' access to higher qualifications through continuing education.

Course of action 12

Obtain from the Ministère de l'Éducation fair and adequate funding for continuing education in CEGEPs with an open envelope, as in the case of universities.

Course of action 13

Obtain from the Ministère de l'Éducation adequate funding for the buildings and premises needed to offer continuing education activities in colleges.

Course of action 14

Convince the Ministère de l'Éducation to reinstate access to CEGEP studies on a part-time basis through adequate funding, so that adults can enroll part time in any course, just as they can at university.

Course of action 15

Allow students in AEC programs to have access to the general education component, with the appropriate recognition and funding. Therefore, have the Ministère de l'Éducation ensure that programs leading to an AEC are not strictly confined to the specific training of a technical program.

Course of action 16

With regard to prior learning assessment, improve access to services by supporting colleges' particular areas of expertise; explore the channel of regionalized services, especially through closer cooperation with universities and school boards; and establish a fund to develop a standardized, coordinated set of tools for prior learning assessment of both formal and extracurricular learning. Also review the financing methods for prior learning assessment and assessment of education that is lacking.

Course of action 17

To improve the continuing education services offered, adjust the organizational and financing methods used so that this type of education can be provided to students in both day and night courses, seven days a week and all year round.

Course of action 18

To ensure better recognition of CEGEPs' ability to provide companies with expertise and customized training, and to have Québec companies profit from this, as such to convince the Government of Québec to authorize CEGEPs to present bids when it calls for tenders. In this respect, have colleges recognized as suppliers according to the meaning of section 3 of the *Regulation respecting supply contracts, construction contracts and service contracts of government departments and public bodies*.

Developmental direction 4

Introduce more organizational flexibility in CEGEPs.

Course of action 19

Adjust school organization by examining more particularly questions regarding the academic calendar and how the academic year is divided.

Course of action 20

Facilitate student access to re-evaluation and complementary learning activities by ensuring the necessary financial means and regulations.

Course of action 21

Re-evaluate the necessary and sufficient conditions to earn a DEC.

The Educational Environment

Orientation

Offer students a quality educational environment to foster achievement, stimulate personal and social development and support a process of self-discovery.

Developmental direction 1

Consolidate colleges as living environments where students will benefit from guidance and encouragement to achieve and develop as citizens.

Course of action 22

Develop a concept of student life based on the program of studies and aimed at fostering a closer link between formal education and extracurricular activities; facilitate students' achievement; encourage participation in college life and reinforce a sense of belonging.

Course of action 23

Increase opportunities for students to become involved in their college and surroundings and establish a way to recognize this involvement.

Developmental direction 2

Adapt services to a more diverse student population.

Course of action 24

With a view to becoming more knowledgeable about the college student population and adapting services accordingly, promote the creation of a continuing research-action program on college life and encourage studies and surveys concerning this level of education and the students enrolled in it.

Course of action 25

Study the problem of young men's success rate in college and establish appropriate means for achieving a higher rate of retention and graduation.

Course of action 26

Obtain the support of the Ministère de l'Éducation to establish new measures or improve existing ones to support student success, in particular for Allophone and Aboriginal students.

Course of action 27

As a partner, ensure that the Ministère de la Santé et des Services sociaux (MSSS) and health and social services agencies are made aware of the psycho-social needs of college students, both young and adult, and that appropriate services are furnished to them. As a college network, commit to sharing this responsibility, notably by networking among colleges for mutual support and discussion, and with agencies of the health and social services network and community sector, with the goal of preventing suicide in young people.

Course of action 28

With respect to the preceding proposals, ensure the allocation of sufficient resources and means for the development of a quality educational environment in CEGEPs.

Research, Transfer and Innovation

Orientation

Draw on colleges' full potential in the fields of research, transfer and innovation.

Developmental direction 1

Foster more active participation by colleges in research, transfer and innovation circles.

Course of action 29

Obtain public college network participation on the board of directors and peer review panel of the Québec research funds where it is not currently represented, and with the federal research funding agencies such as the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council.

Course of action 30

Persuade the Québec government to facilitate the creation of a corporation to promote colleges' technological research activities, similar to the corporations which develop university research, with a view to developing and commercializing the results of college research.

Course of action 31

Obtain the support of the Québec government for the spin-off efforts of CEGEPs and collegial technology transfer centres.

Course of action 32

Convince the Ministère de l'Éducation to implement support measures for college research promotional organizations and for the dissemination of research results.

Course of action 33

In connection with the *Québec Policy on Science and Innovation*, ensure the development of collegial technology transfer centres, meaning, in concrete terms:

- ongoing adequate core funding from the Ministère de l'Éducation and the Ministère des Finances, de l'Économie et de la Recherche;
- matching funding from the Ministère des Finances, de l'Économie et de la Recherche for research contracts obtained by each of the collegial technology transfer centres;
- the creation of new collegial technology transfer centres in regions where none currently exist or where there is a need for them. In this respect, the possibility of creating technology transfer centres in the field of applied social sciences should be considered.

Developmental direction 2

Increase the presence of college researchers in research networks.

Course of action 34

Following the example of the existing programs of the Fonds NATECH and the Fonds québécois de la recherche sur la société et la culture, recommend that Québec and federal funding bodies create a research fund specifically designated for CEGEP and collegial technology transfer centre researchers, with a particular focus within this fund on the situation of less experienced researchers.

Course of action 35

Recommend that the federal government create applied research chairs in the colleges' fields of expertise.

Course of action 36

In collaboration with partners like the Association of Canadian Community Colleges, convince the federal government to give Québec college teachers direct access to its research grant programs—as is currently the case with the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada—and to award funding to colleges to cover their indirect research costs.

Course of action 37

In conformance with the *Québec Policy on Science and Innovation*, colleges should encourage the practice of releasing teachers to enable them to participate in the Québec research network; in particular, they should ensure that certain teachers be released and assisted in the preparation of research proposals.

Educational Technologies

Orientation

Enrich the collegial learning setting through broader utilization of educational technologies.

Developmental direction 1

Facilitate the optimal integration of educational technologies in colleges.

Course of action 38

In collaboration with the Ministère de l'Éducation, prepare an action plan to facilitate the optimal integration of technologies in college education. This plan should include, in particular:

- measures to facilitate access to or acquisition of computers by students and teachers;
- appropriate measures to ensure the renewal of the current computer resources in colleges;
- technical and professional support to ensure adequate utilization of technologies by students and staff, teachers in particular.
- a program to update and improve technological knowledge and competency, addressed to teaching staff;
- ongoing financial resources to support the integration of technologies in colleges, particularly in programs of study;
- financial measures to support research and experimentation aimed at improving knowledge about the strategies and pedagogical means that need to be implemented, and the effects of technology use in education.

Developmental direction 2

Create network synergy in the field of educational technologies with a view to broadening accessibility to college education.

Course of action 39

Encourage partnership between colleges and other network organizations to coordinate delivery of distance and online education, and obtain financial support from the Ministère de l'Éducation for the public college network to develop diversified and more comprehensive online education.

Course of action 40

Acquire financial support from Québec and federal funds to develop Francophone content online that is accessible to French-speaking countries.

Course of action 41

Obtain financial support from the Ministère de l'Éducation for the creation of an educational video training network within the public college network.

Opening Up to the World**Orientation**

Increase the openness to the world of colleges, students and staff.

Developmental direction 1

Better position colleges, staff and students in the international arena.

Course of action 42

Convince the Ministère de l'Éducation to facilitate and simplify CEGEPs' efforts to offer programs and grant college diplomas abroad and enable them to grant a DEC that is adapted to situations abroad.

Course of action 43

Promote the internationalization of education and certain college activities, notably travel and exchange projects offered to students and teaching staff, and more initiatives to encourage students' awareness of international conditions.

Course of action 44

Convince the Ministère de l'Éducation to create a bursary fund for CEGEP students wishing to study abroad, based on the existing model for university students.

Course of action 45

Recommend to the Government of Québec that the staff of their general delegations, delegations, or foreign offices or branches include an education officer who would be responsible for facilitating communication between Québec education networks and institutions abroad.

Course of action 46

In association with the creation of the Observatoire québécois de la mondialisation, assume, as a public college network, a strategic monitoring role concerning issues related to an eventual agreement on a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) and its impact on higher education in Québec.

Developmental direction 2

Increase foreign student enrolment.

Course of action 47

Convince the Ministère de l'Éducation to deregulate tuition fees for foreign college students and allow the CEGEPs to keep the entire amount.

Course of action 48

Obtain transitional financial assistance from the Ministère de l'Éducation to create services facilitating the recruitment and integration of foreign college students, in particular through Cégep international, and implement measures to facilitate their integration throughout Québec.

The Contribution of Employees and Work Organization

Orientation

Ensure the staff's wholehearted contribution in achieving the CEGEPs' mission.

Developmental direction 1

Adapt college organization to the new demands and needs to which CEGEPs must respond.

Course of action 49

Ensure the optimal utilization of the competencies of all college staff.

Course of action 50

Pursue and support the renewal of teaching practice for enhancing professionalization.

Course of action 51

While acknowledging the relevance of the colleges' departmental structure, assess its role and functioning—including departmental coordination—in order to increase its relevance to college life, improve overall control of professional and institutional responsibilities, and ensure a more shared responsibility with program committees.

Developmental direction 2

Encourage the professional development of all employees and the integration of the new generation of employees in CEGEPs.

Course of action 52

Reinforce professional development and resourcing activities for all CEGEP staff and obtain sufficient funding from the Ministère de l'Éducation to do so.

Course of action 53

Facilitate the socio-professional integration of the new generation of employees in all job categories and ensure the relaying of information between generations.

Financing**Orientation**

Ensure adequate, stable and equitable financing for the public college network.

Developmental direction

Obtain financing that is adapted to colleges' higher education mission.

Course of action 54

Obtain transferable core funding from the Ministère de l'Éducation so that colleges can make budget decisions based on their priorities and institutional situations, in compliance with the teachers' payroll funding model.

Course of action 55

Study possible adjustments to CEGEPs' financing, including the FABES allocation model, with a view to preserving the accessibility, quality and development of college education in every region of Québec.

Course of action 56

Broaden the definition of allowable expenditures set out in Bill 90, to enable businesses to provide more financing for college technical education. For instance: funding for upgrading of technical training on an individual basis and contributions to support a given technical program.

Course of action 57

Obtain direct access, as universities have, to federal and other funds, including foreign sources, for activities complementary to teaching.

Course of action 58

Obtain matching funding for sums collected by CEGEPs through their foundations.

Course of action 59

Recommend to the Government of Québec that it examine the possibility of other government ministries contributing to financing colleges for a particular component of their mission.

Course of action 60

Recommend the maintenance of funding for activities set up by CEGEPs as part of the "Une école ouverte sur son milieu" program, funded by the Québec Youth Fund.

College Development

Orientation

Obtain the leverage colleges need to ensure their full development potential.

Developmental direction 1

Consolidate the quality of college-level teaching in every region of Québec.

Course of action 61

Obtain the agreement of the Québec government to continue and intensify — as of the 2003–2004 fiscal period — its reinvestment in the public college network, based on the CEGEPs' share of the education budget which is approximately 15%. This reinvestment should take the form of transferable core funding.

Course of action 62

Persuade the Government of Québec to make college technical education a priority, in particular by accelerating the implementation of revised programs; giving colleges new program authorizations where appropriate, notably in sectors marked by a labour shortage; assuring colleges adequate financing for their implementation; and supporting program rationalization efforts.

Course of action 63

Support initiatives to pool vocational and technical educational resources at all educational levels in certain regions and urban centres, and in particular fields, with a view to educational accessibility and resource optimization.

Course of action 64

In order to recognize colleges' performance as fully as possible, new quality indicators, established jointly by the Fédération des cégeps and the Ministère de l'Éducation, should be added to graduation rates.

Developmental direction 2

Ensure the optimal development of colleges as institutions and as a network.

Course of action 65

Promote more targeted institutional development in some regions and urban centres in order to create or consolidate niches of expertise.

Course of action 66

In connection with the preceding proposal, explore the conditions and incentives to enable colleges' increased differentiation, and examine the means to continue functioning effectively as a network.

APPENDIX 1

The College Network at a Glance

A Statistical Portrait

- 48 CEGEPs throughout Québec

- 28 collegial technology transfer centres (CCTT)
The CCTTs conduct applied research, technology transfer, business services, strategic monitoring and information dissemination activities.

- 5 Québec-wide schools
Every school with a Québec-wide mandate is associated with a CEGEP and specializes in a field for which it has the exclusive mandate.

- 150,000 students enrolled in full-time regular programs¹
 - 69,000 students in the pre-university stream (46%)
 - 76,000 students in the technical stream (50.7%)
 - 5,000 registered in the bridging semester (3.3%)
 - 85,500 female students (56.9%)
 - 64,500 male students (43.1%)

- 33,000 continuing education students

- 33,000 employees²
 - 21,000 teachers
 - 2000 professionals
 - 9,000 support employees
 - 1,000 management staff

- 8 pre-university programs

- 125 technical programs

¹ Data collected by the Fédération des cégeps for programs leading to a Diploma of College Studies (DSC) in autumn 2002. Figures are rounded off.

² Data issued by the Ministère de l'Éducation for 2000–2001.

- Programs leading to an Attestation of College Studies (AEC) designed to serve adults' educational needs
- Overall academic success rate of 86.1% in 2000–2001³
- Of the students who registered for a Diploma of College Studies program in Autumn 1996; 56.4% earned their diploma. The rate climbs to 62.4% if those who earned a Diploma of Vocational Studies (DVS) after taking college-level courses are included.⁴
- A budget of \$1.4 billion in 2002-2003 for all public college institutions.

³ Data issued by the Ministère de l'Éducation in September 2002.

⁴ September 2002 data.

APPENDIX 2
Individuals Consulted by the Study Committee
March–April 2001

- **Mr. Jim Barrett**
Dean of On-going Studies
Canadian Military College
(Ontario)
- **Mr. Paul Inchauspé**
Former Director General
Collège Ahuntsic
Commissaire des États généraux
sur l'éducation en 1995-1996
- **Mr. Robert Bisailon**
Assistant Deputy Minister for pre-
school, primary and secondary
education
Ministère de l'Éducation
- **Mr. Gérald Larose**
Former president of the CSN
Université du Québec à Montréal
- **Mr. Charles S. Bourgeois**
Senior Vice-President and Managing
Director
Montréal TechnoVision
- **Mr. Jacques L'Écuyer**
Chairman
Commission d'évaluation de
l'enseignement collégial
- **Ms. Pauline Champoux-Lesage**
Ombudsman
Government of Québec
- **Ms. Solange Lefebvre**
Professor – Faculty of Theology
Université de Montréal
- **Mr. Marc Dutil**
President
CANAM MANAC – Acier plus
- **Mr. Claude Lessard**
Professor – Faculty of Education
Université de Montréal

■ **Ms. Andrée Lortie**
President
La Cité collégiale (Ontario)

■ **Mr. Marc-André Sauvé**
Former executive
Noranda Inc.

■ **Mr. Pierre Lucier**
President
Université du Québec

■ **Mr. Gilles Taillon**
President
Conseil du patronat du Québec

■ **Ms. Claire McNicoll**
Vice-Chancellor of Undergraduate
and Continuing Education
Université de Montréal.

■ **Mr. Richard Wilshire**
Director of Staff Training and
Development
Alcan – Manoir Saguenay

■ **Mr. Robert Papineau**
Director General
École de technologie supérieure

Works Consulted

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and the Canadian Education Centre Network. *Ouvrir la porte aux étudiants étrangers. Comparaison internationale des politiques et pratiques d'immigration*. Ottawa, June 2000, 12 p.

Association Pour la Recherche au Collégial. *Historique de la recherche au collégial*, Montréal, 1999, 14 p.

Canadian Education Association. "Globalization: Education in a Shrinking World," *Education Canada*, Vol. 42, No. 1. Toronto, Winter 2002, 48 p.

Canadian Education Centre Network, "The Value of International Students," *Perspectives*, Ottawa, 2001, 36 p.

Cégep international. *La mobilité étudiante dans les cégeps*. Brief presented to the Minister of State for Education and Youth. Montréal, February 2001, 7 p.

Cégep international, *Les droits additionnels exigés des étudiants étrangers*. Brief presented to the Comité consultatif sur l'accessibilité financière aux études. Montréal, September 2002, 15 p.

Cégep international, *Les étudiants étrangers dans les cégeps : état de la situation et pistes d'action*. Montréal, March 2002, 11 p.

Cégep international, *Profil des activités internationales des cégeps*. Study directed by Ms. Gisèle Bonin. Montréal, January 2000, 33 p.

Clark, Burton R. and Allan M. Carter, *Créer des universités entrepreneuriales : l'organisation au service de la transformation*. Thematic paper presented at the IMHE General Conference, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Centre pour la recherche et l'innovation dans l'enseignement. Paris, September 11-13, 2000, 4 p.

Clark, Burton R. and Allan M. Carter. *L'université entrepreneuriale : nouvelles bases de la collégialité, de l'autonomie et de la réussite*. Thematic paper presented at the IMHE General Conference, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Centre pour la recherche et l'innovation dans l'enseignement. Paris, September 11-13, 2000, 14 p.

Collège de bois-de-boulogne and Cégep Marie-Victorin, *La réussite en français des allophones au collégial : constat, problématique et solutions*. Montréal, 2000, 313 p.

Commerce, "L'année de tous les projets," Special Issue, Montréal, June-July 2002, 134 p.

Commission canadienne pour l'UNESCO, *Rénover ensemble l'enseignement supérieur*, Working paper for the World Conference on Higher Education. Ottawa, 2001. [Thematic cards]

- Conseil de la science et de la technologie, *Des catalyseurs de l'innovation, les centres de transfert et leur financement*. Québec City, 2000, 110 p.
- Conseil de la science et de la technologie, *La culture scientifique et technique au Québec : bilan*. Québec City, 2002, 215 p.
- Conseil de la science et de la technologie, *Des catalyseurs de l'innovation, les centres de transfert et leur financement*. Québec City, 2000, 110 p.
- Conseil du statut de la femme, *Des nouvelles d'elles. Les jeunes femmes du Québec*. Information paper on young women in Québec aged 15 – 29, Québec. 2002, 97 p.
- Conseil du statut de la femme, "Jeunesse d'aujourd'hui," Special Issue: Tribune Jeunes, *La Gazette des femmes*, Vol. 22, No. 6, Québec City, March-April, 2001, 50 p.
- Conseil Permanent De La Jeunesse, *Y'a pus d'avenir ici. L'exode des jeunes vers les centres urbains*. Québec City, 1997, 107 p.
- Conseil supérieur de l'éducation, *Au collégial, l'orientation au cœur de la réussite*. Québec City, 2002, 124 p.
- Conseil supérieur de l'éducation, *Des conditions de réussite au collégial. Réflexion à partir de points de vue étudiants*. Québec City, 1995, 124 p.
- Conseil supérieur de l'éducation, *Éducation et nouvelles technologies. Pour une intégration réussie dans l'enseignement et l'apprentissage*. Annual report for 1999-2000 on the status of education needs. Québec City, October 2000, 181 p.
- Conseil supérieur de l'éducation, *Éduquer à la citoyenneté*. Annual Report for 1997-1998 on the status of education needs. Québec City, 1998, 110 p.
- Conseil supérieur de l'éducation, *Enseigner au collégial : une pratique professionnelle en renouvellement*. Québec City, December 1997, 106 p.
- Conseil supérieur de l'éducation, *La formation du personnel enseignant du collégial : un projet collectif enraciné dans le milieu*. Québec City, May 2000, 102 p.
- Conseil supérieur de l'éducation, *La gouverne de l'éducation, logique marchande ou processus politique?*, Annual Report for 2000-2001 on the status of education needs. Québec City, 2001, 97 p.
- Davies, Gordon K., *Créer une demande où le besoin existe*, Thematic paper presented at the IMHE General Conference, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Centre pour la recherche et l'innovation dans l'enseignement. Paris, September 11-13, 2000, 4 p.

- Delors, Jacques, "Former les acteurs du futur," *Le Courrier de l'Unesco*, Issue entitled "Une éducation pour le 21^e siècle," Paris, April 1994, p. 6-11.
- Dumont, Fernand and Yves Martin (under the direction of), *L'éducation 25 ans plus tard! Et après?* Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture. Québec City, 1990, 432 p.
- École nationale d'administration publique, *Le changement de génération chez le personnel des cégeps : un état de la question*. Study conducted on the request of the Fédération des cégeps by Jean-Raymond Marcoux. Montréal, September 2002.
- Emploi-Québec, *L'emploi au Québec en bref*, Monthly newsletter, Vol. 17, No. 3, March 2001, 29 p.
- Emploi-Québec, "Les Indicateurs du CETECH," *Revue du nouveau marché du travail*, Vol. 2, No. 2, Centre d'étude sur l'emploi et la technologie, Autumn 2002, 29 p.
- Emploi-Québec and Comité national des services aux entreprises des cégeps et des commissions scolaires, *L'apprentissage virtuel au Québec*. Montréal, February 2002, 39 p.
- Fédération des cégeps, *La réussite et la diplomation au collégial. Des chiffres et des engagements*. Montréal, 1999, 136 p.
- Fédération des cégeps, *L'enseignement collégial vu par des étudiants*. Report of discussion groups on college training. Montréal, October 2000, 17 p.
- Fédération Des Cégeps, *Les cégeps, une présence essentielle pour la société québécoise*. Brief presented to the parliamentary commission on college education. Montréal, 1992, 96 p.
- Fédération des cégeps, *Mémoire en réaction au projet de politique de l'éducation des adultes dans une perspective de formation continue*. Montréal, 2001, 26 p.
- Fédération des cégeps, *Miser sur la formation technique. État de la situation et plan stratégique de développement*. Montréal, 1998, 76 p.
- Fédération des cégeps, *Pour une culture de l'éducation*. Brief presented to the Commission on the Estates General on Education. Montréal, 1995, 48 p.
- Fédération des cégeps, Fédération autonome du collégial, Fédération des enseignantes et enseignants de cégep, Fédération nationale des enseignantEs et des enseignants du Québec, *De techniques et d'avenir*. Proceedings of the forum on technical training held January 10-11, 2002, Montréal, 2002, 93 p.
- Fédération des cégeps and ministère de l'Éducation, *Baisse de l'effectif scolaire dans le réseau collégial public. État de situation et voies de solutions*. Québec City, April 2002, 25 p.

Fédération étudiante collégiale du Québec, *Avis portant sur les fluctuations de clientèle dans le secteur de l'éducation*. Montréal, September 2002, 11 p.

Fédération étudiante collégiale du Québec, *Baisse de clientèle dans les cégeps de région*. Brief presented to the Ministère de de l'Éducation-Fédération des cégeps joint committee on the drop in enrolment in the public college network. Montréal, December 2001, 13 p.

Gauthier, Madeleine, Marc Molgat, Serge Côté et al., Groupe de recherche sur la migration des jeunes, Institut national de la recherche scientifique/Urbanisation, Culture et Société, *La migration des jeunes au Québec, Résultats d'un sondage auprès des 20-34 ans du Québec*. 2nd edition revised and corrected, Montréal, October 2001, 113 p.

Government of Québec, *Apprendre tout au long de la vie, Plan d'action en matière d'éducation des adultes et de formation continue*. Québec, 2002, 40 p.

Government of Québec, *Apprendre tout au long de la vie, Policy paper on adult and continuing education*. Québec, 2002, 40 p.

Government of Québec, *Déclaration commune faisant état des consensus dégagés par les participantes et participants associés au Sommet du Québec et de la jeunesse*, Québec City, February 2000, 6 p.

Government of Québec, *Horizon 2005, Prospérité et qualité de vie, Plan d'action pour un Québec meilleur.*, Québec City, November 2002, 48 p.

Government of Québec, *Horizon 2005. Un Québec fort de ses régions, Plan d'action Québec-Régions.* Québec City, November 2002, 69 p.

Government of Québec, *La jeunesse au cœur du Québec*. Politique québécoise de la jeunesse, Québec City, 2001, 67 p.

Government of Québec, *La volonté d'agir, la force de réussir*, Stratégie nationale de lutte contre la pauvreté et l'exclusion sociale. Québec City, June 2002, 57 p.

Government of Québec, *Le français, une langue pour tout le monde. Une nouvelle approche stratégique et citoyenne*, Rapport de la Commission des États généraux sur la situation et l'avenir de la langue française au Québec. Québec City, 2001 298 p.

Government du Québec, *General and Vocational Colleges Act*, R.S.Q., c. C-29 (last updated in September 2000).

Government of Québec, *Politique nationale de la ruralité. Une vision d'avenir*, Québec City, 2001, 73 p.

- Government of Québec, *Relever les défis de l'emploi, Parfaire le savoir et la formation, Élargir notre ouverture sur le monde, Promouvoir une société équitable*. Reports of the work groups of the Sommet du Québec et de la jeunesse. Québec City, 2000. [Thematic cards]
- Government of Québec, *Knowledge to Change the World*, Québec Policy on Science and Innovation. Québec City, 2001, 169 p.
- Government of Québec, *Une école d'avenir*, Politique d'intégration scolaire et d'éducation interculturelle. Québec City, 1998, 42 p.
- Haug, Guy, *L'esprit d'entreprise à l'université et la convergence des réformes préconisées à Bologne : enjeux nouveaux et nouvelles possibilités*. Thematic paper presented at the IMHE General Conference, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Centre pour la recherche et l'innovation dans l'enseignement. Paris, September 11-13, 2000, 6 p.
- Hémond, Éline, "Attention! Jeunes au travail! Millénaire en construction," *Réseau*, Université du Québec. Québec City, Winter 2001, p. 13-19.
- Inchauspé, Paul, *La formation à distance : enjeux et perspectives*. Speech given during a seminar on distance learning organized by Cégep@distance, Montréal, April 2001, 18 p. [Online] www.cegepadistance.ca
- Inchauspé, Paul, *L'avenir du cégep*. Montréal: Éditions Liber, 1992, 208 p.
- Julien, Caroline, "Le collégial, dans les plates-bandes des universités?", Association francophone pour le savoir (ACFAS), *Découvrir*, Vol. 23, No. 3. Montréal, May-June 2002, p. 54-61.
- Lessard, Claude, *L'obligation de résultats en éducation : de quoi s'agit-il?* Lecture delivered during the international colloquium on the obligation for results held as part of the series Entretiens Jacques-Cartier 2000. Montréal, October 2000, 25 p.
- Levine, Arthur E., "The Future of Colleges: Nine Inevitable Changes," *The Chronicle Review*, October 2000, 10 p. [Online] www.chronicle.com
- Lucier, Pierre, "La ZLEA et l'enseignement supérieur : mythes et réalités," in *Le Devoir*, 19 April 2001.
- McGill University, Université du Québec à Montréal, Concordia University and the Université de Montréal, *Fluctuations des clientèles dans le secteur de l'éducation*. Brief submitted to the Commission de l'éducation. Montréal, September 2002, 16 p.
- Ministère de la Formation et des Collèges et Universités, *Portails et voies d'accès. Examen du système d'éducation postsecondaire en Ontario*, Rapport du Groupe d'étude sur l'investissement au service des étudiantes et étudiants. Toronto, February 2001, 105 p.

- Ministère De L'éducation, "Indicateurs de cheminement des étudiantes et étudiants inscrits au baccalauréat dans les universités québécoises," *Bulletin statistique de l'éducation*, No. 23. Québec City, April 2002, 16 p.
- Ministère De L'éducation, "La scolarisation au Québec et dans les pays de l'OCDE en 1995-1996," *Bulletin statistique de l'éducation*, No. 13. Québec City, November 1999, 6 p.
- Ministère de l'Éducation, Direction des statistiques et des études quantitatives, Fichier CHESCO, version 2002. September 2002.
- Ministère de l'Éducation, Direction des statistiques et des études quantitatives, Système prévisionnel SIPEEC, March 2002.
- Ministère de l'Éducation, *Effectif scolaire des établissements d'enseignement collégial selon le groupe d'âge, le type de formation, le type de programme et le sexe, de 1997 à 2001*, Statistiques de l'éducation 1997-2001. [Online] www.meq.gouv.qc.ca
- Ministère de l'Éducation, *Indicateurs de l'éducation*, Édition 2002. Québec City, 2002, 140 p.
- Ministère de l'Éducation, *La formation professionnelle chez les jeunes : un défi à relever*, Rapport du groupe de travail sur la relance de la formation professionnelle des jeunes au secondaire et de la formation technique., Québec City, August 1995, 90 p.
- Ministère de l'Éducation, *La formation technique au collégia : les employeurs se prononcent.*, Québec City, 1998, 90 p.
- Ministère De L'éducation, *La relance au collégial en formation technique, situation au 31 mars 2001*. Québec City, 2002, 40 p.
- Ministère de l'Éducation, *L'école, tout un programme*, Énoncé de politique éducative, Québec. 1997, 40 p.
- Ministère de l'Éducation, *Lire, écrire, communiquer... réussir!*, Plan d'action pour la valorisation du français, langue d'enseignement. Québec City, 2001, 16 p.
- Ministère de L'éducation, *Politique québécoise de financement des universités*. Québec City, 2000, 19 p.
- Ministère de l'Éducation, *Pour mieux assurer notre avenir collectif*, Politique québécoise à l'égard des universités. Québec City, 2000, 37 p.
- Ministère de l'Éducation, *Prendre le virage du succès*, Plan d'action ministériel pour la réforme de l'éducation. Québec City, 1997, 55 p.
- Ministère de l'Éducation, *Rénover notre système d'éducation : dix chantiers prioritaires*, Rapport final de la Commission des États généraux sur l'éducation. Québec City, 1996, 90 p.

Ministère de l'Éducation, *Stratégie pour l'internationalisation de l'éducation québécoise*. Québec City, 2002, 32 p.

Ministère de l'Éducation, Système SPOC, Système d'information sur le personnel des organismes collégiaux, 2000-2001.

Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la Science, *Des collèges pour le Québec du XXI^e siècle. L'enseignement collégial québécois : orientations d'avenir et mesures de renouveau*. Québec City, April 1993, 39 p.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *Analyse des politiques d'éducation. Enseignement et compétences*. Paris, 2001, 170 p.

Polèse, Mario and Richard Shearmur, with the collaboration of Pierre-Marcel Desjardins and Marc Johnson, *La périphérie face à l'économie du savoir. La dynamique spatiale de l'économie canadienne et l'avenir des régions non métropolitaines du Québec et des provinces de l'Atlantique*, Institut national de la recherche scientifique/Urbanisation, Culture et Société, et Institut canadien de recherche sur le développement régional. Montréal, 2002, 237 p.

Rapport de la Commission royale d'enquête sur l'enseignement dans la province de Québec, *Les structures pédagogiques du système scolaire*, vol. 2, May 1965, 404 p.

Salmi, Jamil, *L'enseignement tertiaire au XXI^e siècle : enjeux et perspectives*. Thematic paper presented at the IMHE General Conference, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Centre pour la recherche et l'innovation dans l'enseignement. Paris, September 11-13, 2000, 21 p.

Service régional d'admission du Montréal métropolitain, *Données réseau 2002-2003 de l'enquête "Aide-nous à te connaître."* Montréal, 2002, 45 p.

Statistics Canada and Human Resources Development Canada, *A report on adult education and training in Canada: learning a living*. Ottawa, May 2001, 104 p.

UNESCO, *Lifelong Learning and Training: A Bridge to the Future, Recommendations*, Second International Congress on Technical and Vocational Education, Seoul, April 26-30, 1999, 16 p.

UNESCO, *Higher Education for the Twenty-First Century: Vision and Action*. World Conference on Higher Education. Final report, Vol. I. Paris, October 5-9, 1998, 38 p.

Université du Québec, *Bâtir notre avenir*, Document de réflexion sur l'Université du Québec. Québec City, September 2001, 23 p.

Vincens, Jean, "Dynamique de l'éducation et systèmes éducatifs," *Revue européenne Formation professionnelle*, No. 25. Belgium, January-April 2002, p. 9-26.

Wilson, Cynthia D., Cindy L. Miles, Ronald L. Baker et R. Laurence Schoenberger, *Learning Outcomes For The 21st Century: Report of a Community College Study*, League for Innovation in the Community College. California, February 2002, 68 p.

