

THE CFF NEWSLETTER

Editorial Staff:

Ross Fraser  
Bill Holdon  
Ian Johnston

Typist:

Ruth Harrison

NOTE: The editorial opinions expressed herein do not necessarily represent the opinions of the CFF or its Executive.

This issue was produced with the assistance of duplicating personnel and facilities at Malaspina College.

We welcome contributions for future issues of the CFF Newsletter: letters to the editors, reports, articles, photographs and, especially, cartoons. Send contributions to one of editors c/o Malaspina College, 375 Kennedy Street, Nanaimo, British Columbia, V9R 2J3.

OCTOBER, 1975

## EDITORIAL

If the newspaper accounts of the incident are accurate, the recent debate between the Department of Education, the administration of V.C.C., and the community representatives is an excellent illustration of the central problem confronting the colleges in British Columbia. Faced with the need seriously to adjust the college programmes, the administration made its decision on the basis of cost per student; the minister of education objected that the college was favouring academic programmes; spokesmen for the public deplored the removal of expensive but necessary special programmes unavailable elsewhere. Each debater apparently had his own concept of what the college should be doing; there was no agreement because the concepts were evidently quite different, perhaps even mutually exclusive. The debate reveals clearly that for all our energetic commitment to colleges in the past decade we have failed adequately to consider what (if anything) we mean by a college philosophy. What should a community college be?

This question has never been adequately answered. Indeed, it has hardly been considered. Of course, we have the pious affirmations about "the college's first responsibility to the student," "the college's need to respond to the community," and similarly profound statements. There has been no shortage of such persiflage. But no group, so far as I know, has ever attempted to cope in a detailed and intelligent manner with the complex questions of a college philosophy. The much heralded Task Force Report characteristically avoided the issue and so consistently contradicted itself on what should have been the central issue of its mandate that it achieved nothing but a further confusion. Administrations and governments have been so obsessed with financial matters and public relations that they have been able to devote themselves to little else. And faculty associations have channelled their energies into organizing for contract negotiations. No one has bothered to reflect extensively on the purpose and nature of the enterprise.

Thus, for all its outward success, the college movement is still hollow at the core. Because we lack an educational philosophy, we have no coherent sense of what we are trying to build. We face problems as they arise and cope with them as best we can, not realizing that many of our problems are created by our philosophical confusion and that no problem will ever be resolved satisfactorily until we achieve a clear idea of what our colleges should be.

Consider, for example, the problems associated with amalgamation. Many of the difficulties of this union have arisen (and will continue to arise) because no one has offered any convincing educational rationale for it (apart from dubious short term economic expediency). But why should we combine in one institution such odd bedfellows as vocational, university, career, and continuing education programmes? Shotgun marriages, even polygamous ones, are not necessarily barren and unhappy, but unless the partnership is going to be a creative and compatible union, it is hardly advisable. Since amalgamation has always lacked a convincing theoretical basis, it is not surprising that amalgamated colleges for the most part remain rigidly separated (in curriculum, students, faculty, and buildings). Nor should we wonder that the colleges have been unable to develop a recognizable and significant college education: the university transfer programmes still follow the universities, the career programmes still follow B.C.I.T. and the advisory groups, vocational programmes still follow the Department of Labour and Manpower, and community education programmes still

follow the adult education directors. The hydra has many heads, but it lacks a personality and a soul.

The absence of a college identity has serious consequences for those who work in colleges. For example, faculty members without a common purpose often lose any sense of belonging to a significant educational community. Once the pioneer enthusiasm of the early years passes away, all too often energetic and capable instructors sink into a slough of despond or else channel their efforts into the frequently trivial and factious disputes of departments, committees, faculty associations, and the like. There is a perceptible weariness and cynicism overtaking many of the once eager instructors who helped to launch the college movement in B.C. a few years ago and who now are frustrated by a large and growing institution with no clear purpose.

College planning has always suffered from the lack of long term theoretical models. The major concern of college administrators has been maximum growth, a concern inevitably fostered by governments which link financing to annual enrolments. But what are the limits to college growth? Can colleges be all things to all people? What should a college undertake and what should it not undertake? In what ways should a college strive to coordinate its activities with those of schools and universities? In what ways should a college work towards creating a totally new educational institution? Should all colleges have similar functions? Should a college have a computer, a swimming pool, a resident poet, a student newspaper, a trade union, a permanent building? Problems like this confront college planners every day, yet no one proclaims the obvious and difficult truth that we cannot rationally decide such matters, even the most mundane, without knowing what we expect a college to be.

The educational philosophy we require will not, of course, appear miraculously overnight. If it is to develop at all, it will require a considerable amount of clear thought and honest, intelligent discussion. Obviously we can hardly rely on Departments of Education to think about, promote, or even seriously participate in the development of something which they have so far shown no indication of even comprehending. *Nihil ex nihilo fit*. Indeed, the major cause of the philosophical emptiness in the college movement in B.C. is the traditional indifference and even hostility of the Department of Education to intelligent and comprehensive thought. Governments in B.C. have created colleges for reasons which one suspects have little relation to any clear educational philosophy. Certainly if the present government has a master concept, it does not want anyone to know about it. Instead of thinking about the nature and purpose of colleges before building them, governments have evidently assumed that college growth should proceed by ad hoc solutions to every day problems and by annual internecine combat over budgets; the philosophy, which is irrelevant to the pragmatic North American educator, like decorative icing, can come later. We have reached the point, however, where the flaws in that approach are manifest. Thus, the C.F.F., the only group apart from the Department of Education with an active interest in all colleges, must address itself to the task of developing a college philosophy. Perhaps we shall be unsuccessful; perhaps we shall be unable to develop a cogent sense of what our colleges are and what they should be. But let us at least make the endeavour. It might just save us from the confusion in which we find ourselves. To date the C.F.F., which many of its members regard as an organization developed solely to facilitate inter-college communication or to lobby for better contracts, has, like the government, the college administrators, and the B.C. Association of Colleges, evaded any meaningful enquiry into the essential nature of

colleges. Let us rectify that sin of omission as soon as possible in our professional development programmes and at the next Annual General Meeting. Let us set aside our constant preoccupation with secondary matters and, for once, focus directly on the central issue facing college educators.

IAN JOHNSTON

REPORTS FROM THE COLLEGESVANCOUVER CITY COLLEGE - LANGARA CAMPUS

Langara has been busy since last March coping with the consequences of the "status quo" budget provisions. Council efforts, administration approaches and faculty work led eventually to a Public Inquiry Commission under Dr. George Stuart of S.F.U.

Their recommendations reinstated approximately \$500,000 to provide an operating budget of \$17,327,000, still leaving a substantial shortfall for the whole college. More significant to all of us are their recommendations that accounting and budgetary procedures be strengthened, that the Department of Education's Division of Financial Services be increased to permit improved long-range planning and budgeting, that the term of College Council members be increased, that school trustee membership not be required, and that a "strong component of financial expertise" exist in Council.

For Langara, September saw enrolment at its highest level ever, circa 5200, despite cut-backs in "out-reach" and several internal programs. Virtually every class is at maximum enrolment and every classroom full. Our estimates suggest that this fall we have turned away several hundred potential students.

The implications are clear. Langara cannot enlarge. Such a step would be unsound. The Langara faculty will continue to press for at least partial implementation of the Marsh Report.

DON MC CRAE

SELKIRK COLLEGENew Principal

Mr. A. M. (Mitch) Anderson became principal of Selkirk in August. Mr. Anderson comes from Ontario (Confederation College in Thunder Bay).

NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY (NDU)

The government has stated that NDU in Nelson will have a new corporate identity on July 1, 1976 (The Kootenay University Centre?) but not all details have been worked out. Since Nelson is only 30 miles from Castlegar, you can imagine that these changes are of some interest to us. It seems that at Nelson there will continue to be degree level offerings, perhaps by all three coast universities (depending on a students' program selection). The questions concerning staffing for the KUC, and about provision of instruction for the first two years, are highly vexing ones. Dr. Walter Harwick of U.B.C. is advising the Minister regarding changeover details and has addressed our faculty association on the issues involved. He is, of course, optimistic that accommodation can be made among reasonable people to make things work, but it is clear that he envisions an arrangement where the power to make decisions about program offerings and staffing will lie with the universities.

VOCATIONAL SCHOOL MELD

At last word, Selkirk and the B. C. Vocational School at Nelson were to be 'melded' 100% on September 30, 1975, by administrative fiat from Victoria. We have been melded in name for sometime, but it seems there are endless administrative details which simply haven't been attended to concerning the 'actual' meld which will produce some interesting dilemmas for our administrative staff.

GREG LAYTON  
MEMBER-AT-LARGE  
SELKIRK FACULTY ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVE

MALASPINA COLLEGE

At a meeting of the Malaspina College Faculty Association held on August 25, the following motion was passed: "That the Contract Negotiating Committee be empowered to renegotiate the membership clause . . . to provide for payment of fees . . . by all employees covered by the certified bargaining unit, while membership in the Association shall remain voluntary". Thus the "Rand formual" will soon be presented to the College Council.

Another area that has commanded much of our attention and energy in the past few months is the question of jurisdiction. The support staff at Malaspina recently became certified as Local 1858 of C.U.P.E. Their certification entitles them to bargain for all employees not expressly covered by our agreement, and we have thus been involved in discussion with an officer from the Labour Relations Board, specifically concerning the dispute whether certain positions belong more properly to C.U.P.E. or to the Malaspina College Faculty Association. It has become patently clear to us that our certification document is not as specific as it might have been, and C.U.P.E. has forced us to reconsider what it means to be the bargaining agent for a group of people -- something for which we are, or should be, grateful.

That we are certified as a bargaining agent, that we are in fact a trade union, is the main lesson we have had to learn this year, and we are presently coming to terms with that fact. We have had to recognize that we are no longer -- nor can we be -- a casual association of 'professionals'. Our hope is that we might retain certain of the characteristics and enjoy certain of the benefits deriving from a loose association, and at the same time acknowledge and fulfil our obligations as a trade union.

L. D. LOVICK, PRESIDENT  
MALASPINA COLLEGE FACULTY ASSOCIATION

COLLEGE OF NEW CALEDONIA

Gordon Ingalls is acting principal for the length of F. Speckeen's educational leave. Frank Gelin is the new Dean of Arts & Science.

Despite budget limitations, no courses have been cancelled for financial reasons. Construction of the new gymnasium is well under way, and as soon as Cabinet approval is received tenders will be called for construction of the new library, classroom and lab facility.

The association has applied to the L. R. B. for certification as a union.

This year we shall repeat the faculty evaluation of administration that commenced last year. Results of the evaluation are available to the principal and college council (Only).

ED. NOTE: We wonder how long Dr. Speckeen will be on leave?

J. P. CROW

CARIBOO COLLEGE

It's been a long, not very hot summer of negotiations and renegotiations, but finally the Cariboo College Faculty Association has a contract. Delays originated from the Faculty Association's inquiries into excessive administrative salary increases, as well as inadequate administrative job descriptions and performance evaluations. The outcome of these inquiries was to set up a Job Study, conducted by a member of the faculty and a member of the administration. The faculty was also involved in its own salary review, now completed and accepted by the membership. The contract included a 13.7% salary increase, a slightly more generous allotment of assisted leaves, holidays, and maternity leave benefits; a dental plan, and a 9 month teaching load for vocational instructors, to put them on a closer parity with the academic and careers areas.

Two new buildings, a gymnasium and the Library Complex, are under construction and will be completed by January 1976. Following their completion, construction will begin on a Fine Arts Building and a new Science Complex.

Student enrollment has increased 18.9% over last year in the Academic and Career programs.

B. F. PELMAN, SECRETARY  
CARIBOO COLLEGE FACULTY ASSOCIATION

#### CAPILANO COLLEGE

At Capilano much of the faculty's energies have been devoted to the activities of the education action committee. The committee has established a three point programme which it has begun to implement over the past two months:

1. An internal struggle to get hold of all the data which is necessary to understand the financial situation of the college. This has been relatively successful but the battle has not been entirely won.
2. A campaign to inform the community of the college's activities. This includes letters which have been sent to 200 groups on the North Shore. From these have come requests for speakers. We also undertook a campaign during registration to inform the students of the financial situation at the college and included a form letter for students to sign and send to their M. L. A.
3. A media campaign to get the image of the college across to the community. This includes weekly press releases, a couple of press conferences, and volunteer efforts on a number of T.V. and radio programmes.

This campaign is designed to make as much political impact as possible but also to begin to build a base in the community for our college and for all colleges.

SONJA SANGUINETTI

#### DOUGLAS COLLEGE

##### Signing of Collective Agreement

In July members of the DCFA ratified the collective agreement negotiated by the Salaries and Working Conditions Committee. This agreement incorporates the decision of the Labour Relations Board to include Deans and Directors in the bargaining unit. An appeal has been made by the College Council to the LRB to be excluded from the unit. The DCFA forwarded its response in July and is awaiting a ruling on the appeal. There is a second appeal before LRB to have the technicians and educational planners removed from the Faculty Association bargaining unit in favor of the Staff Association. (Ed. Note: What is a Staff Association?) This appeal filed by College Council has held up the final wage settlement for these employees pending a ruling from the LRB. An interim wage settlement is under negotiation. The DCFA is quite confident that it will win both appeals.

##### DCFA October Meeting

The CFF Field Organizer, E. Green, President, J. Slater, and Educational Action Committee chairman, S. Sanguinetti, have been invited to attend our October General Meeting.

ANDRE PIQUETTE  
CFF DIRECTOR

### PROFILE OF ERIC GREEN

On September 15th Eric Green became the CFFBC's first Director of Research and Field Organizer. His main duties at present will be to:

- a. Visit college faculty associations in the province to assist them with organizational problems (particularly at the new colleges), and to provide additional liaison between the associations and the CFFBC Executive Committee.
- b. Assist the CFFBC to keep governmental officials informed of faculty concerns.

The latter task is particularly important now as the provincial government is preparing a position paper on the proposed Colleges' Act.

Eric graduated from the North Kamloops Jr./Sr. High School with first class honours and obtained his B.A. at U.B.C. He has completed all the course requirements towards the Ph.D. in English Literature and History of Ideas. He was awarded a Canada Council Doctoral Fellowship which permitted him to travel to England to work for a year with the Director of Archives and Libarian-ship at University College.

Eric has worked as a reporter with the Kamloops Daily Sentinel, Kelowna Daily Courier, as editor of the Delta Challenger and as an information officer for U.B.C. Reports. He has articles in the latest issues of U.B.C. Reports ("History of U.B.C.") and U.B.C. Alumni Chronicle ("Academic Standards").

In 1973-74, he was the Executive Assistant to the Honourable Gary Lauk, Minister of Economic Development, during which time he was involved with planning the restructuring and redefinition of the role of the Department. While with Mr. Lauk, he attended most of the major interprovincial First Ministerial conferences related to economic development.

More recently, he helped, for eight months, the Chairman of the Universities Council of B.C. to establish a research secretariat for the Council and assisted in the initial research programme of the Council. In that position, he set up the first national conference of executive staffs of the University Commissions and Councils in Canada.

Eric has been hired on a consulting basis until next April 30th. At the Annual General Meeting at Capilano College next May, his role within the CFFBC will be reconsidered and a decision will then be made as to whether the position should be continued.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT  
COLLEGE FINANCING

At the CFFBC Annual General Meeting which was held last May at Cariboo College, a resolution was passed which recommended that "In view of the current restrictive college budgets, the member associations adopt the principle of restricting student enrollments rather than lowering the quality of their educational service by accepting overloads of students or instructional units". During the discussion of this resolution, the delegates agreed that the intent was not to imply that student enrollments in courses should be reduced below 1974-75 levels, (provided that at least the same number of instructors would be available to teach those courses).

Little did we know what the situation would actually be only four months later.

On July 21st the Minister of Education, Mrs. Dailly, invited representatives of the college councils, principals and faculties (including CFFBC) to meet with her in Victoria to discuss 1976-77 budgets. She said that the time for spontaneous growth for the colleges was over and that because of present economic realities the colleges must be characterized by more orderly development.

But at that meeting it became clear that neither she nor her officials were aware that there would be any cut-backs in programmes this fall.

Since the beginning of the semester, the debate has been growing as to who is to blame for the shortage of funds, particularly in view of the current budgets being about 22 percent higher, on the average, than last year.

In the news media, controversy rages over salaries, workloads, sabbaticals, growth of administrations, lack of sensitivity to students' needs and so on. While much of the criticism is justified we have to admit that some abuses have developed in the college system.

Why do abuses exist? Perhaps it is because we faculty have been placated by our own salary increases, which, while not excessive by current industrial contract awards, have been sufficient to keep most of us comfortable.

As a result of the July 21st meeting in Victoria, and after talking with many persons in the colleges and in the provincial government, my own personal prediction is that the 1976-77 operational budgets will be permitted to rise only about 15 percent over this year's. (This figure applies to the older colleges, not to the four newest ones which can expect more larger increases.) If my prediction is right, the difficulties we face this fall will seem mild in comparison.

College faculties must become informed and involved with the complete budgeting processes in their respective colleges. Probably the question of budget disclosure should become an issue during contract negotiations. If we don't become vigilant in eliminating unnecessary administration costs and in stopping other excesses, many more of us will be joining (next year) the 61 instructors at the King Edward Centre of Vancouver Community College who found that their contracts had been cancelled or greatly reduced last September.

Our new Director of Research and Field Organizer, Eric Green, has been given the task of evaluating how the colleges' budgeting is done in comparison with procedures used in other provinces. But his findings will be of little benefit to us unless all the faculties do their part.



CFF Executive Meeting, Douglas College, September 26-27:COMMENTS

Now that CFF fees have been increased, and a special levy has been passed by all member faculty associations to pay for a Field Organizer, what are we getting for our money? What are our elected volunteers doing, and why?

I attended the last executive meeting (in Richmond) to try to find out; my findings were, in some ways, surprising. Easily the most active and aggressive committee of the CFF is the Educational Action Committee, chaired by Sonja Sanguinetti from Capilano. She presents the major items on Friday evening's agenda. She clearly dominates the meeting, confidently explaining her points in such a way as to discourage questions or objections. She not only knows her material, but has developed persuasive interpretations of it -- interpretations that the rest of the executive rarely if ever question. On Friday evening, she presents a critique of the Marsh Report (which involved recommendations regarding the reorganization of the Lower Mainland Colleges), a report of a meeting with John Fryer of the BCGEU, and a description of the modus operandi of her committee. All her performances are impressive.

Having left her notes at home, Sonja proceeds through the 33 recommendations of the Marsh Report from memory, explaining why her committee accepted or rejected each. Many of her comments, such as the rejection of the notion of a regional co-ordinating council for the Lower Mainland Colleges, make a great deal of sense. It does seem premature to set up a regional council before we have a provincial one, and before the colleges as a whole are covered by proper legislation. But her rejections of other recommendations are more questionable. She rejects the separation of the Vancouver Vocational campus from the rest of VCC, and the creation of separate vocational colleges in Richmond and Surrey because, as she says, "We are pro-comprehensive". She notes that the idea of separate and equal institutions with differing functions is to be rejected in favour of a comprehensive model. But why? It is, of course, a fairly standard working principle that all regions of the province receive as comprehensive a range of college services as possible, but it does not follow that all those services must be offered by a single institution, particularly in an area as densely populated as greater Vancouver. There is also the ominous general rule that the larger an institution becomes, the greater the proportion of that institution's funds go into administration. (Small is beautiful.) And finally, neither the rationale nor the advantages of comprehensive institutions have been clearly articulated or proved. Hostility, jealousy, and the suspicion of social stigmatism may simply intensify when vocational, continuing education, special projects, and academic interests compete directly for funds and recognition from a unitary agency. The question, of course, involves more than just the Marsh Report; but the CFF executive may be well-advised to re-assess its commitment to the comprehensive model before making any more briefs to the government on this issue.

Unfortunately, none of these points is made at the meeting. Indeed, the mood of the meeting is expressed by Andre Piquette from Douglas, who makes the crack that "The dividing of Douglas into three campuses would simply provide lots of opportunities for aspiring administrators amongst the

faculty". He points out that smaller institutions would not aid the commuting students because "the smaller the colleges are, the less comprehensive they are". Again, no one from a smaller college objects to the assumption. Without further discussion, the executive passes a motion that the report be drafted and sent to the Minister of Education, apparently sight unseen.

On another topic, Sonja reports that her discussion with John Fryer led her to the impression that the BCGEU is again interested in becoming the representative for college faculties. The consternation this causes on the executive is understandable: many of the small independent bargaining units that make up the CFF membership were formed specifically to prevent a takeover by a larger union. Herb Warburton, past President and member-at-large from Okanagan, points out that the BCGEU threat could be a very real one if the College Councils and administrations press for single bargaining units within melded institutions. The executive fails to realize, however, the strange irony of their position. They express support for the notion of comprehensiveness and, by implication, melding of academic/technical colleges with vocational schools, but at the same time oppose, by and large, the suggestion that the faculties should be melded. A curious paradox, and an apparent contradiction.

Later Friday evening, Sonja outlines the three-pronged plan her committee is acting upon. Inside the colleges, they want to raise awareness of various problems and specifically to get detailed budget information that will support the claims that the colleges are actually in poor financial shape. "If we don't know the financial picture, how can we tell the community the problem?" Sonja asks. Outside the colleges, they want to talk to community organizations and discuss the colleges' problems with them. At Capilano, they have established a Speakers Bureau; Gary Kilgour, the Director from Capilano, describes his experience talking to the Optimists and persuading them to write letters to the government. Finally, they want to make as much contact as possible with the press in order to heighten public awareness of the contributions the colleges are making. Sonja is handling this task, and has already written a page six article in the Sun, has been interviewed on CBC radio, and has addressed the NDP caucus in Victoria. Obviously, a great deal of effort and energy is being expended on these projects, but one is forced to ask what it is all for. Sonja says that the NDP government sees the college faculties as essentially a captive group of electors, and that we must convince a larger group, in the community as a whole, to express concern before we can have any political influence. We apparently have to create the impression that bad handling of the colleges will lose a lot of votes. But to what end? Does the CFF have a blueprint for how to handle the colleges better? Is the blueprint the old CFF submission to the now-defunct College Task Force? Is a committee of the CFF now doing the work of the College Councils and administration? What is the purpose of publicizing the "problems" of the colleges?

Turning a public spotlight on the colleges is something of a gamble. There is, of course, no guarantee that reporters and journalists are going to see our concerns as the central ones; as we have seen in the series of articles by Doug Collins, publicity may play right into the hands of those who wish to cut back on college spending and erode college autonomy. Sonja argues that various actions such as the budgetary cutbacks, the commission inquiry at VCC, the proposed creation of specialized Marine, Labour, and Police Colleges, and the establishment of shoestring colleges in the remote areas of the province are an erosion of B.C. College movement. She is no doubt correct in

perceiving that the colleges are changing and are being changed without a clear statement of policy or a sense of direction. But the methods being used by the Educational Action Committee certainly deserve close scrutiny, both by the CFF Executive and the member Faculty Associations.

This particular meeting spends no time discussing either methodology or purpose. Perhaps they have done it all before. Instead, the executive passes a motion to urge all faculty associations to bargain for access to the college budgets in the upcoming round of negotiations. There is no realization of the difficulties that policy would cause. It is one thing for faculty as educators to participate in the budgeting process of their own institutions; it is quite another for faculty as union members to have access to the budget from which their salaries and working conditions will be paid, and which they will have to bargain for. The implications of the motion, if carried far enough, would require a major re-structuring of the adversary bargaining model along more cooperative lines. It will be interesting to see how the various faculty associations will respond to the suggestion.

\* \* \* \* \*

The executive covers a large range of other business at this meeting, but most of it is routine. President Jim Slater, from Malaspina, runs the meeting with coolness and efficiency. Jim is unsurpassed in his belief in the power of the printed word. His painstaking examination and correction of the minutes of the last meeting is typical; given enough paper and money, he will duplicate anything, including the entire B.C. Labour Code, and distribute it everywhere. In between Sonja's items, he introduces Eric Green, the new Director of Research and Field Organizer. Eric gives a history of his activities, his need for an office, and his desire to do a comparative analysis of College budgets. (Isn't that what everybody wants to do these days?) He is also collecting information about the CFF positions on the proposed College Act. (Strange that this information is not already collected somewhere.) He offers to "access" information for Faculty Associations who wish to use his services; direct requests to:

Eric Green  
1975 Larch Street  
Vancouver, B. C.  
733-0282

Almost everyone has a report to give. Slater reports on the pleasant receptions he received on his visits to VCC Langara, Okanagan, and New Caledonia. Wayne Pack, who is the Chairperson of the Salaries and Working Conditions Committee, reports his plan to arrange a long working session for the Negotiating Chairpeople. Andre Piquette reminds everyone of the ACCC Convention at the Hotel Vancouver, November 9 - 12; each member college should have four voting delegates: 1 College Council representative, 1 administrator, 1 faculty member, and 1 student. Peter Robinson from New Caledonia reports on the woes of being a treasurer. Jim Wright, the Director from Cariboo, gives the Professional Development Committee report. Apparently Andy Soles, Associate Deputy Minister of Education, has been talking about taking selected faculty into the Department for limited terms as a means of professionally developing. Jim notes that there are no college faculty on the important Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee, the body which has replaced the Academic Board. Marg Nickle reports on Pensions, and mentions the need for more representatives on her committee. Observers from Fraser Valley and Camosun report on what is happening in their institutions. And there is some talk of the Clause Finder, a document being prepared by Duane Thomson at Okanagan (not present at

this meeting) that will provide cross-referencing and tabulation of all aspects of the various faculty contracts now in operation.

By far the most moving report of the Saturday session comes from Betsy McDonald, the President of the VIA at the Vancouver Vocational Institute. She gives an animated, wry account of the situation at VCC from the viewpoint of the Vocational and Special Programmes Divisions, where large numbers of part-time and temporary faculty lost their contracts because of the budget cuts. Most of the gory details appear in a taped interview recorded elsewhere in this newsletter. After her report, the executive agonizes briefly over the possible participation of the CFF in the affairs of a non-member, but finally some plans are made for Slater to meet with the VIA membership and offer whatever advice or support he can. Don McCrae, Director from VCC (Langara), comments on the situation on his campus. They have been able to maintain a status quo position largely because of the strength of their contract. It is generally agreed that the VIA had suffered the most because the VCC administration had simply chosen the weakest link in terms of the faculty contracts. Don also reports that they may be involved in a dispute with the VCC administration over certain recommendations that the faculty made to the Inquiry Commission.

Under "New Business", the most controversial item comes from Marg Nickle of Selkirk. She presents a copy of a Memo of Agreement between the Faculty Association of Notre Dame University (FANDU) and that university concerning what conditions will prevail if and when the government takes over the university and melds it with Selkirk College. The Memo seems to be a statement of FANDU's initial bargaining position, but it is clearly very threatening to Selkirk faculty.

Interestingly, Sonja sees both the VIA situation and the FANDU memo as examples of the province-wide erosion of the colleges, and thus they become grist for the mill of her committee. The VCC people, on the other hand, think of their situation as mostly the result of errors by the VCC administration. Whether this finger-pointing will lead to any solutions is a moot point.

\* \* \* \* \*

I came away from this CFF executive meeting with mixed feelings. It was certainly pleasing to find such a group of dedicated people who are willing to give up many weekends and much free time just to represent my interests and yours at the provincial level. It was satisfying to see that this group could carry on its business in a cool, efficient manner, without rancour or hostility. But I was disappointed to find the work of the executive so dominated by the concerns of the Lower Mainland Colleges. I was disturbed by the executive's failure to discuss fully the reasons for the positions it seems to be taking on various issues. And I was alarmed by the possibility that statements and briefs were going to the Minister of Education on my behalf without being fully circulated throughout the general CFF membership. I remember a letter that a former CFF president sent to Eileen Dailly. For some very forgettable reasons, the letter upset many faculty associations, and actually led, I believe, to Camosun's withdrawal from the Federation. At least we all got a copy of the letter. Of course, with Jim Slater running the ship, we'll no doubt all receive copies of everything.

BILL HOLDOM

INTERVIEW BETWEEN BETSY McDONALD, SVI PRESIDENT, VANCOUVER VOCATIONAL INSTITUTE  
AND BILL HOLDOM, NEWSLETTER STAFF

Q. Betsy McDonald, what is your position?

A. I am the President of the VIA, the Vocational Instructors Association: the faculty association of the Vocational Institute and the King Edward campuses of Vancouver Community College.

Q. A number of people have been dismissed that belong to your bargaining unit. Can you describe the events, step by step, leading up to the dismissals?

A. Yes, I can give you some idea. We knew in March that our budget for the 1975-76 year was not approved by the Department of Education, and that some cutbacks were probably necessary but we were in dispute -- that is, the Council was in dispute with the Department as to just how much. The Department of Education set up a public inquiry and as a result of the report of that inquiry, written allocations were made and cuts were made following those allocations of monies. The two centers concerned are the Vocational Institute and the King Edward Center. (King Edward was formerly known as Special Programmes.) All of our programmes there lead to further training; they are not an end in themselves. We have a large English-training programme for New Canadians; we have a big up-grading section in the BTSD in basic education; we have a number of other "Special" programmes such as training for men who wish to get back in the labour force, the EOW (Employment Orientation for Women), and other programmes of this kind that are even less than upgrading -- they prepare people to take upgrading. Now in our school (King Edward) we received the biggest proportion of cuts of any of the three units in the College. Because our English-training programme had not cut back in April, April to August, but continued to go on as they had, indeed some expansion was planned, they were very much hit by these cutbacks.

Twenty-five full-time and thirty-six part-time have been either cut, or their programmes have been reduced to the point where the positions are less than half-time.

Q. 25 full-time people?

A. Yes, they were not permanent people, but they were full-time.

Q. What is the difference?

A. Well, temporary people might have contracts for full-time from September to December, but they they would be only temporary. Temporaries are not permanents.

Q. Would they normally expect their contracts to be renewed?

A. They would hope to be renewed, and would normally be. Many of these people have had their contracts amended to half-time or less. Many of the other 36 have had complete termination of contracts signed in August or before, and in September were cancelled.

Q. Normally the reason for cancelling a part-time contract is the lack of students. What was the reason given for cancelling these?

A. Lack of funds. And there is a clause in our collective agreement that gives the College permission to cancel contracts because of a lack of funds or students in a given programme. Lack of funds is the reason given. There have also been cutbacks in our academic programme and the upgrading to Grade 12: the equivalent of six full-time people. I have not been able to find

out how many that actually applies to. All they will tell me is that they cut the equivalent of 6½ full-time people. Now in the Vocational Institute, however, they were actually hitting permanent people -- people who have permanent contracts but where the whole programme was terminated.

Q. What programmes were they?

A. The Marine Centre where the industrial marine work was done; Instrumentation was being cancelled; the Homemakers has been cancelled completely. And those people were permanent, and had the right to move into another area of that institute if they had the skills. But in several instances they were offered a position in another area where they did not have the necessary expertise, and you can't accept it when you know you can't do it, so they haven't accepted. They're talking about going back to industry, I suppose. But they were all given six weeks' notice. The people in King Edward who were terminated were not given any notice whatsoever.

Q. Was there something in your contract that provided for due and proper procedures in situations of this kind?

A. Yes, we have a whole sequence of reductions of staff in the event of a lack of funds or students and it's purely and simply a seniority clause. But it's a seniority clause that's been invoked by the area in which you teach. So if I've been teaching in an area for ten years, and my area's been cut out, it's very hard for me to go over to another area and get a position, even though I have permanent seniority.

Q. Where were the particular dismissals or amendments to contracts coming from? From what level of the administration?

A. The administration made the decisions, together with divisional chairmen and department heads, but in many cases, particularly at King Edward Centre, the actual dismissal was made by the co-ordinator or department head, often by phone, to be followed then by a letter. There was some discussion among our executive as to whether it is even legal when it is done this way, because if you have to have a written contract to be legally employed, then you must have a written cancellation. And those cancellations have been going out in the last week. It's my opinion that they violated the contract. But we have yet to find anyone who is willing to bring a grievance because half a loaf is better than no loaf, and they're afraid they will lose everything, even the little bit they have....

Q. And there's no one who has been dismissed completely who is willing to bring forth a grievance?

A. Well, the ones who were dismissed entirely were new people who had never worked for us before and weren't even members of our Association in some cases. But you know, they were told that when the next opening came along they would be contacted, so they hate to rock the boat.

We have cases where people have had signed contracts for full-time employment, and these have been amended to half-time or less, which is a complete violation of a contract as I understand contracts, but I can't find anyone who is willing at this point to bring a grievance against the Council.

Q. Do you have any specific examples of what actually happened to an individual?

A. Yes. Just the day before yesterday I had a call from a lady who said that she had a contract that gave her 76 days full-time September to December. She had signed her contract and had

received confirmation in the mail; she then received a phone call and was told, "Sorry about the 22 hours a week that you were going to be teaching. We want to cut that down to 10 hours. Would you please return your contract so we can make the amendment". She phoned to ask me if she should return the contract and I said "No! Don't return the contract. You have a grievance!" She said, "I don't know if I want to bring a grievance". I said, "Well, how will you ever get your 22 hours back?" And she said, "Well I've still got 10. I have commitments; I have committed this and that for the next few months on the basis of having a job and how will I get a job now?"

I have another example of an instructor who came to me because there had been a typographical error in his contract -- a part-time contract, but still, it was what he wanted -- he was going to university at the same time. While he was in my office I said "Phone down, they've made a mistake, obviously." He phoned down and they said yes, they had made a mistake and if he would just bring his contract down they would make the adjustment. He popped right down that afternoon; they made the adjustment on his contract. When he got home later that afternoon, say about 5:00 p.m. he got a phone call from our college and they said oh, by the way, your contract is cancelled.

Makes you raise your eyebrows, doesn't it?

Q. Certainly does. Were there any reasons given for cancelling contracts in particular areas, such as the Language-Training Programme?

A. Well, English Language Training had the greatest number of over-run positions, you might call it -- like the famous welfare over-run, that's what we've been doing -- but in my division, which is called Training and Development, we only lost one programme assistant, and in my programme I lost one part of my programme assistant. It hasn't been the same in our division because in the first place we are funded by Canada Manpower, and secondly, I guess we have been a little more careful. I, for instance, had two classes in February, and I'm co-ordinator; when the cutbacks came, we said we don't know whether we'll have a second September class or not. We didn't hire for that second class, nor did we plan for it -- very wisely, as it turns out, because I can't have it. But we aren't in the hole, whereas others in the same circumstances have gone ahead and said, I've had two, and I need two, and I'm going to have two, and consequently they're that much in the hole.

Q. Just for the record, what is the name of your programme?

A. Employment Orientation for Women.

Q. Who would you blame for this mess?

A. Well, I don't want to be unfair, but it seems to me we have a College Council, we have a regional office with highly qualified and highly paid regional administrators, and I think accountability must then go to them. In the final analysis they do make these decisions, and if one division was expanding when it shouldn't, and there was a division chairman that missed it, and there was a dean that missed it, and the principal of a centre missed it, we still have the principal and the administrators at our regional office plus a college council. And I lay the blame strictly at the hands of those people, because they knew it might happen, and they weren't willing to tell anybody 'cut back, cut back'. At the Vocational Division, where

permanent people have been laid off, and where programmes have been terminated -- these were federal government programmes that were terminated -- I'm not sure that was the best way of going about it at all.

Q. Do you blame the Department of Education for cutting back in the first place?

A. Well, how about the whole government, not just the Department of Education. They've spent all the money in the first three years and now there's nothing left for this year, that's the way it seems to me. I don't think it's the people in the Department of Education, I really feel very sorry for the people in the Department. As you know, federal funds for education don't go to the Department any more than they go to the Municipalities or the School Boards. They go to Treasury Board in consolidated funds and then the Treasury Board decides how those funds will be distributed.

I would blame the Department a bit because they too knew, but look: the Department has now told you in CFF and us in VIA, "The honeymoon is over -- be careful for next year". I have not heard many instructors say to me, "Let's not ask for an increase next year". The bulk of the cost of education is instructors' salaries, 80%. It used to be 75% but now 80% of the total cost is there. But I would still say we are top-heavy with administration in our college. I don't know about others but I'm sure we are top-heavy. I think we could save money that way. I'm sorry that the inquiry commission had on it three members who were administrators themselves, and therefore very sympathetic toward the need for more administration. If we'd got an instructor on there we could have said "Look, I've been teaching for years now; I don't need three administrators to tell me what I'm doing. I know what I'm doing." I think we're over-administrated.

Q. What do you think will happen now to the people who have been terminated?

A. I don't think we can help them right now in our college. I have no hope that they can get back to work this year. My hope would be that we would work with the College Council and the Department of Education in order to have a more equitable distribution of funding so that we don't spend so much on administration if we can avoid it. We should have more money to service the students, which is where it's at. And I think we may all have to tighten our belts next year.

Q. Thinking of the students, Mrs. Dailly said in a radio broadcast that all the landed immigrants, at least, would be serviced by the English Language Training Programme. Is that true?

A. Well, they will be served, but they will have to wait. We believe that over a thousand students were not accommodated this September -- for this intake -- and they will probably have to wait until January. But when I take a look at my own programme, I have three intakes a year. There are 56 people on the waiting list right now. They won't be waiting three months, they're going to have to wait a year and a half to get in.

You know, do you play the numbers game or do you play the waiting game? I can't get too sympathetic with the New Canadians sometimes, when I have women who are really down and out, alienated, and defeated by life, who are motivated enough to come in to get on a programme and are told you won't get in in January, or in March, or even next September. You may get in a year from January -- that's 1977! It's a long wait. I only take 15 in each class. I took 18 this time -- I couldn't bear it.... But will I do as good a job with 18?

Q. Thank you very much Betsy.



THE ETHICS OF JOURNALISM: THE CFF AND THE VANCOUVER SUN

In case you were wondering . . .

There are two letters below. The first was sent to the Sun by Jim Slater. The second is the "edited" version printed by the Sun without consulting Jim. Vive la difference??

Letter One:

The Editor  
The Vancouver Sun  
Sun Publishing Company Ltd.  
2250 Granville Street  
Vancouver, B. C. V5H 3G2

Dear Sir:

I would like to say a few words in reply to Mr. Collins' page six article of September 27 about the "happy jostling and pushing at the public trough" which he claims is occurring at B.C.I.T. and in the province's community colleges.

Mr. Collins appears to have decided to join in the general witch-hunting for follies and abuses in the educational system. I guess it's pretty marketable stuff these days, since a heated exchange about B. C. colleges has been in progress for a few months now, with some loose remarks from both sides -- that is, from people in the Department of Education and the colleges themselves. But Mr. Collins' contribution is unimpressive even given the rather mediocre standard of debate so far.

I don't know whether Mr. Collins is aware of the fact, but B.C.I.T. is one of the largest and best technical institutes in Canada. The only one certain to outrank it is Toronto's Ryerson Institute. It is not an academic institution -- part of the "academic mafia", to use Mr. Collins' inflammatory phrase. Is a salary in the neighborhood of \$50,000 completely out of line for the chief executive of such an institution? I challenge Mr. Collins' assumption that it is; and I refute the charge, by the mysterious Mr. "X" from the Department of Education, that \$50,000 would be "totally out of gear with private industry" for a demanding position running an operation with an annual operating budget of about twenty million dollars. What would salaries at this level in Ontario, for instance: Or Alberta?

How does Mr. Collins feel about the salaries of other senior executives in British Columbia -- or does he know anything about them? And what does he think of income figures for other professional groups, such as doctors, dentists, lawyers and accountants? It would seem that even brief consideration of these other groups might cause him to rethink his statement that people at B.C.I.T. are all, "on the glorious climb up the money tree". It is still true, as it always has been, that one does not go into education, on any level, if one's primary goal is to make money. High salaries have always been rare in education and there is every reason to think that they always will be. But the notion that educators must be ascetic, sacrificial individuals went out with the dirty thirties, and I don't think anyone seriously wants such thinking to come back. Except perhaps Mr. Collins.

Generally speaking, remuneration of people working at B.C.I.T. and in the colleges is about what it should be. Most college faculties, in negotiating new contracts, accept wage increases similar to

those granted to school teachers in the college regions. Those in turn usually bear some relation to settlements in business and industry. There is no reason that B.C.I.T. and college teachers' salaries should fall behind in relation to those in other occupations.

There may be occasional abuses in the post-secondary educational system, but the system as a whole is staffed by responsible, competent people whose morale can only be damaged by sensational articles which make comparisons to "King Farouk and his court". If there are specific abuses which require correction, it is the clear responsibility of the governing boards and the Department of Education to correct them firmly and equitably.

Yours truly,

COLLEGE FACULTIES FEDERATION OF B. C.

W. James Slater  
President

Letter Two:

PRINCIPAL'S PAY DEFENDED

I would like to say a few words in reply to Mr. Collins' Page Six article of Sept. 27 about the "happy jostling and pushing at the public trough" which he claims is occurring at BCIT and in the province's community colleges.

I don't know whether Mr. Collins is aware of the fact, but BCIT is one of the largest and best technical institutes in Canada.

The only one certain to outrank it is Toronto's Ryerson Institute.

BCIT is not an academic institution -- part of the "academic mafia" to use Mr. Collins' inflammatory phrase. Is a salary in the neighborhood of \$50,000 completely out of line for the chief executive of such an institution?

I challenge Mr. Collins' assumption that it is; and I refute the charge, by the mysterious Mr. "X" from the department of education, that \$50,000 would be "totally out of gear with private industry" for a demanding position running an operation with an annual operating budget of about \$20 million dollars.

What would salaries at this level be in Ontario, for instance?

W. James Slater  
(President, College Faculties Federation of B.C.)

The principal of Ryerson College, which is three times the size of BCIT, receives \$40,000 a year plus certain tax-delay benefits if he fulfils his four-year contract -- Editor.