



November 24, 2014

Normand Pelletier, sous-ministre adjoint
au développement pédagogique et au soutien aux élèves
1035, rue De La Chevrotière, 15^e étage
Québec (Québec)
G1R 5A5

Monsieur Pelletier,

In December 2013 the Leadership Committee for English Education in Quebec (LCEEQ) responded to the consultation on the Secondary Cycle II History program. Given that the LCEEQ represents youth, adult and vocational education in the public and private sectors, post-secondary education, professional associations for teachers, administrators and non-teaching professionals, it was most appropriate that its voice be heard in the context of a consultation on such an important component of the curriculum.

Accompanying this letter is a copy of the original position paper submitted in December 2013. The LCEEQ has been closely monitoring developments since the release of the revised program, and wishes to express its current views in light of ongoing developments.

It is important to state from the outset that the LCEEQ appreciates the fact that the proposed timeline for continued consultation, piloting and implementation of the program is far more realistic than the one suggested initially.

The fact that the revised program consists of only two competencies with no specific reference to the former “constructs a consciousness of citizenship through the study of history” is a concern. One of the essential reasons to study one’s history is to develop citizenship and civic values.

From the outset, LCEEQ has stated that the promotion of a “national framework” is ambiguous. The title of the program, *History of Québec and Canada*, could be interpreted as giving equal attention to Québec and Canada, which is not the case, given the emphasis remains on Québec. It should be clearly indicated that the course focuses on the history of Québec in the context of Canada, North America, and the world. Furthermore, the concept of “nation” may still be interpreted in a limited way, which does not support the importance of diversity and pluralism, a hallmark of Québec principles.

In the original position paper the LCEEQ was adamant that there must be a clear link between any program proposal and its evaluation. We have had far too many experiences where programs and evaluation of learning have run separate courses, all of which have had negative impact. Evaluation is an integral part of any program and will determine the pedagogy applied in the classroom.

Although a representative of the Evaluation Department has been in attendance at meetings of the group studying the proposed changes, there is still no clear indication of how the program will be evaluated. LCEEQ continues to believe that this is unacceptable. The concept of *evaluation of and evaluation for learning* must be respected.

Furthermore, evaluation is not simply tied to course content knowledge. Evaluation must consider the outcome expectations from the onset so that the program is specifically designed to ensure that students have ample opportunities to examine and explore a deeper understanding. How students will be expected, through ongoing evaluation, to demonstrate their understanding of connections between course content topics must be factored in at all stages of designing the curriculum. Students cannot be expected to make connections that are not built into the curriculum from the beginning. There must be a resolution of this essential matter prior to any piloting of the program.

Information has been provided that materials to support the teaching of the new program will be available electronically and that publishers will be approached to produce materials specific to the program. LCEEQ made a strong and clear recommendation that all materials must be available in English before the implementation of any pilot program. We take this opportunity to reiterate the importance of this demand, as students and teachers in the English sector cannot be placed at a disadvantage due to a lack of appropriate English resources.

LCEEQ made a strong case in December 2013 that an appreciation for and understanding of one's history is established at a young age. Although we understand that the immediate priority is making the necessary changes to the program in Secondary Cycle II, there has been no indication at any time that consideration is being given to a progression of learning starting at the elementary school level. Serious consideration must be given to assigning a specific time allocation to the teaching of History in elementary school if we are to ensure student success in the long term.

In closing, the LCEEQ made eight recommendations in its original response in December 2013, as contained in the document accompanying this letter. In examining the new proposed program, it is reasonable to state that some of the original concerns have been heard. It is equally clear that there are still serious issues that must be addressed before the pilot program is introduced.

Sincerely,



Cindy Finn, Chair

c. c. : Mme Chantal Beaulieu, sous-ministre adjointe Services aux anglophones, aux autochtones,
et aux communautés culturelles
Danielle Dumas, Responsable par intérim des programmes de l'univers social
Ministère de l'Éducation, des Loisirs et du Sport