



MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON
THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 2016
FROM 9:00 AM TO 2:00 PM
ENGLISH MONTREAL SCHOOL BOARD

Member Organization	Name	
A.A.E.S.Q	Sam Bruzzese	Present (a.m. only)
	Ralph Mason	Present V.C.
A.C.E.S	Cindy Finn	Present
	Gail Somerville	Regrets
CEGEPS	Normand Bernier	Regrets
ADGESBQ	Sylvain Racette	Present
SCHOOL BOARDS	Sandra Furfaro	Present
	Geoffrey Hipps	Present
	Marian Lothian	Present
	Stewart Aitken	Present
	Kandy Mackey	Present V.C.
	Lisa Mosher	Regrets
	Lisa Rae-Nutter	Present
	Brenda Smylie	Present
	Mark Sutherland	Present
	Marie Wahba	Present
I.S.A.T.	Holly Hampson	Present
	Corinne Levy Sommer	Regrets
P.R.O.C.E.D.E	Mario Argiropoulos	Regrets
	Bonnie Mitchell	Regrets
PROFESSIONALS' ASSOCIATIONS	Tino Bordonaro	Present
	Arlene Scott	Present
Q.P.A.T.	Andrew Adams	Present
	J.P. Fossey	Present
	Sébastien Joly	Present
	Paul Pompa	Present
SPECIAL STATUS BOARD EDUCATIONAL SERVICES REPRESENTATIVES	CREE-Serge Beliveau	Regrets
	LITTORAL-Deborah Foltin	Present
MEESR/DSCA	Lise Langlois	Present
	Christie Brown	Present
UNIVERSITIES	Bishops-Avril Aitken	Present
	McGill-Fiona Benson	Regrets
	Concordia-Dominic Martini	Regrets
ADM – English Sector	Anne-Marie Lepage	Regrets
LEARN	Christine Truesdale	Present
Coordinator	John Ryan	Present
Recording Secretary	Angela Rosa	Regrets
GUESTS Pauline Gagne - PACT-Ottawa Raphaël Charrier – MEES, Alice Cristofaro, Melanie Tranchemontagne – History teachers LBPSB Joan Zachariou – Social Studies Consultant LBPSB		



1. WORDS OF WELCOME

1.1. Cindy Finn welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 14, 2016 MEETING

Resolution #21-2016-03-10

2.1. It was moved by Brenda Smylie and seconded by Avril Aitken and unanimously resolved that the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the committee held on January 14, 2016 be approved with the following corrections:

- 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTMEMBER 17, 2016 MEETING should read APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 17, 2016 MEETING
- Geoffrey Hipps, reported as present should have been recorded as sending regrets

3. HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Guest: **Pauline Gagne** from Persons Against the Crime of Trafficking in Humans (PACT-OTTAWA) (<http://www.pact-ottawa.org>).

Cindy Finn introduced our guest and reminded the membership that earlier in the year several members expressed an interest in having more information about this important topic as students, particularly in Secondary and Post-secondary levels, are potential victims.

Pauline Gagne made a PowerPoint presentation in which she highlighted the findings of a recent survey of a study conducted in the Ottawa area. She noted that although there are different reasons for trafficking, the vast majority of victims are young females between 12 and 25 years of age, most frequently lured for sex exploitation. Targets are attracted to what they see as a more luxurious lifestyle as recruiters, often other young women already trapped in the system, use gifts and promises that are difficult to ignore. Within a short time the victim becomes infatuated, psychologically trapped and indebted to the pimp.

One point of interest is that although one would expect that trafficking would be rampant at bars, massage parlours and the like, often recruiters take advantage of private parties, family gatherings and school settings. Of course, social media is a very active means of attracting victims.

Following a question and answer period, members were provided with a number of resources including a list of websites where more information is available (see Appendix A). It was noted that although there is an Association in Quebec (CATHII - cathii.org) they do not have services available in English. Anyone who is interested in more information should feel free to contact Pauline Gagne (p.gagne@pact-ottawa.org).

Marian Lothian recommended that LCEEQ send a letter to request information about what the Quebec government plans to do in order to help support efforts to counter human trafficking. A suggestion was made that the current sex education program that is being piloted in schools could be a mechanism to discuss exploitation issues with secondary students. Cindy Finn pointed out that the lack of sex



education materials is not simply an English issue but also one in the French sector. The committee agreed that we should move this forward.

4. HISTORY OF QUEBEC AND CANADA – PILOT EXPERIENCE

The revised History of Quebec and Canada programme at Secondary III is presently being piloted in four English-speaking schools. LCEEQ invited the pilot teachers to share their experiences to date. Cindy Finn welcomed: Raphaël Charrier, the Ministry representative responsible for Social Sciences in the English sector, Alice Cristofaro and Melanie Tranchemontagne two teachers from the Lester B. Pearson School Board, and Joan Zachariou, Social Sciences Consultant, LBPSB. Tino Bordonaro chaired the panel presentation.

A third teacher, Matthew Russell, from Western Quebec School Board, was unable to attend as Parent Teacher Interviews that had been postponed due to bad weather earlier in the month were scheduled for the same day. However, he did send a written response to the guiding questions (see Appendix 2)

Panelists were asked to address for guiding questions:

1. What do you like about the new History program?
2. Do you have any concerns regarding this new program?
3. What are the pedagogical challenges that you have faced in teaching this new program?
4. Is this new program an improvement over the previous?

Following a question and answer period, Cindy Finn thanked the panellists.

5. ASSISTANT DEPUTY MINISTER'S REPORT – ANNE-MARIE LEPAGE

Lise Langlois reported on Mrs. Lepage's behalf.

- We welcome the new Minister, Sebastien Proulx, who will also keep the Ministry of the Family portfolio.
- The Parliamentary hearings into Bill 86 have resumed. The recommendation by the Deputy Minister to invite LCEEQ to present a brief was not recognized. However, LCEEQ is encouraged to submit a written brief before the April 6, 2016 deadline.
- Lise Langlois reported that the sous-ministre, Mme Barcelom, is a strong proponent of increasing collaboration within the Ministry itself and with all partners. DSCA is looking forward to the improvements that will be forthcoming from this direction.



6. BILL 86 – UPDATE

Cindy Finn reported that at the most recent Steering Committee a decision was taken to submit a written brief. A draft will be circulated to all members for feedback.

7. ANNUAL SEMINAR

Cindy Finn reminded members of the purpose and importance of the Annual Seminar held each April. This is an opportunity to reflect on what has transpired this year and to plan for the meetings for the year to come. Since we are coming to the end of the current Strategic Plan 2013-2016, this topic will be of particular significance in April.

Ainsley Rose has been invited to animate the two-day session scheduled for April 27-28 at the Sheraton Laval Hotel. As is the tradition, we have invited those within the organization responsible for different activities (e.g. Elizabeth Therrien Scanlan, Chair of the Professional Development Subcommittee – PDSC) and our ABEE partners. An article will be circulated prior to the event and members are asked to reflect on the relationship between LCEEQ and the organization they represent.

8. LCEEQ BUSINESS ITEMS

8.1. DSCA REPORT

Lise Langlois reported that progress was being made in the Linguistic Policy dossier. There has been agreement that there needs to be a document created as to how the policy is to be implemented so as to ensure consistency across the various Departments within the Ministry. This has been a problem in the past as each Department seemed to have a different interpretation of the expectation.

Christie Brown reported that the annual PDIG process will open as of March 20, 2016. She provided an update on the Elementary Mathematic project scheduled for August 2016 informing members that the registration process would open shortly for both Cohort I (those returning from August 2015) and Cohort II, those beginning the process in August 2016.

She also provided updated information on the Canada-Wide Science Festival encouraging members to check out several links:

- ✓ The Event Main Website;
<http://cwsf.youthscience.ca/>
- ✓ School Tours:
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/CWSF-TOURS>
- ✓ Teachers Conference:
https://lceeq.ca/en/stem/2016/?pk_campaign=STEM_2016&pk_kwd=homepage_banner



8.2. **WEBSITE UPDATE**

John Ryan gave a brief tour of the revised website <https://lceeq.ca>. Members were invited to visit the newly designed website to see the many features.

8.3. **ANNUAL CONFERENCE**

John Ryan tabled the Final Report of LCEEQ 2016. Fifty-four percent of the attendees responded to the online survey. The feedback was positive and will be helpful as we prepare for LCEEQ 2017, *When Diversity and Technology in the Classroom Converge* (February 13-14, 2017).

8.4. **PROJECT FUNDING 2016-2017**

John Ryan informed members that the annual projects, *John Killingbeck Teacher/Administrator Scholarship Program* and the *Resource Development Project* were now on line and ready to receive applications. The deadline is May, 5, 2016.

He reminded members that since there were difficulties for some groups to meet their obligations because of the situation at the beginning of the academic year, approved projects in 2015-2016 will be carried over until June 2017. These projects cannot be adjusted given the new funding for 2016-2017. The new funds should be assigned to new applicants.

8.5. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR JUNE 2, 2016**

Members were invited to submit any suggestions for agenda items.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.



APPENDIX A

Human Trafficking Some sites for research

Government of Canada: Local Safety Audit Guide: To Prevent Trafficking in Persons And Related Exploitation <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/lcl-sfty-dtgd/index-en.aspx>

US Government: <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/tiprpt/> TIP Reports
<http://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/human-trafficking-americas-schools> HT in US schools

Canadian women's Foundation: Report Fall 2014 <http://canadianwomen.org/trafficking>

Agencies that fight Human Trafficking

PACT-Ottawa: <http://www.pact-ottawa.org/>

Project Impact Report (PACT-Ottawa):

http://www.pact-ottawa.org/uploads/7/6/4/6/7646662/impact_report_final_03182015.pdf

Ottawa Coalition to End Human Trafficking: - service providers

<http://www.endhumantrafficking.ca/human-trafficking/>

CATHII: French agency <http://www.cathii.org/>

Some material that is available

RCMP: <http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/ht-tp/publications/index-eng.htm>

- for posters, brochure, DVD, report

Online course: <http://www.pssg.gov.bc.ca/octiptraining/index.html>

- Office to Combat Trafficking in Persons (British Columbia)

Reel Youth – A documentary and 3 short videos on human trafficking: <http://reelyouth.ca/pactottawa.html>

King Pimp video: Walk with me – Project Innocence <http://www.projectinnocencecanada.org/>

NAFC videos: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DHBcrTg3Efw&list=UU0xFtnOnq3cWXqNFebhjLYQ&index=33>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HvTx5Qh03tE&list=UU0xFtnOnq3cWXqNFebhjLYQ&index=32>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qkrh3C9S8Y4&list=UU0xFtnOnq3cWXqNFebhjLYQ&index=31>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qkrh3C9S8Y4&list=UU0xFtnOnq3cWXqNFebhjLYQ&index=31>



APPENDIX B

LCEEQ and the History of Quebec and Canada Pilot Program

Matthew Russell
D'Arcy McGee High School
WQSB

1. What do you like about the new History program?

There are a number of things that I like about the new History program. The first is that it is organized chronologically and the content is split over two years. This makes just so much sense! As well, I like that because the content is split over two years there is time to go into depth on the content. It really allows for the knowledge to be developed.

Along with time to go into the content deeply, there is time to work and develop the skills related to the discipline of history. These historical thinking skills are conceptualized as intellectual operations (situating in time and space, establishing cause and consequence, determining continuity and change etc.) that form the backbone of history. While the intellectual operations are not new, we really have the time to work on activities that build these skills.

Another thing that is good about the new program is the way that the two competencies work together. The first competency "Characterize a Period in the history of Quebec and Canada" asks students to establish facts, establish a chronology and to consider geographical reference points. The second competency is "Interprets a Social Phenomenon" which tasks students to define the object of interpretation (looking at aspects of society – political, economic, territorial, cultural), analyzing the social phenomenon by establishing change and continuity and identifying cause and consequence and finally ensuring the validity of the interpretation. I think that within the discipline of history these two competencies work in a symbiotic way, each complementing each other. They are certainly an improvement on the History and Citizenship competencies which I felt were conceptualized more for a broader social studies orientation to history, rather than the discipline of history itself. It's clear from reading the texts on the two competencies that the writers of the program have been influenced by the growing scholarship concerning history education that has appeared in the last fifteen to twenty years. The new curriculum very much in alignment with the developments that have taken place recently in other Canadian provinces like Ontario, British Columbia and Manitoba that have augmented historical thinking in their curriculums. This trend can also be found in the history curriculums in the United Kingdom, Sweden and Germany among others, which also have a strong emphasis on historical thinking.

2. Do you have any concerns regarding this new program?

The concerns that I have is that the overall orientation of the program is oriented around the ‘*Recit Nationale*’ that came out of the Beauchemin/Fahmy-Eid report *The Meaning of History* in 2014. While I think that the authors of the curriculum have tried to find a balance between the narrative of the nation and the discipline of history, there is a danger that the curriculum in the application of the curriculum. If the curriculum is interpreted by textbook publishers and a large number of teachers (probably in Francophone schools) to be nationalistic and one that promotes a collective memory function, then in my opinion the change will be a failure. I have no doubt that this is the way that the current curriculum is being taught in some schools, but my fear is that it will only be reinforced with the central organizing concept being the nation.

I would have liked to see more space for local history and the history of Anglophones and Aboriginal people and perspectives in the curriculum. While almost the whole first unit is about the first occupants, the interpretive angle is colonization, but mostly from the European perspective. What is missing is the distinct perspective of Quebec’s indigenous people. Likewise, Anglophones are largely missing from the narrative. Certainly there are some references to England and the English, but current historiographic research treats colonial societies as part of the wider Atlantic world and focuses on the interconnectedness of peoples and societies. I’m not advocating that the curriculum should be the same as a university course, but there should be space for the wider context that people in past lived in. New France didn’t exist in isolation, but a student going through this curriculum might get that impression. This is despite the curriculum stating that: “The history of Québec is also part of the Canadian, North American and world socio-historical context because various nations have shaped Québec society” (p. 8). I’m not sure that enough is paid to this wider context in the content. As well, the curriculum calls for the interaction between political and social history, but in my opinion the curriculum is heavily slanted towards political and economic history and less so towards social history.

Another concern that I have is over the precisions. This is list of content that teachers are expected to teach to students. The precisions are not presented in chronological order, which means that for them to make a certain amount of sense; they must be re-ordered and in some cases re-conceptualized. There’s also no indication over the relative importance of one event over another. Where should the emphasis be placed? We don’t know. As well, some of the precisions are vague. There have been numerous questions about them from the pilot teachers and these questions and the answers from the authors of the program appear in a document called the *Foire*. Will these explanations be made public to all teachers next year? If the group of expert teachers in the pilot program have that many questions, what about a teacher that does not have a background in history or history education pedagogy? I think that this program really calls for expertise in history and history education pedagogy because of the depth of the material – both the content and the disciplinary nature of the program.

3. What are the pedagogical challenges that you have faced in teaching this new program?

I have found that one of the benefits of the program from a teacher’s point of view – the ability to go into depth on the content – is a significant challenge for some students. Simply, there is a lot of content to the program and it represents a very large step up from Cycle 1 History and Citizenship. The Competencies also no longer build upon each other from Cycle 1 to Cycle 2. In many cases I have found myself starting over in building the disciplinary skills.

The other challenge that I have faced is that there is no progression of learning, and I don’t mean that in the sense of the current progression of the learning which is not a progression at all, just a list of content to be learned. Rather I continually ask myself: how are these students developing their skills and understandings? At what point should they be now? When should they be able to do this skill? I’m finding it hard to figure out where exactly they should be. I know what the end result in Secondary IV should be, but I’m finding it difficult mapping out a path to



get them there. This I think is the biggest challenge that I'm facing. I'm trying to develop a tool to track their progression, but since I don't know the benchmarks I feel like I'm flying in the dark. I would really have liked to see the Prototype exam at the beginning or at least at the midpoint (we won't see it until the end). I think that this would have helped me guide the skill development a lot better.

4. Is this new program an improvement over the previous?

Yes! This new program is absolutely an improvement. Despite my criticisms and the challenges that I have outlined above I am really enjoying teaching this program. I expect that it will only get better next year both in Sec III and piloting Sec IV. I'm very enthusiastic about teaching this course. I feel like the authors have fixed most of the shortcomings of the current program. Going through the pilot process has been a shot in the arm for me. Even though it has been a lot of work, I've been learning (or re-learning) some new material, honing my pedagogical skills and really relishing the challenge of teaching a completely new course. I'm very happy that I volunteered to take this on and that I have the support of my principal George Singfield, my directors at the school board Marian Lothian and Ruth Ahern.