



School of Graduate Studies

University of Toronto

November 26, 2004

Professor Vivek Goel
Vice-President and Provost
Room 225, Simcoe Hall
27 King's College Circle
University of Toronto

Dear Professor Goel:

At its meeting of November 23, 2004, the Council of the School of Graduate Studies approved the following motion:

THAT SGS Council approve the proposal of the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning that admission to the M.Ed./ M.A./ Ed.D./ Ph.D. Program in Teacher Development will cease immediately and that Council approve the closure of the program when no students are registered in it. The entry for the program will be removed from the School of Graduate Studies calendar on a permanent basis, effective September 2005.

The motion and supporting documentation are attached. Division II Executive Committee approved this proposal at its meeting of November 2, 2004. This proposal will go to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies for information.

On behalf of the Council of the School of Graduate Studies, I am presenting this item to Governing Council committees for approval.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Alderdice
Secretary to SGS Council
and Coordinator of Policy, Program and Liaison

Encl. (1)
/gj

c.c.	S. Acker	A. Drummond	C. Johnston	H. Lasthiotakis	V. Makarovska	P. Orser
	S. Pfeiffer	D. Theissen	L. Yee	S. Zaky (attachments)		

H:Council/FollowUp/2004-2005/Nov 23/CTL, discontinuation of TD

Motion

School of Graduate Studies Council Tuesday, November 23, 2004

Item 7.

7. Discontinuation of M.Ed. / M.A. / Ed.D. / Ph.D. Program in Teacher Development

MOTION (/) THAT SGS Council approve the proposal of the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning that admission to the M.Ed./ M.A./ Ed.D./ Ph.D. Program in Teacher Development will cease immediately and that Council approve the closure of the program when no students are registered in it. The entry for the program will be removed from the School of Graduate Studies calendar on a permanent basis, effective September 2005.

See attached.

NOTE:

See rationale attached.

Division II Executive Committee approved this proposal at its meeting of November 2, 2004.

With SGS Council approval, this item will go to Governing Council committees for approval.

Graduate Proposal Requirements for Governance Form

1. **Graduate Unit: Curriculum Teaching and Learning**
(graduate department/centre/institute)
2. **Graduate Program/s involved in proposal:**
(including degree level)
 - **Teacher Development Program (M.Ed., M.A., Ed.D., Ph.D.)**
3. **Contact name, e-mail address and telephone #:**
(name and contact information of individual from the department who will attend meetings to serve as the official department spokesperson on the proposal)

**Dennis Thiessen,
dthiessen@oise.utoronto.ca
416 923 6641 ext 7876**
4. **Previous Action Taken:**
(explain how the proposal was approved in the department, and in the divisional Faculty, if appropriate)
 - Approved by faculty and students involved in the program during meetings and e-responses
 - Approved by CTL Council (unanimous), October 13th 2004
5. **Brief Summary of Proposed Change:**
(Most changes require Calendar revisions. See Note 1 at the end of this form. Changes also include additions and deletions of requirements or regulations).

In general, concerns about both the viability of the program and a growing realization of the feasibility and advantages of integrating the TD program into the Curriculum program have prompted the above motion to integrate the M.Ed./M.A./Ed.D./Ph.D. Program in Teacher Development.

... 2

School of Graduate Studies
University of Toronto
Graduate Proposal Requirements for Governance Form (cont'd)
Page 2

6. Proposed Effective Date:

(SGS reserves the right to alter the effective date, taking into consideration our legal responsibilities to prospective and current students. Changes to admission and program requirements for the next SGS Calendar must be submitted by the January Executive Committee and Council agenda deadlines. See further important information to consider regarding selection of an effective date in Note 2 below.)

06

Month

05

Year

7. Rationale:

(Provide an explanation about why the change is being proposed and its anticipated effect on the program and students enrolled in it. Attach letter, if appropriate.)

The persistent and comparatively low student enrolments, the forthcoming retirements of core faculty, and the increasingly limited capacity to offer an appropriate range and number of courses for all four degree programs are problems which make the separate program no longer viable. The re-location of TD courses and faculty to the Curriculum program will provide students with greater depth and breadth of study in teacher development and access to other faculty involved in teacher development research. The proposed integration of the TD program into the Curriculum program then is a move which strengthens the CTL commitment to and coordination of the study of and research in teaching, teacher education, and teacher development

8. Financial and/or Planning Implications:

(Provide a clear statement indicating that there are no financial implications or, if there are financial implications, provide details. If the financial impact is substantial, provide a budget statement or other documentation.)

Staff support for the program will continue to support the Center for Teacher Development as well as to provide support for faculty and staff in the newly merged program. There are therefore no resource implications or new financial arrangements to be made to support this shift in administrative responsibility.

Submitted by: Anne Jordan, Associate Chair, CTL.
Dennis Thiessen, Chair CTL.

(Chair of graduate unit or designate)

Date: **October 22nd 2004**

School of Graduate Studies
October 2004

To: Division II, School of Graduate Studies
From: Dennis Thiessen, Professor and Chair, Department of Curriculum,
Teaching and Learning
Date: September 24, 2004
Re: Discontinuation of M.Ed./M.A./Ed.D./Ph.D. Program in Teacher
Development

Proposal

That the M.Ed./M.A./Ed.D./Ph.D. Program in Teacher Development (TD) be discontinued based on the following sequence:

- ◆ Admissions to the Program would cease effective immediately;
- ◆ The Program would formally close when no further students are registered in it; and
- ◆ The TD faculty and courses would be fully integrated into the M.Ed./M.A./Ed.D./Ph.D. Program in Curriculum by 2005/2006.

The Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning (CTL) will continue its strong commitment to teacher development research through studies conducted, coordinated through, or supported by faculty and students associated with the Centre for Teacher Development. Furthermore the Curriculum program will offer a wide range of courses in teacher development, some of which will be transferred from the TD program and some of which are already available in the Curriculum program. Both current and future students will be able to pursue in depth studies in this area, though no longer in a separate program devoted exclusively to teacher development.

Background

Teacher development as a field of educational study encompasses the development of teachers throughout their careers. The four degree programs (M.Ed., M.A., Ed.D., Ph.D.) are governed by the central idea that teaching is an act of inquiry and that teachers are inquirers and learners.

The following points provide an abbreviated history of the development of TD program:

- ◆ 1989. The Joint Centre for Teacher Development (JCTD) was created through a new affiliation agreement between the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) and the University of Toronto (specifically with the Faculty of Education or FEUT). The core faculty of the JCTD came from both OISE and FEUT; the JCTD was located within the Department of Curriculum at OISE. One of the mandates of the JCTD was to create a graduate program in teacher development.
- ◆ 1989-1995. FEUT and OISE faculty members offered masters and doctoral courses in teacher development in the Curriculum program.
- ◆ 1995. The Ontario Council for Graduate Studies (OCGS) approved the M.Ed./M.A./Ed.D./Ph.D. Program in Teacher Development.

- ◆ 1996. FEUT and OISE merged and became the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). The JCTD was renamed the Centre for Teacher Development (CTD). The CTD was located with the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning (CTL).
- ◆ 1999. In the abbreviated periodical appraisal of the OCGS, the TD Program received a classification of GOOD QUALITY WITH A REPORT. The Report had to address supervisory capacity (two faculty members would retire before the next periodic appraisal and three of the four recently-added TD faculty were Associate Members of the Graduate School and thus were not approved to supervise doctoral theses), student enrolment, and student support.
- ◆ 2002. After a review of the Interim Report on the M.Ed./M.A./Ed.D./Ph.D. Program in Teacher Development, the OCGS reclassified the program to GOOD QUALITY. The issues to be addressed in the next periodic appraisal included: “the decrease in Ph.D. enrolment and/or increase in faculty complement, so as to bring the supervisory capacity and student enrolment into alignment”; the relationship between the teaching and supervisory activities of the core faculty to other programs at OISE/UT, especially within CTL; and whether or not the TD program will identify and seek approval for fields (reference to “focus areas” in the Bulletin and on the web site).
- ◆ 2002-2004. Following the decision to provide full funding to all Ph.D. students and to all full-time M.A. students in their first year, OISE/UT introduced enrolment targets. In CTL, the admission quotas in 2003/2004 for the TD program were four in the Ph.D. program and none in the full-time M.A. program. In 2003/2004, 19 new students (M.Ed.-12; M.A.-1; Ed.D.-2; Ph.D.-4) were admitted to the TD program. In 2004/2005, 11 new students (M.Ed.-8; M.A.-0; Ed.D.-1; Ph.D.-2) have registered in the TD program.

In 2002/2003, the TD program group (consisting of faculty, students, and staff) discussed the future of the TD program. The group examined such matters as the enrolment projections based on current targets or quotas; future retirements and the prospects of further appointments; program coherency and distinctiveness; and relations with other programs within and outside the Department. With the support of the Department Chair (Merl Wahlstrom), a decision was made to continue the TD program. An OCGS Appraisal Brief was submitted in July 2003. The School of Graduate Studies raised questions about the TD program, in particular noting concerns about the actual and projected enrolments and its viability as a separate program, and pointing to the possibility of some connection to another program (eg., “.....perhaps the M.Ed. could function as a field within another program?”).

During 2002/2003, a sub-committee of faculty in the TD and Curriculum programs explored various ways in which the two programs could work together. In 2003/2004, the future of the TD program was again reviewed as part of the academic planning process. In November 2003, the TD program group decided to discontinue the TD program and to develop a plan for the eventual integration into the Curriculum program. Dennis Thiessen (new Department Chair) informed the School of Graduate Studies of this decision. Jack Miller (Coordinator of TD program) and Dennis Thiessen met with TD students in December to discuss the reasons for and

implications of this decision. Between January and May 2004, Dennis Thiessen met with representatives from the TD and Curriculum programs to develop a plan for integrating the TD faculty and courses into the Curriculum program.

Rationale

In general, concerns about both the viability of the program and a growing realization of the feasibility and advantages of integrating the TD program into the Curriculum program have prompted the above motion to integrate the M.Ed./M.A./Ed.D./Ph.D. Program in Teacher Development. The persistent and comparatively low student enrolments, the forthcoming retirements of core faculty, and the increasingly limited capacity to offer an appropriate range and number of courses for all four degree programs are problems which make the separate program no longer viable (see **Appendix I** for a more detailed review of the concerns about viability). The re-location of TD courses and faculty to the Curriculum program will provide students with greater depth and breadth of study in teacher development and access to other faculty involved in teacher development research. The proposed integration of the TD program into the Curriculum program then is a move which strengthens the CTL commitment to and coordination of the study of and research in teaching, teacher education, and teacher development.

Though formally the above motion proposes to close the TD program, it would not be an end to graduate study in this area. The discontinuation of the TD program creates an opportunity for CTL to embark on a different approach to the program-based study of teacher development. The integration of TD faculty and courses into the M.Ed./M.A./Ed.D./Ph.D. program in Curriculum will in fact enhance the capacity of CTL to provide students with many ways to study teacher development in greater depth. The following historical snapshot of teacher development as a field of study gives some background to why CTL now sees some advantages in this proposed integration into the Curriculum program.

For many years, various topics in teacher development have been part of the research agenda in many other fields of study, notably curriculum, education psychology (eg., studies in instructional psychology; stages of career development), educational administration (eg., studies in school improvement), or sociology of education (eg., studies of professional socialization). In the last 25 years, teacher development has become a field of study in its own right, supported in part by the significant increase in journals and handbooks and in the number of associations (eg., Canadian Association for Teacher Education) or divisions (eg., Division K, American Educational Research Association) devoted to research in teaching, teacher education, and teacher development. In universities, numerous research centres emerged (eg., University of Alberta—Centre for Research for Teacher Education and Development; University of British Columbia—Centre for the Study of Teacher Education; OISE—Joint Centre for Teacher Development). While more graduate courses in the area were introduced (especially in Curriculum, Curriculum and Teaching, or Elementary/Secondary Education programs), only a few “stand-alone” graduate programs were developed in teacher development (eg., Michigan State University, OISE/UT). In short, many departments in faculties of education at research-intensive universities (usually in Curriculum Departments) have developed a rich and varied scholarly tradition in teacher development, more typically embodied in a research centre/unit, an active publication

record, and a range of graduate courses, but not as a separate graduate program. In the above motion, CTL proposes to maintain its commitment to teacher development through its longstanding connections to the field of curriculum, a program approach that is a more common pattern of scholarly engagement.

To some extent then, CTL intends to return to the pre-1995 period where teacher development courses were offered as part of the Curriculum program. The post-2005 version would offer more possibilities for students than the pre-1995 period because of what has transpired within and between the two programs in the intervening years. For example:

- ◆ The Curriculum program has appointed 18 new faculty members all of whom teach in the B.Ed. program and many of whom identify their research interests in terms of teaching, teacher education, or teacher development.
- ◆ These new appointments in the Curriculum program have introduced graduate courses that explicitly include topics relevant to teacher development.
- ◆ A number of Curriculum and TD faculty members supervise and serve on thesis committees of students in both programs (TD faculty were previously part of the Curriculum program).
- ◆ Curriculum and TD faculty are involved in collaborative research projects, special interest groups, and joint publications in teacher development.
- ◆ Some TD faculty regularly teach a course in the Curriculum program.
- ◆ The majority of Curriculum and TD students take all of their courses in these two programs. In TD courses, it is common to have more Curriculum than TD students.
- ◆ In the last two years, Curriculum and TD faculty have been working together to define a new research requirement common to both programs, to develop additional research courses, and to restructure the comprehensive examination.

In short, the faculty in both programs have sustained and indeed increased their organizational and intellectual connections. The proposed integration will simply create a single program home for a group that already has many common interests and activities.

In a Curriculum program enriched by the addition of former TD faculty and courses (see **Integration Plan** below), **students** with an interest in this area would have numerous choices of advisors/ supervisors and courses to support their studies. For example, M.A. students who want to focus on teacher development in a particular subject area (eg., science education, language arts), in addition to their core requirements (ie., CTL 1000 Foundations of Curriculum and a research methods course) may take a combination of subject-specific and former TD courses. Or Ph.D. students who want to focus on the implications of particular curriculum practices in the classroom, in addition to their core requirements (ie., one or two research methods courses), may take a combination of courses on the conceptualization of curriculum and instruction. Or M.Ed. students who may want to survey current developments in a wide range of curriculum areas, in addition

to their core requirements (ie., CTL 1000 Foundations of Curriculum), may choose to include one or more teacher development courses to explore pedagogical issues of curriculum reform. The availability of a larger number of faculty most of whom have expertise in both curriculum and teacher development will offer greater possibilities for students in terms of both courses and supervision.

The viability concerns make a separate program in teacher development untenable. However, the integration into another program affords new possibilities for teacher development within an enriched Curriculum program. Students entering the Curriculum program would have the opportunity to complement their studies with courses in teacher development, as needed or appropriate. The integration also enables CTL to strengthen its commitment to scholarship in the area through a more coherent and sustainable program strategy.

Integration Plan

As outlined above, there are many factors or conditions that facilitate the integration of the TD faculty and courses into the Curriculum program. Furthermore both programs have had a similar organization and “ethos” (eg., minimizing core course requirements, maximizing choice of courses; same approach to comprehensive examination). And TD faculty and staff are physically located on the same floor as most of the faculty who teach in the Curriculum program. The foundation for a successful integration then is in place and already in motion.

Following approval of the above motion, the Department would continue this process towards full integration through the following steps:

- ◆ Revise the SGS Calendar, the OISE/UT Bulletin, and all relevant web sites (eg., CTL, Registrar’s Office, Centre for Teacher Development) to reflect the changes.
- ◆ List TD courses within the Curriculum Program. See **Appendix II**.
- ◆ Review program progress of each student (eg., course completed, outstanding requirements).
- ◆ Send a letter to TD students to notify them of the discontinuation and to review steps taken to ensure CTL support for the completion of their courses.
- ◆ Arrange individual and/or group meetings to discuss the implications of the change and/or to address any questions/needs particular students might have about their program.

APPENDIX I

Concerns About Viability

Much of the concern about viability is based on the challenges created by small numbers, in terms of both student enrolment and the core faculty in the program. The following points illustrate how these challenges of critical mass persist:

Students

- ◆ The Graduate Studies Ministry Counts as of November 1, 2003 were: M.Ed.=24; M.A.=6; Ed.D.=27; and Ph.D.=36 for a total of 93 students.
- ◆ Since the program's inception, the M.Ed. enrolment has remained relatively stable, usually between 20 and 25 students. Most M.Ed. students (over 90%) are enrolled part-time in the program.

The M.A. enrolment has remained low, never exceeding 7 students with an average of 4 per year. 2/3 of the M.A. students are enrolled part-time in the program.

The Ed.D. enrolment has also remained low with an average of a little more than 4 students per year. In 1998/1999, the new enrolment jumped to 26 based on a special project with the Hong Kong Institute of Education (17 Hong Kong Institute students began their program part-time). Most students begin the Ed.D. program on a part-time basis and complete the program with one or more years on a full-time basis.

The Ph.D. enrolment has more than doubled since 1996 (1996=15; 2002=38; 2003=34). Some of the increase in recent years has occurred as a result of 10 students who transferred from the Ed.D. to the Ph.D. program. All Ph.D. candidates are enrolled full-time in the program.

- ◆ The application-offers-acceptances/registered numbers for the last two years are displayed in the following table (enrolment targets introduced in for 2003/2004). Note the target/quota is presented on the first line for each degree in each year.

Degree Profile	2003/2004	2004/2005
M.Ed.	Target—not defined	Target =5
Applications	50	33
Offers	11	8
Acceptances	9	7
Registered	6	8
M.A.	Target=0 (FT only)	Target=0 (FT only)
Applications	14	2 (PT)
Offers	0	2
Acceptances	0	2
Registered	0	0
Ed.D.	Target—not defined	Target=1
Applications	8	11
Offers	3	1
Acceptances	3	1
Registered	1	1
Ph.D.	Target=4	Target=3
Applications	64	16
Offers	10	3
Acceptances	4	2
Registered	3	2
Totals (All Degrees)		
Applications	136	62
Offers	24	14
Acceptances	16	12
Registered	10	11

- ◆ In comparison to the 11 other active OISE/UT graduate programs (excluding the two graduate teacher education programs and the Measurement and Evaluation program—admission to this program ceased as of 2004/2005), since 1999/2000, the TD program has received the fewest applications (466) and made the fewest offers (174). One other program has comparable application-offer numbers; all others are at least 50% higher in both the number of application and the offers made. Based on the 2003 November Counts (see above), the TD program had about 10% of the CTL graduate count and 4% of the OISE/UT graduate count.

Faculty

- ◆ All of the core and affiliated faculty are members of the Centre for Teacher Development and have active research records in this area. The CTD has just been renewed for another 5-year period as one of 10 OISE/UT research centres.
- ◆ When the program was approved in 1995, there were five core faculty (category 1 in the OCGS submission) and four affiliated faculty (category 3). In the abbreviated appraisal of 1998, there were five core faculty and three affiliated faculty. In the 2003 periodical appraisal, there were 11 core faculty and one affiliated faculty.

Of the 11 core faculty and one affiliated faculty, four have been added for 2003/2004 (Beattie, Bennett, Miller, Thiessen---transferred from the Curriculum program). Two of the core faculty have a limited involvement in the TD program (Thiessen is the

CTL Chair; Kosnik is on a 3-year leave). Six will retire before the next periodic appraisal in 2010/2011.

- ◆ Since the FEUT-OISE merger in 1996 (see **Background** above), faculty have increased their teaching involvement in the Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) program. By the next periodic appraisal in 2010/2011, each TD faculty member will devote on average 50% or more of their yearly teaching responsibility to the B.Ed. program. The five core faculty then will be able to offer no more than 10 graduate courses per year for the four degree programs (M.Ed., M.A., Ed.D., Ph.D.).
- ◆ About 2/3 of the current M.A./Ed.D./Ph.D. students in the TD program are supervised by Professors Connelly (retired in 2002), Beck (retired in 2004), or Diamond (will retire in 2005). Most of the core TD faculty supervise both Curriculum and TD students. Two of the core faculty are Associate Members of the School of Graduate Studies and thus cannot be sole supervisors of doctoral students.

While student enrolment has remained relatively low (especially for the M.A. and Ed.D. degrees), the TD program has been an effective small program for professionals who want to engage in advanced part-time study on topics relevant to their own teaching or teacher development (especially in the M.Ed. degree) and for students who want to prepare for a research career in higher education (especially in the Ph.D. degree). In the first two years of enrolment targets (2003/2004 and 2004/2005), the TD program has admitted about 10 new students each year across four degree programs, most of whom enrolled part-time in the program. What was a manageable low-enrolment program for at least the M.Ed. and Ph.D. degrees has now dropped to level of enrolment that is difficult to sustain in terms of course offerings, student support, or intellectual community. Without a critical mass of students, it is no longer viable to offer a separate program in teacher development.

The projected drop in faculty complement (to five core faculty by 2010/2011, two of which at the moment are not full members of SGS) might still be sufficient for a yearly intake of 10 new students. Five faculty (provided that the two Associate members become full members of the School of Graduate Studies) would be able to respond to the supervision load. However, offering about 10 courses per year is both insufficient to provide the breadth and depth needed for the four degrees and too many courses to schedule for the reduced number of students enrolled in the program (would likely have to cancel some courses because of low enrolment). Though the supervisory capacity would likely be aligned with the student enrolment (and thus respond to a concern expressed in the OCGS response to the 2002 Report), the anticipated faculty-student numbers do not align themselves in a way that would allow the program to maintain its good standing on other program requirements (eg., reasonable range and number of courses offered each year, depth of offerings for each degree, critical mass of full-time students to sustain a vibrant research culture). In short, there are problems in the faculty complement that also threaten the long-term viability of a “stand-alone” TD program.

APPENDIX II

TD Courses to be located within the Curriculum Program

MASTER'S COURSES

Current TD
Courses to be
relocated in
Curriculum Pgm.

CTL4000 H	Improving Teaching
CTL4001 H	Facilitating Reflective Professional Development
CTL4002 H	Constructive Feedback in Teaching
CTL4003 H	Teacher Development and School Improvement
CTL4004 H	From Student to Teacher: Professional Induction
CTL4005 H	Arts-Based Approaches to Teacher Development
CTL4007 H	Language, Culture, and Identity: Using the Literary Text in Teacher Development
CTL4008 H	Knowing and Teaching
CTL4009 H	Multicultural Perspectives in Teacher Development: Reflective Practicum
CTL4010 H	Action Research in Language and Learning
CTL4011 H	Teaching and School Renewal
CTL4012 H	Thoughtful Teaching and Practitioner Inquiry
CTL4013 H	Teacher Development: Comparative and Cross-Cultural Perspectives
CTL4797 H	Practicum in Teacher Development Program: Master's Level
CTL4798 H	Individual Reading and Research in Teacher Development Program: Master's Level
CTL4799 H	Special Topics in Teacher Development Program: Master's Level

DOCTORAL COURSES

CTL4800 H	Seminar: Current Problems in Teacher Development and Curriculum Studies: Apprenticeship
CTL4801 H	Narrative and Story in Research and Professional Practice
CTL4802 H	Qualitative Research in Teaching
CTL4804 H	Alternative Theoretical Perspectives in the Study of Curriculum Practice and Teacher Development
CTL4806 H	Professional Ethics of Teaching and Schooling
CTL4997 H	Practicum in Teacher Development Program: Doctoral Level
CTL4998 H	Individual Reading and Research in Teacher Development Program: Doctoral Level
CTL4999 H	Special Topics in Teacher Development Program: Doctoral Level