

COMPREHENSIVE EXAMS – ONE PAGERS (or so!!)

I AN INTRODUCTION TO HIGHER EDUCATION IN CANADA

a) Jones (1997) Higher Education in Ontario

*Before 1945

- *1868 – only secular (non-denominational) institutions to be publicly funded
- *continued growth in denominational colleges
- *gradual development of technical, non-university institutions
- *formal review of institutional governance at U of T
- *1906 Flavelle Commission Report (one of the most imp. documents)
 - *need universities to be separate from political powers
 - *recommended a corporate board composed of mostly gov't appointed members
 - *bicameralism – retain the U/T Senate (resp. for academic matters), became the dominant governance model for universities

*1945-1960 – Evolutionary Expansion

- *public valued higher ed.; demands for skilled labour; gov't investing in technical, vocational training; higher ed. became an aspect of govt BUT lacked representation from university community

*1960-1970 – Structural Revolution

- *expanded university sector; develop. of CAATs – Council of Regents created; new gov't dept (University Affairs) & related advisory structures (COU); high level of institutional autonomy/system of checks & balances (enrollment & program weighting funding; Ont. Council on Graduate Studies); student & faculty orgs. emerged

*1970-1990 – Structural Stability

- *2 distinct higher ed. Sectors emerged; Degree Granting Act(1983); “managerialism at the margins” (Jones, 1994) CAATs’ & Us’ focus was on funding; some discussion about lack of interaction b/t sectors
- *From 1990- govt no longer giving sectors what they asked for; Vision 2000; Social Contract; Ministry of Colleges & Universities to Ministry of Education & Training (resp. for all levels of ed.); Common Sense Revolution focusing on deficit reduction

*Conclusions

- *high participation rate in higher ed, but some groups still not represented
- *market forces/competition may play a greater role -decreased gov't support & deregulation of fees
- *gov't interest in accountability may lead to increased regulation/competition
- *need system-wide not sectoral perspective; no master plan for higher ed.

b) Skolnik (?) “Canada”

- *education is primarily a provincial jurisdiction (Fed. – revenue –sharing with provinces, support of research, student loans/graduate scholarships, ensuring adequacy of skilled manpower for the economy)
- *4 structural characteristics that provinces share

- *binary system with clear demarcation b/t degree and nondegree sectors
- *all institutions that award secular degrees are public institutions
- *prevalence of affiliation/federation arrangements that are legally & financially separate (some hold degrees in abeyance, students receive degree from larger one)
- *public policy has encouraged institutions of comparable standards instead of specialized systems in the U.S.
- *commitment social equality fueled expansion in the 60s/70s
- *higher ed. serves as an intellectual & research base; universities follow social demand approach to admissions (student preferences, not required workers)
- *with funding problems, shift of control from presidents to faculty, unionization – increasing divergence b/t the interest of the gov't and the U – increasing calls for rationalization (some Us that would benefit may break ranks)
- *dependent on gov't funding and lacking strong political allies – Us are vulnerable BUT still have a high degree of autonomy for public institutions
- *weak points – underrepresentation by some groups, lack of prov/fed coordination of policies and funding, inferior opportunities for part-timers, weaknesses in general & liberal ed., historic tendencies towards dispersal of funds for research and graduate studies

IV THE DEVELOPMENT AND AIMS OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

a)Gallagher and Dennison (1995) “Canada’s Community College Systems: A Study of Diversity

- *public funds for vocational training have come almost exclusively from Feds but have been managed jointly with provinces
- *1960s – dramatic change in public policy – influence of the human capital theory, prediction of huge demand for postsecondary ed. and view that Can. Prosperity depended on technical skills of workforce
- *concern on how Us would be affected led to search for new options
- *nationwide approach not possible with vast differences among provinces
 - *Ont/ PEI – for students not going to Us and for career and vocational training
 - *Alberta/B.C. – technical/ vocational and university transfer
 - *Manitoba/New Brunswick, Newfoundland – vocational/technical, focus on short term work-entry
 - *Saskatchewan – community colleges without walls – brokering
 - *Quebec – pre-university and 3 yr technical
- *instruments for implementation of gov't policy, not autonomous
- *increasing demand of faculty to be involved in governance
- * diversity will continue, but will be driven more by the postindustrial world than by the local communities

b)Munroe (1972) Profile of the American Community College

- *community college has its heritage deeply rooted in the democratic philosophy
- *community college must become an innovator – define its own obj., plan its own curriculum, hire its staff, and serve its students, community (more than any other part of the ed. system, CCs have the opportunity to explore, experiment and be innovative)

- *Community College Objectives (opportunity -universal education beyond high school)
 - *comprehensive curricula
 - *open-door policy (not program specific – careful of revolving door syndrome)
 - *community orientation – geographically and to the various groups in the community
- *Functions
 - *transfer
 - *citizenship and general education
 - *occupational training
 - *general studies (marginal students)
 - *adult and Con.Ed.
 - *remedial programs
 - *counselling and guidance
 - *salvage function (students needing a second chance)
 - *screening function (finding the right program, academic resources)
 - *goal-finding/ cooling-out (guide students into the right program)
 - *custodial (students who would otherwise be on the streets)
 - *co-curricular or student activity function

VI TOLERANCE AND NEUTRALITY (as you can see,not complete!)

a) Kolakowski (1975) “Neutrality and Academic Values”

*

b)Purdy (1994) “Politics and the College Curriculum”

- *examines traditionalists’ objections to including revolutionary works in the curriculum
- *relativism – traditionalists believe revolutionaries have given up the search for truth

VII ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE

*According to Skolnik, academic freedom is derived from the idea of the university; if truth is known and not being searched for, then academic freedom is not an issue (only imparting accepted truths)

a)Horn (1994) “Academic freedom in Canadian Universities”

- * “freedom to teach, pursue research, & publish without adherence to prescribed doctrine & without censorship” (does not mean academics should be free from criticism)
- *academic freedom is essential in the modern liberal university (CAUT, AUCC)
- *willingness to put up with views one finds offensive is fundamental to academic freedom - universities should not impose freedom of expression restrictions greater than those in the society at large
- *believes sensitivity & civility are desirable, but cannot be mandated
- * ‘Zero Tolerance’ document from the gov’t (people have a right to complain about aspects of university life) & York’s draft policy on anti-racism are troubling
- * believes greatest danger is from those who seek “more scholar for the dollar” - tenure has been seen as a major rigidity and this puts academic freedom at risk

b)Shils (1991) “Academic Freedom”

- *university’s primary task is to transmit and discover truths; professors should make it clear when they are expressing a personal evaluation
- *university autonomy (freedom of university from the power of any corporate body) and academic freedom are not the same and can exist independently of each other
- *no university could ever be wholly autonomous (some links to gov’t - financial)
- *academic freedom also involves: right to express views on public questions and to join learned societies; political freedom; freedom of students to pursue courses of their choice
- *does NOT involve actions counter to public morality or that are illegal; does not protect individuals who are incompetent or whose work is substandard
- * examples of infringements – withholding promotion, censorship, loyalty oaths etc

VII INSTITUTIONAL AUTONOMY VIS-À-VIS GOVERNMENT (not done yet!)

a)Jones (1996) “Governments, Governance, and Canadian Universities”

b)Skolnik (1992) “A Comparative Analysis of Arrangements for State Coordination of Higher Education in Canada and the United States”

c)Winchester (1985) “The Concepts of University Autonomy – An Anachronism?”

XI INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON HIGHER EDUCATION (not done yet!)

a)Altbach (1993) “Gigantic Peripheries: India and China in the World Knowledge System”

b)Bagherian (1993) “Culture Survival of Education in Iran”

c)Mazuri (1982) “The African University as a Multi-National Corporation”

d)Rahnema (1995) “Science, Universities and Subjugated Knowledge: A ‘Third World’ Perspective”

XIV CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY (A & B) **I don’t think this section is helpful!**

a)Cherryholmes (?) “Thinking About Education Structurally”

- *Structuralism promises order, organization, and certainty
- *Structuralism in education promises accountability, efficiency, and control as well
- *Structuralism is consistent with teaching for objectives, standardized educational assessment, quantitative empirical research, systematic instruction, rationalized bureaucracies, and scientific management
- *3 proponents of structuralism
 - *Tyler (1949)- argues for organization in curriculum planning (objectives, identify learning experiences, organize experiences and then evaluate)
 - *Schwab (1983)- identifies elements of curricular structure
 - *Bloom’s Taxonomy – classification of educational objectives

b) Cherryholmes (?) “Thinking About Education Poststructurally”

- *criticism of structuralism, stating it reinforces the status quo by calling for change but not identifying what needs to be changed
- *Foucault – emphasized the political production of truth and that what passes for truth is historically relative
- *Derrida- meanings are relative to the rhetorical claims of specific text

c) Tierney (1993) “Structure and Knowledge: Building a University” (21st Century)

- *choosing faculty because of their expert teaching skills rather than academic areas or who have been involved in cross-disciplinary studies (not just one specific dept)
- *hiring plan affects decisions made about how knowledge is defined, structured, and taught (separate depts. or colleges lead individuals to identify with their units more than the university – structure influences behaviour)
- *have no strict differentiation b/t faculty and administration (both are intertwined in the teaching and learning process)
- *have an educational philosophy that determines how decisions are to be made, the goals for curriculum and pedagogy, and what it means to be an educated citizen of the next century
- *consider interdisciplinary centers and keeping decision-making shared
- *mission statement that speaks to the clientele served rather than one that is “vanilla”
- *have formal socialization activities that focus on universal interests (eg, the nature of pedagogy) otherwise informal socialization within individual interest groups will result

d) Bryson and de Castell (?) “Queer Pedagogy: Praxis Makes Im/Perfect”

- *impossible to achieve freedom from bias even when efforts are made to plan it into the curriculum – there is no unbiased truth
- *heterosexism & homophobia are rife in the fields of education
- *they call into question the traditional, rational, objective, empirical, truth seeking goals associated with traditional Western scientific inquiry

e) Hoodfar (1992) “Feminist Anthropology and Critical Pedagogy: The Anthropology of Classrooms’ Exclude Voices”

- *key to influencing social change lies in the teacher’s ability to map the complex relationships within the triangle of subject matter, teacher, and student
- *being a teacher from racial/cultural minority compromises one’s authority in the classroom, students are more resistant to critical pedagogy in this situation
- *she is more successful teaching critical thinking when she distances herself, acts more powerful, knowledgeable & asks questions

f) Manicom (1992) “Feminist Pedagogy: Transformations, Standpoints, and Politics”

- *3 themes characteristic of feminist pedagogy
 - *teaching should begin from women’s experiences
 - *sharing experiences builds a sense of solidarity & mutual support
 - *authority relations in classroom should be dismantled to equalize power relations
- *does not recommend developing a set of rules to follow, instead suggests a set of things to think about – “Is what I am doing as a teacher *enhancing* our capacity for

transformative practice? In my particular circumstances, what kind of teaching and learning has the most potential to develop a collective capacity to engage in transformative feminist practice?”

XV ACCESSIBILITY: FROM ELITIST TO MASS HIGHER EDUCATION

a) Arai & Guppy (1992) *The Changing Mosaic in Canadian Education*

*reason for more degrees being granted is not that a greater percentage of high school students are earning degrees BUT that many more people are graduating from high school and becoming eligible for postsecondary

*women & non-British ethnic groups have increased their educational outcomes substantially (however, among Aboriginal groups it is still low)

*however influences of social classes have remained constant – less privileged individuals do not do as well as the privileged groups

*dividing students into different curricular streams seems to perpetuate this inequality since it is based on previous student achievement (school organization & family background have direct effects on student achievement)

*need to examine the effects of various school programs and we need better national data of a longitudinal nature

b) Kirkness & Barnhardt (1991) *First Nations and Higher Education*

*U.S and Canadian universities have failed in their efforts to improve First Nation’ participation in higher ed.

*universities must respect and build upon the cultural integrity of students (not change or assimilate them)

*must have institutional legitimation of indigenous knowledge & skills

*focusing on attrition and retention has not worked

*higher ed. must be relevant to their view of the world, offer them “human” relationships and help them exercise responsibility over their own lives

b) Trow (1973) *Problems in the Transition From Elite to Mass Higher Education*

*growth has its impact on every aspect of higher ed. –finance, admin., recruitment, curriculum & instruction, standards, exams, student housing, job placement, relation of research to teaching; increases concerns for equality of opportunity

*go from a privilege, to a right, to an obligation

*mass ed. - curriculum becomes more modular, there is more flexibility with courses & easier movement b/t fields and institutions; must consider learning needs of the less privileged students who now have access

*Mass ed. -variable standards; universal – more of the focus is on value-added

*student participation in governance becomes an issue

*question is whether institutions can maintain standards, satisfy egalitarians and reduce costs in order to move to mass ed.

*educational inflation of occupations – better educated individuals reshape jobs previously done by less skilled

*growth, democratization & diversity are anticipated trends

- *changes in societal values will also impact higher ed.
- *his bias is for continued diversity in higher education
- *suggests a way of thinking about the development of higher education – clearly states he is not providing any definitive answers

XVII QUALITY AND ITS ASSESSMENT

- a) Austin (1980) When Does a College Deserve to be Called ‘High Quality?’
- *3 basic functions of higher ed. – education of students, research and public service
 - *5 current views of quality
 - *mystical – rejects idea that valid assessments of quality can be made
 - *reputational – quality is whatever people think it is
 - *resources – libraries, qualified staff etc.
 - *outcomes – says more about the quality of the students admitted
 - *value-added – ability to make a difference in students’ intellectual/personal develop.
 - *believes these traditional measures don’t work
 - *new conception of quality
 - *must maximize learners’ knowledge of results and time on task
 - *“high quality” institution = knowing what’s happening to students, giving faculty opportunities to develop teaching skills under minimally threatening conditions, having a system of feedback that identifies institutions contribution to intellectual/personal development
- b) Magnusson (?) The Evaluation of University Teaching: Exploring the Question of Resistance
- *believes students can use evaluation as an expression of resistance to a curriculum
 - *departmental power structures/culture may support this resistance
 - *evaluation practices whether in the context of students or teachers, have the effect of regulating knowledge
 - *standardized institution-wide evaluation systems are disrespectful of diversity in terms of how other academic cultures think about education & knowledge
 - *suggestions for implementing an evaluation system within universities
 - *Assessment philosophy must acknowledge the oppressive conditions exist (racism, violence against women, gender issues etc.)
 - *teaching centers must be set up to encourage not discourage connections with grassroots movements (must not be under the thumb of administration)
 - *administration must be educated to read faculty evaluations
 - *does not recommend removing student input from the evaluation process – is only saying there needs to be greater awareness of the potential problems/misunderstandings
- c) Skolnik (1989) How Academic Program Review Can Foster Intellectual Conformity & Stifle Diversity of Thought & Method
- *refers to the Pogo View of Academic Freedom (Mills, 1963 – “we have met the enemy and it is us”)
 - *factors contributing to non-conformity
 - *selection process – find individuals that fit the institution

- *Us are conservative bureaucracies
- *struggle b/t diverse groups in the Us – sciences vs humanities
- *natural urge for intellectuals to have their views prevail
- *Program Review (focus is on quality but that is an elusive term)
 - *many different models and some are combinations (goal-based or criterion-referenced; responsive to stakeholders; decision-making; connoisseurship where the evaluator is key)
- *Ontario – connoisseurship – Appraisals Committee of Ont. Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS)- an attempt to prevent increased gov't intrusion
 - *emphasis on resources & quality of faculty
 - *none of the committee members were from education which does have some expertise in evaluation
 - *lowest ratings to humanities
 - *did not elicit input from programs being appraised
 - *doesn't allow for debate and pressures faculty to conform
 - *little attempt to assess student development
 - *focus is on volume of research, not the quality and does not take into consideration time spent in practicum by the professions
 - *prevents experimentation of non-traditional methods of ed. (resulted in U.S. Us providing programs in Canada
 - *need a decentralized appraisal process that recognizes and values the diversity of programs

d) Vidovich & Porter (1997) The Recontextualization of 'Quality' in Australian H. Ed.
*Reasons for quality movement – expansion from elite to mass education and need for economic constraint

Reasons for Aust. quality movement (high degree of consistency with global patterns)

- *with global competitiveness, should not be seen as being left out
- *growing community demands for accountability
- *quality construed as accountability to ext. interest groups & gov't then has an interest
- *an example of gov't strategy 'steering at a distance' - earlier involvement of academics and compromises were made – this approach should allow quality to evolve & reflect contextual and institutional differences
- *unique features – whole institution approach (not discipline-based); was not a fixed gov't entity, it evolved over time

XVIII FINANCIAL ISSUES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

a) Hough (1992)

*funding of higher ed. is characterized by its diversity – there is no set pattern that countries follow, but **certain principles** can be identified (ongoing debate about whether higher ed. is primarily a social or individual benefit)

- Having highly skilled labour is crucial to economic prosperity & growth
- An increasing share of the costs should be borne by students & families
- Higher ed. is expensive
- Increased institutional efficiency may be an objective of a funding mechanism

*recent trends

- Modification of funding mechanisms (providing funding incentives) in an attempt to make institutions more entrepreneurial and cost-conscious

*main source of funding for higher ed. continues to be gov't

*U. S.A. is the closest to a market model of funding

*institutions increasingly seek funds from other sources eg. research & industry contracts

*student fees have become more imp. - students are the main beneficiaries & some believe institutions will be more customer orientated if they have to attract students

*most countries have a combination of grants and loans (emphasis tends to be on loans)

XIX ACCOUNTABILITY

a)Hufner (1991)

*notion of accountability is not new, but its application to higher ed. is recent (a result of economic & political circumstances)

*problems- academics want to keep their privileged position & available tools are not well suited to multigoal institutions

*if institutions don't measure their own performance, external accountability will occur

*U.S. institutions have a variety of performance measures (they are more market driven)

* is not a one-dimensional concept – have 2 levels – system & institutional; & different functions – teaching, research, consulting, learning, or fiscal accountability

*in narrow sense, external accountability = financial accountability(other is performance)

*accountability is good because it asks for more clearly defined responsibilities within institutions of higher ed.

b)Dennison (1995) Accountability: Mission Impossible?

*"more prominent since the mid-1980s, has "a variety of contexts and...no common definition"

*reasons for its prominence – need for gov't to justify spending in face of huge deficits; questioning institutions' ability to deliver on promises; lack of confidence that institutions will do it themselves; CCs should indicate how they will contribute to economic growth

*has 2 steps – "demonstrated & documented realization of...specific goals" and agreement upon what are valid indicators & how they are to be measured

*should be accountable to: students, gov't, community (says this is difficult since expectations may not be financially possible), employers (indicates a problem with them wanting generic & specific job skills), staff, & transfer institutions

*should be system-wide standards and reviews

*believes CCs can make a case for their development of student talent as a measure of quality; questions the value of Boards & challenges their objectivity

*questions validity of accreditation – feels it rarely addresses student learning; he advocates for provincially based institutional accreditation through a "quasi-independent agency" and he cautions against government involvement citing the "need to separate the powers of judge and jury"