DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 096 SP 005 145

AUTHOR Robertson, Neville L.
TITLE The Doctorate in Education in Canada.
INSTITUTION Phi Delta Kappa, Bloomington, Ind.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 29p.; Occasional paper 12

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Admission Criteria, Curriculum, *Doctoral Degrees, *Doctoral Programs, *Education Majors, Financial Problems, Program Content, School Role, *Schools of Education, Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Canada

ABSTRACT

This paper deals with the Canadian counterpart of the survey of doctoral programs in professional education in the United States undertaken by Phi Delta Kappa and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (SP 005 011). The information in this report was gathered by visits to four Canadian universities. Three--the Universities of Alberta, British Columbia, and Toronto--were selected because they represented the bulk of doctoral output in professional education in Canada. The fourth university--the University of Manitoba--was chosen because it provided an excellent example of an institution with a new program. The information gathered is discussed under the headings of admission procedures, programs of study, areas of study offered, student support, and housing. The section on programs of study includes the categories of course work, examinations, committees, internships, research dissertations, program length, and foreign language requirements. The report notes that, like American institutions, Canadian universities seem to be phasing out the Ed.D. in favor of the Ph.D. degree and dropping the foreign language requirement. (RT) !

PHI DELTA KAPPA

RESEARCH SERVICE CENTER

OCCASIONAL PAPER 12

THE DOCTORATE IN EDUCATION IN CANADA

by

Neville L. Robertson
Commission on Higher Education
Phi Delta Kappa

This paper is a project of the Phi Delta Kappa Commission on Higher Education, composed of M. L. Cushman, Chairman; Wade Arends; John E. King; John T. Wahlquist; John Dale Russell; August Eberle; J. W. Lee, (PDK Board Liaiaon); and Maynard Bemis (PDK Staff Liaison)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper deals with the Canadian counterpart of the cooperative survey of institutions in the United States offering doctoral programs in professional education undertaken by Phi Delta Kappa and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Particular appreciation must extended to George E. Flower, John M. Brown, Henry T. Coutts, and Neville V. Scarfe for their readiness and willingness to cooperate in this survey and their unselfish efforts to assist the author in every possible way at their respective institutions. The author also wishes to record his sincere gratitude to every one of the educators he interviewed who not only gave of their time unstintingly, but were always ready to offer guidance when requested. He is particularly grateful to all the above persons, as well as members of the Phi Delta Kappa Commission on Higher Education and to Edward C. Pomeroy and Mark Smith of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education for so graciously consenting to critique this paper and for the constructive suggestions they made. It is hoped that this paper may add to the understanding of Canadian institutions offering doctoral programs in professional education. The inadequacies of this presentation are the responsibility of the author.

Neville L. Robertson

THE DOCTORATE IN EDUCATION IN CANADA

INTRODUCTION

Doctoral programs in professional education are relatively new in Canada. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) study of the 92 institutions in the United States offering the doctoral program covered the period 1956-58, which coincided with the inauguration of programs for doctoral study in educational administration and educational psychology at the University of Alberta. The first students were admitted in 1957 and the first degrees conferred in 1958.[1] The Canadian scene, therefore, offers an investigator the opportunity to examine and analyze doctoral programs in professional education of relatively recent vintage.

The information in this report was not gathered by means of a questionnaire as was the case in the parallel study of United States institutions. Four Canadian universities with doctoral programs in professional education were visited by the investigator, the main thrust being to determine the rationale underlying these programs. He hoped to gain an understanding of both present objectives and future trends. This involved direct interviews and discussions with Deans and Chairmen of departments in each of the colleges visited.[2] Three universities were selected because they represented by far the bulk of doctoral programs in professional education offered in Canada. These were the Universities of Alberta, British Columbia, and Toronto, the study for the degrees from the latter being offered through the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). This institution was

[1] Letter from Mrs. M. Cameron, Assistant to the Dean, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, May 6, 1970.

[2] See Appendix.

responsible for almost all doctoral degrees in the province of Ontario as indeed were the other two universities for their own respective areas. Quebec was not included as this is principally a French-speaking area with programs geared to its own particular system. The fourth university visited, the University of Manitoba, was chosen because it provided an excellent example of an institution with a new program, and one which, therefore, would provide an insight into the realities of launching a new area of study. No doctoral programs in education were reported in the other provinces.

The purpose of the study was to understand the Canadian scene from a Canadian frame of reference, and to follow the reasoning, the objectives and the hopes underlying an individual program. Hopefully from such an analysis, an educator might gain a wider perspective with which to view his own program both critically and constructively.

Each of the universities visited emphasized excellence of quality of the graduates of the programs as a basic underlying philosophy. The thinking behind this stance appeared to be two-fold: first, that true leadership and genuine innovation in the field of education were dependent upon high quality preparation; second, and closely tied to the previous tenet, was the strong belief that an institution was measured by the quality of its graduates. If in any way the public's confidence was lost by virtue of mediocre or poor quality graduates, the university itself had failed to meet its obligation to the community it served.

The foregoing remarks should not be interpreted as implying that manpower needs were either relegated to a level of no importance or as being minor in the blind pursuit of excellence. A strong realization existed that society is placing an ever-increasing pressure upon the institutions to produce more and more graduates of advanced degrees and justifiably so, but there was also a strong and unified belief that resources and personnel should not be overextended merely to participate in the numbers game. Such a venture was seen to be self-defeating. It is against this background that the actual number of graduates of doctoral programs in education must be viewed.

Since the inception of the program at the University of Alberta in 1957 six students have been awarded Ed.D. degrees and 148 Ph.D. degrees. In 1969-70, however, there were 16 candidates for the Ph.D. and a further 99 full-time graduate students with provisional status.[3] A similar picture was seen at OISE. The number completing the Ph.D. in 1968-69 appeared as a modest nine, but this represented a marked increase over the previous year. Add to this the 120 Ph.D. and two Ed.D. candidates enrolled as daytime students in the same academic year, and the trend was markedly clear.[4] When it is understood that OISE opened its doors to students as recently as 1965-66 the growth pattern has been spectacular by any standards. The University of British Columbia was able to report a parallel development to the two examples cited above, but the belief in excellence of preparation remained the overwhelming priority.

Another theme was noted in each of the institutions visited, the awarding of the degrees through the Faculty of Graduate Studies with the responsibility for instruction being placed in the Faculty of Education. This applied whether a Ph.D. or an Ed.D. was awarded. The degree itself was no guide as to its origin. The Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia for example, prepared students for the Ed.D. but the degree itself was conferred by the Faculty of Graduate Studies. There was no indication that the administration of the doctoral program should be otherwise, and it can be safely assumed that a shift from this practice is not anticipated in the foreseeable future.

ADMISSION PROCEDURES

Entry to the doctoral program in education generally followed traditional lines. The usual criteria of previously awarded degrees,

---

[3]Letter from Mrs. M. Cameron, Assistant to the Dean, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, May 6, 1970.

[4]George E. Flower, *Progress, Problems and Prospects*: A Report of the Coordinator of Graduate Studies. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education: Toronto, Ontario. 1970. pp. 5-8.

scores on standardized tests, letters of recommendation, and previous experience provided distinct and significant weighting in the admission of a student. Although some administrators expressed reservation as to strict adherence to these criteria, it was generally conceded that each individual case was judged upon its own merits. In certain instances the prospective student was required to demonstrate the level of his area interest prior to acceptance to the doctoral program. This was strongly in evidence at the University of Alberta where the team approach of faculty and students in joint research pursuits was emphasized.[5] Also stressed at the University of Alberta in the educational psychology department was the need for the prospective student to have shown evidence of good writing ability, either through a Master's degree *with* a thesis, or by articles published in reputable journals.[6]

Turning specifically to previously awarded degrees, a Master's degree with first class performance in the area of speciality from an acceptable university was the standard point of entry to doctoral study. This degree generally meant a Master's degree in education. There were, of course, a number of other acceptable channels, the most common of which was the Bachelor of Education degree and a fifth year of university study plus a minimum of two years of teaching experience. This statement can be very misleading as the Bachelor of Education degree means very different programs from one province of Canada to another as well as from one institution to another. In Manitoba, for example, it is a two year degree in education after the first degree (probably taken in Arts and Sciences) whereas in British Columbia the B.Ed. is a first degree in education covering four years in the case of elementary education. However, such degree

[5]Interview with Dean Henry Kreisel and Dr. E. D. Hodgson, Faculty of Graduate Studies, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, May 4, 1970.

[6]Interview with Dr. Bernard R. Corman, Chairman, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, May 4, 1970.

holders may *not* be admitted to a graduate degree without a fifth year of studies. A general guideline, however, appeared to be for the prospective student to have successfully completed five years of university work as an absolute minimum, to which must be added a number of other requirements. It went without saying that when such students were admitted to the program, they would be required to meet a number of prerequisite courses through make-up study. This would ensure bringing their studies into line with those of students already holding the M.Ed. degree.

An Honours Degree in a field other than education sometimes permitted a channel of entry, provided the applicant had at least two years' teaching experience. In such circumstances the first year of the doctorate would be in line with the Master's degree and the program would require an additional two years. The University of British Columbia, however, in some programs stressed the necessity for at least one year of teacher education for an entrant to the doctoral program.

All the institutions visited made use of standardized scholastic aptitude test scores. The two most commonly used were the Miller's Analogies Test and the Aptitude Test of the Graduate Record Examination. In either or both cases, the institutions did not apply any cut-off point for entrance requirements, but examined an individual's score as a guideline for predicting the suitability or otherwise of an applicant for advanced graduate study.

As has been indicated above, experience carried with it a definite importance in the whole admission process. Generally teacher education was not enough and applicants were required to back their academic qualifications with evidence of minimum periods, often two years, in the teaching field. Nevertheless, there was some definite indication that everything possible was done to avoid rigidity and that individual experience, both in related and other fields, would be evaluated on its respective merits. As an example, at the University of British Columbia "experience" for a research major may well be deemed to have been met by successful research assistantship experience. For the future school

business administrator, "experience" could be several years in hospital administration. Some educators expressed the belief that different but rich experiences in fields other than education could bring fresh ideas and a new perspective, which for the most part could result only in a positive contribution. Therefore, they concluded that admission procedures, which clung too closely to a rigid definition of experience as a major criterion, would result in the loss of prospective high calibre students.[7]

A final note on the admission process – to reiterate excellence above an overextension of personnel and resources - it must be understood that Canadian universities stress admission to doctoral programs as being based upon vacancies in specific fields for which students have applied. By following this standard, it was contended that the excellence of programs will not become diluted by sheer weight of numbers thereby sacrificing quality for quantity. As illustrative of this statement, at the University of British Columbia admission to the doctoral program was seen as a three-level process: first, a university-wide process; second, a faculty process; and third, a departmental process. All three levels have to approve before an applicant is accepted. This approach was basically true of the other three institutions visited.

PROGRAMS OF STUDY

Course work: Naturally it is very difficult to make a general statement on the courses of study followed in doctoral programs, but there was a consensus that course work at this level should be kept to a minimum. There were understandable variations from department to department, and from university to university, but required course work was confined almost entirely to the first year of study. In cases where prerequisites had not been met and make-up study was required, this would very naturally extend

[7]Interview with Drs. G. M. Chronister and W. J. Hartrick, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, British Columbia, May 5, 1970.

into the second year. This statement points to the fact that the time required to complete the doctorate was dependent upon the student's progress. At the University of Alberta a student with a bachelor's degree required a minimum of three academic years in study and research, two of which had to be in residence. Holders of the Master's degree required at least two academic years in study and research in residence.[8] This pattern was closely adhered to by the other universities. OISE required two academic years of full-time residence study beyond the University of Toronto M.A. or equivalent;[9] the University of Manitoba stated a minimum of fourteen consecutive months or two academic years as a full-time student beyond the Master's;[10] the University of British Columbia normally required a minimum of three winter sessions at the University. In the latter case, where students entered with a Master's degree (or equivalent), the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies might reduce this period.[11]

To return to the emphasis upon a minimum of course work, it should be stressed that the seminar provided a large proportion of the time spent in formal study. The rationale behind this approach lay in the firm conviction that the advanced graduate student was not only a mature, thinking, and experienced individual, but was a person who was deserving of much more than being a passive listener to a content-loaded lecture. It would

---

[8]The University of Alberta, *Faculty of Graduate Studies Calendar 1969-70,* Edmonton, Alberta. p. 203.2 and 203.3.

[9]The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, *OSIE Bulletin: Graduate Degrees in Education, University of Toronto,* Toronto, Ontario. p. 27.

[10]University of Manitoba, *A Proposal to Reactivate the Ph.D. Program in the Faculty of Education,* Winnipeg, Manitoba, November 1968. p. 2.

[11]The University of British Columbia, *The Faculty of Graduate Studies Calendar 1970-71,* Vancouver, British Columbia. p. 05.

be incorrect, however, to suggest there is not content to be mastered at the doctoral level. At the University of British Columbia the departments of educational administration, special education and mathematics education to name but three, point strongly to the necessity of mastering content at the advanced levels. Nevertheless, the seminar as an integral part of advanced graduate study is much in evidence. A striking example was that required by all educational administration majors at the University of Alberta. This was conducted on an interdisciplinary basis with two or more staff, often with joint appointments in both the Faculties of Education and Arts and Sciences. The staff were faculty members from the departments of educational administration, psychology, political science, sociology and economics. This allowed a wide viewing of given issues from varied frames of reference and experience. Students have been found to make outstanding contributions to learning experiences of this type. All, including faculty participants, were regarded as equal partners and it was claimed that members of staff were placed upon their mettle and were forced to strive for survival in the give-and-take of true debate.[12] Much stress was given to this type of learning experience, and variations of the seminar described above were noted in each of the institutions visited. Not only was the seminar emphasized because of the reasons cited, but because of the underlying belief that prospective graduates needed to become issue-oriented and to develop fundamental principles with which to face new and strange situations. In addition, it was argued that such learning experiences provided a sound training ground for the development of decision-making skills. It would be only fair to mention that not all educators interviewed were convinced of the value of these seminars. Some felt that many students regarded these as generally fruitless experiences, and there was also some indication that the more sought-after professors in sociology and political science were gradually withdrawing their participation in these interdisciplinary exercises.

[12]Interview with Dean Kreisel and Dr. E. D. Hodgson.

One final comment upon formal course work is the investigation of this area revealed a standard pattern, even though discernible variations between departments were easy to note. Whether the student was carrying a major and two minors at OISE, whether he was an education administration major at the University of Manitoba, or if he followed an interdisciplinary program with the department of educational administration at the University of Alberta, the related course work was not rigidly prescribed but had to be contributory to the candidate's program. In this manner the student's individual needs were given consideration.

Examinations: Again there was no spectacular deviation from a general pattern. Course work was examined at the end of the session, and at other appropriate times, and the student was required to demonstrate a level of competence consistent with standards expected of advanced graduate students.

Comprehensive examinations, both written and oral, were intended to test the student's grasp of his chosen field as a whole. At the University of Manitoba this normally takes place toward the end of the first academic year, a practice also followed by the University of Alberta. The University of British Columbia required the student to present himself for this examination at the conclusion of all required course work. All institutions followed the practice of having the candidate's committee setting and grading the examination compatible with departmental policies. The University of Alberta, however, set a written comprehensive examination covering the major field with a separate oral candidacy examination. The latter may be taken at the same time as the comprehensive examination, but the usual pattern is for the student to present his proposal for research at the candidacy examination, whereas the comprehensive examination normally comes toward the end of the first year's residence. In any event, the candidacy examination must be completed at least six months before graduation.[13] At the University of

[13]University of Alberta, Faculty of Education Circular.

Manitoba a candiate may not present himself more than twice for the candidacy examination.[14]

A final oral examination, after the candidate's thesis has been approved, was standard practice. Although the main emphasis of questioning was based largely on the research carried out by the candidate, he normally had to be prepared to answer questions on his major field and on related fields, particularly when the latter had a definite and distinct significance upon the research reported in his thesis.

Committees: A word on the candidate's committee would be appropriate at this point. In all the institutions visited there appeared to be a uniform setting up of the committee, first to screen and direct the student's program including the acceptance of a research proposal, and then to act as an examining body at the comprehensive and final examinations. This committee normally comprised a minimum of three persons (at the University of British Columbia there was a minimum of five), one of whom was the candidate's adviser in the major field. This person acted as chairman. In addition, there were at least two other persons, one of whom came from a faculty other than the Faculty of Education. This faculty member normally represented the ancillary or minor field. There was, therefore, nothing unusual in the formation of committees, but the Canadian scene did produce a distinct although by no means unique feature. This was the appointment to the thesis committee of an external examiner. It was felt that not only did this ensure an impartial viewing of the candidate's work, but it also provided an external evaluation of a department itself and helped to maintain a standard of quality. Generally the external examiner read the thesis and made his evaluation, which was then submitted to the examining board. Though not obliged to, the external examiner

[14]University of Manitoba, *Faculty of Graduate Studies Calendar 1969-70*, Winnipeg, Manitoba, 1969. p. 20.

was very often present on campuses at the request and expense of the particular department. In the case of the University of Alberta, however, he was actually invited to the campus to be present for the final oral examination. As the external examiner was usually a person of stature within his own field, this permitted the university to have access to his expertise during his stay on campus by having him participate in seminars or make a presentation in addition to his examining role. There was little doubt that the concept of the external examiner was well-established, and there was a firm belief that such a role could only add to the calibre of the program.[15]

Internships: Internship programs, whereby a candidate might extend his practical xperience, were beginning to emerge strongly. At the time of the survey these were restricted to the area of administration, but there was some suggestion that they could well expand into other fields. At the University of Alberta the internship in school administration was normally of one year duration and was generally taken between the first and second years of the program.[16] The form an internship took was varied but a genuine attempt was made to place the intern in a position closely related to that of his employment. The purpose was to develop marketable skills which could lead to effective decision-making. Where a candidate's background of experience was such as to be considered adequate, it was unlikely that he would be required to undergo a period of internship.

Research Dissertation: The dissertation or thesis is an integral and major part of the research doctorate, the emphasis not being as great with practical or professional degrees. At no institution was it given a proportional weighting by some measure such as a certain number of credit hours. Even in those U. S. institutions

---

[15]This view was unanimous among all the persons interviewed.

[16]University of Alberta, Faculty of Education, Circular on Doctoral Program in Educational Administration p. 3.

where a number of credit hours was allocated to the dissertation, this has never been the intent, but a certain psychological framework has been established whereby course work might come to be regarded as a major aspect of doctoral study. As a result the thesis might then be seen as an appendage, and some have suggested that it is this thinking that has contributed to the large number of A. B. D's (All but the dissertation) leaving universities each year. The Canadian university, from the moment the prospective student applies for admission to the program, attempts to make it clear that all else is contributory to the research; whatever course work, seminar, or internship is part of the student's program, this is required by way of preparation for his research project. As indicated above, the departments with a practical or professional leaning do not stress this as much as in the case of research doctorates.

At each of the institutions visited, the research project was seen as serving one of the twin purposes of the pure researcher or the practitioner. It was not suggested that a clear dichotomy existed but rather that each was complementary to the other. In general terms, however, two types of research did emerge. First, the clean, tight experimental study which was often characteristic of educational psychology departments but was by no means confined to them and which should not be interpreted as being the only form of research undertaken by them. Although the emphasis upon this form of research project no longer dominated the scene, the view that the experimental study provides a sound apprenticeship for research study remained strong. Further evidence of this was noted at the University of British Columbia where educational administration candidates preparing for research careers in organizational science may specialize in organizational laboratory research techniques. Second, there was a growing awareness of the role that might be played by what may be loosely termed "the practitioner research project." In this area there was marked and understandable determination to avoid the ever-present danger of moving into fields which might be considered somewhat less than "scholarly" and certainly as not contributing to the advancement of knowledge. A definite shift to the participant-observer with its anthropological base, was to

be noted in research proposals now being put forward for approval. A number of instances of this approach were cited at the University of British Columbia, but this trend was not confined to this institution.[17]

Probably nothing illustrated more graphically the importance of the research project than the emphasis placed upon the approval of the research proposal. Each univeristy followed its own approach but a common theme did emerge, that of an early approval of the research study. At the University of Manitoba a detailed plan of study was drawn up for the applicant "describing the minimum time for the completion of the degree, course work to be taken, foreign language requirements, and indicating, in general terms, the research project on which the thesis would be based."[18] This plan had to be approved by the Graduate Studies Office as soon as possible after the student was accepted, although not necessarily before registration. During the second half of the first year, doctoral students were advised that a research proposal should be approved within the following four months and, in any event, that approval had to be established before the final year of study could begin.

The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education followed a similar pattern. The student had to declare his field of research for his thesis as early as possible in his first year of study beyond the Master's. In addition, the precise topic had to be submitted by October 10 of the final year of required residence. Failure to meet this requirement resulted in no residence credit for the academic year. As indicated earlier, the University of Alberta laid particular stress upon the student's field of research lying within the demonstrated competence of the faculty to ensure a group approach. This in effect meant that a very serious evaluation of the proposed line of research had been undertaken before the

---

[17]Interview with Drs. G. M. Chronister and W. J. Hartrick.

[18]University of Manitoba: *Faculty of Graduate Studies Bulletin* 1969-70. Winnipeg, Manitoba, p. 19.

student was accepted to the program. This would naturally have the result of focusing the applicant's attention upon what was to become the major and most important part of his program of study, that of the dissertation. Here again the student was expected to take the initiative and begin developing, under supervision of his adviser, his written research proposal during the first year of his study. It was specifically laid down that the proposal be suitably developed before the candidate took the oral candidacy examination. A very similar procedure was followed by many departments at the University of British Columbia.

A closely related question to the matter of a research proposal was the number of full-time faculty qualified to direct doctoral dissertations. The University of Alberta reported that in 1968-69 90 members of faculty were so qualified, but this did not include faculty from the department of industrial and vocational education which as yet has not been authorized to offer a doctoral degree. A number of these were qualified but did not appear in the total because of the present status of their department.[19] The number itself did not represent any magic and there was a strong feeling at the University of Alberta that a designation of staff as graduate and undergraduate faculty was not desirable. A teacher was regarded as qualified or not dependent upon expertise and experience, and not by the level of classes he happened to teach. It was felt that a recent recipient of the Ph.D. and a junior member of faculty could be admirably qualified by virtue of his recently-acquired competence to direct a doctoral dissertation. Obviously, soundly based criteria as to competence in this area were required and this was apparent in each of the four institutions.

Length of Program: A maximum time period to fulfill the requirements of the program has been established in all cases. The

[19]Letter from Mrs. M. Cameron, Assistant to the Dean, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, May 6, 1970.

University of British Columbia placed a maximum of six winter sessions, while the University of Manitoba stated an eight year[20] deadline from the date of acceptance as a Ph.D. candidate. OISE fixed the outer limit as six years from first enrollment or seven years when advanced study had not been granted for the M.A. or equivalent.[21] The University of Alberta, as did the others, evaluated a student's progress at various critical points in the program, and although no maximum period was stated, the implication that credit did not extend beyond a reasonable period was present.

Foreign Language Requirement: There was strong evidence that the foreign language requirement was losing ground. Many educators expressed the view that the study of a foreign language should be determined by the needs of the individual student. The presence of the foreign language within a candidate's program was NOT to be a token but should be closely related to the program. As an example, a student whose research topic covered the historical development of elementary education in Quebec, would of necessity have to understand French well in order to make productive use of the documents available in that province. All in all, the language requirement varied from department to department. The University of Alberta did not require this barrier except on a basis of individual need, but even within its own Faculty of Education, the department of secondary education required students to demonstrate competence in one foreign language. Likewise the University of Manitoba expected Ph.D. candidates in educational administration to demonstrate a reading knowledge of one language in addition to English – the minimum standard to be demonstrated was that of the province grade XII examination level of French.[22] The University of British

[20]University of British Columbia, *Faculty of Graduate Studies Calendar 1970-71,* Vancouver, British Columbia. p. 05.

[21]*OISE Bulletin 1970-71, Graduate Degrees in Education,* University of Toronto, 1971, Toronto, Ontario. p. 28.

[22]University of Manitoba, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Administration Memo to 1st Year Doctoral Candidates. 1970.

Columbia looked to the student and his needs in the decision to show competence in this area. At OISE it was pointed out that a thesis committee may require a language skill for the purpose of research in a particular area. There was no formal procedure determining whether competence had to be demonstrated in an examination or not, the general belief being that the quality of the completed dissertation would reflect the adequacy with which the candidate had acquired his knowledge. The question of waiving the language requirement in favor of statistics and/or computer skills did not really arise because here again the candidate was judged finally upon his ability to conduct research. Where such skills were required, their presence or absence would be revealed in the quality of the research study produced. With a rigorous evaluation of the product, it was extremely unlikely that a candidate could succeed, should these tools be absent or of poor quality.[23]

AREAS OF STUDY OFFERED

The following areas of study were offered for doctoral programs in the four institutions:

Educational administration including higher education
Educational foundations
Educational psychology
Counselor education and research
Elementary education
Secondary education
Adult education
Mathematics education
Music education
Science education
Reading education
Applied psychology

[23] *OISE Bulletin 1970-71*, op. cit.

Computer applications
Curriculum
Educational planning
History and philosophy of education
Measurement and evaluation
Sociology in education
Special education

It can be readily appreciated that a good deal of overlap did occur under this nomenclature. As an example, educational foundations normally embraced such areas as history and philosophy of education, sociology of education, and in the case of the inter-disciplinary program at the University of Alberta, this also included comparative and international education as well as community development. Similarly departments of educational psychology included counselor education, special education, measurement and evaluation, and research where these did not exist as separate entities. An interesting and unique department at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education was that of educational planning but it would be wrong to assume that this particular facet of education was not covered by other institutions. In such cases, the student's individual need was met by exposure to that field as required by his research study. The department of educational administration was the one most likely to be concerned with planning and as such would interpret and meet that need as it arose.

When a Faculty of Education embarks upon a doctoral program, there is inevitably a decision to be made on which fields to introduce first. The Canadian universities appeared to have followed tradition in this respect for the University of Alberta began its program in 1957 with departments of educational administration and educational psychology. The department of educational psychology at the University of Alberta had been in existence long before 1957. Listings of graduate studies at the Master's level date back until 1934. The department of educational administration, where the first Ph.D. was produced, was created in 1957. Administration had formerly been offered as part of the department of secondary education. Likewise the

University of Manitoba, the newcomer to the field, began with educational administration. The rationale behind this choice was well-founded for it is leadership in administration which probably has the most impact in the educational field. An equally compelling argument can be forwarded in defense of an early introduction in doctoral programs of educational psychology, for it attempts to provide the understanding of the basic principles underlying the teaching-learning process.

That the newer fields were not being neglected was in strong evidence with the introduction of separate departments of educational planning and computer applications at the Ontario Institute of Studies in Education. At the University of Alberta these areas were handled through the Division of Research Services. Adult and higher education have also made their appearances at the University of British Columbia (although not at a departmental level) as well as at OISE. An interesting trend, which has been noted at the University of British Columbia, was that its departments of mathematics education and science education were attracting numbers of students who otherwise might have followed their respective disciplines through the Faculties of Arts and Sciences. In part this development may be explained in terms of lessening opportunity in their own fields and in part because of greater incentives to enter the field of teaching, but within their chosen field of interest. In any event it is contended that the teaching profession may be the richer for the higher calibre of entering students.[24]

One final note of caution is against too strict an interpretation of departmental titles. As an example, although the University of British Columbia was the only institution to report a doctoral program in reading education, this should not be taken to mean that this was the only program undertaking this course of study. Such work was available elsewhere although it might come under

[24]Interview with Dr. C. E. Smith, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, May 6, 1970.

a different administrative umbrella. The reading program at the University of Alberta was not only alive and well, but was highly regarded on the international scene.

STUDENT SUPPORT

Financial consideration from the student viewpoint plays a major role in any doctoral program. In this regard doctoral students in Canadian universities may be regarded as having a number of attractive opportunities open to them. Assistantships, teaching, research and service, as well as fellowships may be applied for and students at the doctoral level naturally have a distinct advantage over other graduate students. The awards are earned both in kind and in amount of financial support. As an example, OISE reported financial awards ranging from $500 to $6000,[25] but it would probably be more accurate to speak in terms of University of Manitoba graduate fellowships which carried a stipend of $3000 for the calendar year or $2000 for the winter session.[26] Teaching assistantships provided $2000 for the winter session while $1200 was the award for a research assistantship. An interesting feature of the University of Alberta awards to full-time graduate teaching assistants was the consideration given to travel. This was on a graduated scale based upon distance by the most direct route to take up the appointment. There was no travel grant up to 999 miles but this moved from $50 at the 1000 mile mark up to $250 for 5000 miles or more. The University of Alberta reported graduate teaching assistantships up to $3600 for the academic year and tuition remission. Service assistantships offered similar remuneration, while research assistantships carried $2400 for the first academic year and

[25] *OISE Bulletin 1970-71.* op. cit. p. 12.

[26] University of Manitoba, *Faculty of Graduate Studies Calendar,* op. cit. p. 21.

$2800 in subsequent years with tuition remission.[27] The remission of tuition amounted to approximately $500 per year at each of the institutions. The basic fees reported were:[28]

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education	$475	(1970-71)
University of British Columbia	$457	(1970-71)
University of Manitoba	$475	(1969-70)
University of Alberta	$500	(1969-70)

As a general statement, it might be said that doctoral students were financially well supported in their studies, the educational psychology department at the University of Alberta reporting that more than 70% of its students received assistance.[29]

HOUSING

Housing is a prime consideration for the advanced graduate student, particularly when he is a married man with a family. The availability of adequate housing can become a major factor in his choice of institution. Both the University of British Columbia with its family housing center at Acadia Park and the University of Alberta's Michener Park have moved significantly to meet this need.[30, 31] Although off-campus housing was obtainable in all

---

[27]University of Alberta, Faculty of Graduate Studies Memo, *Regulations Governing Graduate Assistantships, Scholarships and Fellowships.* Edmonton, Alberta, March 20, 1969. pp. 2-4.

[28]These tuition fees are quoted from the respective institution's calendars.

[29]Interview with Dr. Bernard R. Corman, May 4, 1970.

[30]University of Alberta, Public Relations Office, *Michener Park: The University of Alberta's Pioneering Housing Development for Married Students*, Edmonton, Alberta. November 6, 1967.

[31]University of British Columbia, *Faculty of Graduate Studies Calendar 1970-71*, op. cit. p. 013-014.

university centers, there was little doubt that the out-of-town students had a very real concern, and were attracted by the prospects of easily accessible housing.

MISCELLANEOUS

Certain aspects of the doctoral programs in education arose during the course of the interviews. These included discussion of the relative merits of the Ed.D. and the Ph.D., the roles of new degrees, and general problems of administering programs. These will be discussed in turn.

First, the whole problem of the nomenclature of the doctoral degree in education was virtually clear-cut. The Universities of Manitoba and Alberta awarded almost entirely Ph.D.'s in this area and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education had given notice that the Ed.D. was being phased out of the program with no new candidates being accepted. In each of the three institutions, it was felt that no useful purpose was being served by conferring different titles to degrees which were basically identical in content. This was understandable when it was realized that all programs were administered by the Graduate Studies section of the university – the Faculty of Education providing the instruction. In addition, with little or no emphasis upon foreign language requirements except as to individual need, any further distinction between the respective degrees had been practically erased. The University of British Columbia, on the other hand, awarded the Ed.D. for doctoral students in educational administration *only* if a candidate was on a program leading to the practice of administration. If, however, the candidate was on a research program then a joint Ph.D. with a specific social science department was conferred. This in effect meant that the Ed.D. was exclusively reserved for practicing administrators, while all research degrees were interdisciplinary. As an example, a Ph.D. could be conferred in education and sociology or in education and political science.

Closely associated with the nomenclature of degrees was the question of whether other degrees might be more appropriate for different specialities. Even at the University of Toronto where the M. Phil. degree had been introduced for the purpose of preparing college teachers as distinct from the pure research student with his Ph.D., there was a consensus against a proliferation of degrees. One particularly interesting and constructive comment was that rather than produce an array among degrees, the true line of reform should be a greater flexibility within Ph.D. programs themselves. The degree itself was widely accepted as the entrance to college teaching and research, and the feeling was that it should remain so, with the provision that some of its rigidity should give way to a realistic assessment of needs. Expressing this in another way, it was felt that the basic need was for Ph.D.'s with a wider framework for applied scholarship. This would not only permit the student to develop his program without serious and unnecessary restriction, but the demands of society for graduates of advanced degrees in education would be satisfactorily met. If individuals were desirous of following specialities to a greater sophistication and refinement, post-doctoral degrees in an ever-changing environment might be more appropriate. The aim, however, remained to provide an advanced graduate degree with great flexibility and a high degree of marketability, and the feeling was that that degree should be the Ph.D.[32]

One final comment on the administration of doctoral programs. As these programs expand and more and more areas of concentration emerge, certain built-in hazards begin to appear. While it was agreed that decentralization offered the most constructive channel along which to direct expansion (for each department remained both the most appropriate and most competent to plan its growth), the danger of compartmentalization and over-specialization was not to be underestimated. In addition, problems of coordination as among and between

[32]Interview with Dr. George E. Flower, Coordinator of Graduate Studies, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, April 29, 1970.

departments can become heightened in this situation. OISE has attempted to improve coordination and articulation of programs throughout the Institute by the setting up of a Graduate Studies Committee representing all departments' and including student representatives. All reports indicated that this committee has handled its assignment to good effect and there was every hope that it would continue to contribute positively to a quality program.[33]

In summary, it appeared on the surface to this investigator that doctoral programs in professional education in Canada have been established upon a firm foundation. While pressures both from within and without the universities called for an increasing number of advanced degree graduates, those educators interviewed appeared to have a sound grasp of the problems to be encountered. Their concern lay particularly in the maintenance of quality programs, and it was from this perspective that nearly all administrative problems were viewed. Nevertheless there appeared to be some inherent danger in the selectivity for doctoral programs. An impression was given that low enrollment and retention rates provided a built-in guarantee for quality programs. Very little evidence was offered to demonstrate that such an assumption could not be challenged. While it may be true that an institution can in part be judged by the quality of its graduates, it remains an insufficient factor to point to the positions of leadership held by those graduates as proof of the effectiveness of doctoral programs. In many instances this may well be that these positions were open only to doctorate holders in the first place and, as such, became part of a self-fulfilling prophecy. This offered no measure as to the effectiveness of the doctoral preparation and its impact upon leadership and innovation in the field. Closely allied with the above observation was the apparent paucity of truly systematic evaluation of doctoral programs

---

[33]George E. Flower, *Progress, Problems, and Progress:* Report of the Coordinator of Graduate Studies. The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Ontario. 1970 p. 13.

themselves. Again the selection procedures appeared to emphasize the hurdles to be surmounted as the principal means of determining standards for quality doctoral preparation. There appeared little evidence to suggest that the various stages of preparation were closely associated with desired terminal behavior of the student where indeed the latter was defined. The conferring of the doctorate in many instances seemed to be an end in itself and the receipient of the degree was assumed to be adequately equipped to deal with the great diversity of problems which would face him in the field. It would be extremely unfair of this investigator to suggest that the many educators he interviewed were not aware of this need to base evaluation upon genuine and valid criteria and along systematic lines, but there was little evidence that evaluation of this nature was being undertaken. There was much that was positive in each of the institutions visited. For this reason there would seem to be a definite obligation and responsibility to maintain quality and improve programs through systematic evaluation.

APPENDIX

The following persons were interviewed during the investigator's visit to Canadian institutions of higher education offering doctoral programs in professional education.

George E. Flower – Coordinator of Graduate Studies, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Ontario – April 29, 1970.

John M. Brown – Dean of the Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba – April 30, 1970.

John W. Peach – Director of Graduate Studies and Professional Development, Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba – April 30, 1970.

Henry Kreisel – Senior Associate Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta – May 4, 1970.

Bernard E. Walker – Chairman, Department of Educational Foundations, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta – May 4, 1970.

Gordon L. Mowat – Chairman, Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta – May 4, 1970.

Bernard R. Corman – Chairman, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta – May 4, 1970.

Henry T. Coutts – Dean, College of Education, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta – May 4, 1970.

Mrs. M. Cameron – Assistant to the Dean, College of Education, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta – May 4, 1970.

E. D. Hodgson – Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta – May 4, 1970.

Neville V. Scarfe – Dean of the Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia – May 5, 1970.

C. E. Smith – Associate Dean of the Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia – May 5, 1970.

G. M. Chronister – Director of Graduate Studies, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia – May 5, 1970.

W. J. Hartrick – Professor of Educational Administration, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia – May 5, 1970.

K. F. Argue – Professor of Philosophy of Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia – May 5, 1970.