DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 309 HE 033 063

AUTHOR Wilcox, Susan
TITLE Learning from Our Past: The History of Educational Development in Canadian Universities. Occasional Papers in Higher Education Number 8. Occasional Paper Series.
INSTITUTION Manitoba Univ., Winnipeg. Centre for Higher Education Research and Development.; Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, North York, (Ontario).
ISBN ISBN-1-896732-15-1
PUB DATE 1997-00-00
NOTE 42p.
AVAILABLE FROM Centre for Higher Education Research and Development, The University of Manitoba, 220 Sinnott Building, 70 Dysart Road, Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2, Canada; Tel: 204-474-8309; Fax: 204-474-7607.
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; *Educational Development; Educational History; Educational Improvement; *Faculty Development; Foreign Countries; *Higher Education; Historiography; Inservice Education; *Instructional Development; Oral History; Primary Sources; Professional Training; *Program Development; Research and Development Centers
IDENTIFIERS *Canada; Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education; McGill University (Canada); Ontario University System

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the evolution over three decades of the educational development (ED) movement in Canada. An informal history of ED was constructed, using published documents about ED and personal interviews with 8 educational developers who played key roles in programs and ED centers; e-mail responses were received from ten other developers. Five "critical" scenes in the early story of ED are identified: the opening in 1969 of the McGill University (Canada) Centre for University Teaching and Learning; the activities of the Professional Orientation Committee (1970-80); the Ontario University Program in Instructional Development (1973-80); founding of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education; and the Canadian Society for Studies in Higher Education (1969-). The paper goes on to examine the growth and expansion of educational development, and (1) reviews three separate eras of ED unit openings; (2) changes in program development over time; and (3) changes in perceptions, attitudes, and activities of developers. It also identifies important issues that underlie the movement, including concerns about competence; the role of the developer; and concerns about ED as an accepted and legitimate activity in universities. (Contains 12 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 443 309

CENTRE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

OCCASIONAL PAPERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION
Number 8

LEARNING FROM OUR PAST: THE HISTORY OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

Occasional Paper Series

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. GREGOR
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

OCCASIONAL PAPERS
IN HIGHER EDUCATION
Number 8

LEARNING FROM OUR PAST: THE HISTORY OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

COPYRIGHT © 1997

CENTRE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
and

STLHE SAPES

Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education
La société pour l'avancement de la pédagogie dans l'enseignement supérieur

ISBN # 1-896732-15-1

OCCASIONAL PAPERS
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

OCCASIONAL PAPERS
IN HIGHER EDUCATION
Number 8

LEARNING FROM OUR PAST: THE HISTORY OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

Susan Wilcox

Instructional Development Centre
Queen's University

Series Editor
Alexander D. Gregor

Copyright © 1997
Centre for Higher Education Research and Development
The University of Manitoba
and

Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education
La société pour l'avancement de la pédagogie dans l'enseignement supérieur

FOREWORD

The **Occasional Papers in Higher Education** series was initiated by the Centre for Higher Education Research and Development at The University of Manitoba as a means of bringing into the realm of wider public consideration reports on the development of significant research projects and programs. It is hoped that the discussion prompted by these reports will serve not only to enhance the on-going research itself, but also to bring the emerging studies and findings to a wider constituency of scholars and practitioners. The comment has been frequently made that the literature related to the critically important area of Canadian higher education is too sparse and too inaccessible. In presenting these reports on the work of leading scholars in the field, the **Occasional Papers in Higher Education** series hopes to contribute in some measure to addressing that problem.

It is a particular pleasure in the case of this issue to be able to collaborate with the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE) in publication of Susan Wilcox's very useful study. The Centre for Higher Education Research and Development is itself home to one of the country's oldest faculty development units, and has very much been party to the history and issues which Susan Wilcox so engagingly outlines and analyses. There can be no issue of more immediate importance to the contemporary Canadian university than the quality of its teaching programs; and with this historical overview, Susan Wilcox provides a framework for re-examining the place and activities of the units and professionals who play such a central role in that task.

Alexander Gregor
Series Editor

PREFACE

It is rather unnerving to read a history of events in which one has played a part, and especially so when the historical account is the first ever to be written. For despite the fact that, as Susan Wilcox documents, educational development has existed in Canadian universities for the past 30 years, its growth and influence has been gradual and largely undocumented. Indeed the term educational development itself has only gained currency in the past decade.

I have my say twice in this monograph, for I am not only quoted at some length in Susan's paper, but have also been given this chance to provide these introductory comments. As I began reading my own words and those of my colleagues, George Geis, Charles Pascal, Ron Smith, and Patricia Cranton, I was at first struck by the metaphor of the blind men describing an elephant. We were all there at the beginning and we often worked together; yet there remain subtle differences in our analysis of the salient issues and circumstances, even though I suspect we would all largely agree with Susan Wilcox's interpretation and conclusions.

Although educational development remains a fairly small enterprise it has survived remarkably well and recently even prospered. The author reminds us that Canada was in at the start of the whole movement: the first Canadian university centres were established soon after the very earliest American, British, and Australian units were created. We were also fortunate, I think, that Canada is perhaps less ethnocentric (or more insecure?) than some of our neighbours, and we were willing to import good ideas from wherever they could be found, including the United States, Europe, and Australasia (where educational development took hold more quickly and extensively than anywhere else in the world).

At present a substantial majority of Canadian post-secondary institutions make some provision for the development and enhancement of teaching and learning, in most cases through a dedicated centre, in other cases through a committee of faculty volunteers. Even faculty who have never used the services of a development centre have a rough idea of the activities and programs that they provide.

Quite a lot has changed over the past 20 years. In 1976, I was a psychology professor in Saskatchewan with an interest in teaching. I saw an advertisement from the University of Waterloo soliciting applicants for the newly created position of "Teaching Resource Person". I was intrigued enough to write and ask just what sort of role and responsibilities such a post might entail, and what activities the incumbent might be expected to offer. The Vice-President Academic responded by saying, in effect, "Excellent question! Won't you please give us your ideas."

Nowadays advertisements for educational development unit staff are likely to have a much more detailed job description. At the same time, the issues that preoccupied me in my early days at Waterloo are still major concerns today. They include teaching innovation and educational technology, methods for making learning more active, instructional evaluation, better assessment of students, and preparation of teaching assistants. One recent change is perhaps a greater concern with academic program review and curriculum development, which were largely "off limits" in the past, but today are receiving greater attention because of severe budgetary constraints and increasing calls for universities to be publicly accountable.

So as Canadian educational development enters its third decade, what can we say about it impact on universities? More specifically, have we succeeded in changing the quality of teaching and learning? There is unfortunately little empirical evidence on this question, though Harry Murray (in press), on the basis of data he gathered over many years at the University of Western Ontario, has argued that a combination of regular teaching evaluation and expert advice from educational developers does in fact lead to better instruction.

Measuring the global impact of educational development on an institution or system would be a massive undertaking and, as far as I know, it has never been undertaken either in Canada or elsewhere. And given the small size and resources of educational development units, this situation seems unlikely to change. However, my subjective impression is that educational development has made a difference in Canadian higher education, and I think it is significant that the only national inquiry into university education to take place for many years (Smith 1991) devoted the greatest part of its final report to the quality of undergraduate teaching and the contributions of educational development.

Although I would have difficulty pinpointing cause and effect, I would argue that educational developers have helped promote an approach to teaching which is more thoughtful and methods that are more varied; and they have legitimized conversations about teaching and learning on university campuses. It is true that teaching is still overshadowed by research achievements when it comes to hiring, promotion, and rewards generally (see Knapper 1997), but this is due to factors outside of the control of educational developers — for example, the lack of any national funding agency for instructional development or teaching innovation such as exist in Britain, Australia, and Hong Kong.

Despite its brief history and meagre resources, Canadian educational development has much to be proud of, and this account by Susan Wilcox helps document our achievements and provides a cause for modest celebration. It should also serve to make us reflect on our past and on our goals. Susan reminds us that educational development, like all other academic enterprises, needs the underpinning of a conceptual framework or philosophy. Lest we think we are too busy for such theoretical concerns, it should be pointed out that we all do indeed have a philosophy of development and teaching, even if it is implicit rather than articulated.

Susan Wilcox describes educational development as a movement. It is also on the verge of becoming a profession. For example, in Canada we have our own society (the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education), a journal (the International Journal for Academic Development), and a substantial literature about our practice. However, most educational developers are still self-taught, and have no formal background in pedagogy, which raises the question of what should be a proper preparation for a profession that itself is quick to espouse a systematic and professional approach to teaching. Though we may not yet be ready to follow the British lead in embracing the formal accreditation of educational developers, we should at least be ready to follow the advice we often give to others and become reflective practitioners. Susan Wilcox's account provides a marvellous basis for beginning that process and encouraging us to contemplate our future through reminding ourselves of our roots.

Christopher K. Knapper
Queen's University

References

Knapper, C. K. (in press). Rewards for teaching. In P. Cranton (Ed.), *New directions for teaching and learning: Teaching improvement from an international perspective.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Murray, H. G. (in press). Does evaluation of teaching lead to improvement in teaching? *International Journal of Academic Development.*

Smith, S. L. (1991). R*eport of the Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education.* Ottawa, ON: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.

Learning from Our Past: The History of Educational Development in Canadian Universities

This paper takes a reflective look at the emergence and growth of the educational development movement in Canada, tracing its history in the events and people who were part of that movement. The purpose is to ground contemporary experiences and expectations of educational development in a thorough understanding of the past.

Within higher education, there is an area of work — and a related body of literature and field of scholarship — that focuses on improving the quality of education provided by institutions. In Canadian universities, *instructional development* and *faculty development* are the most commonly used terms for improvement activities and the improvement process. The usual role of the institution/faculty development is to establish and support a unit, or at least a committee, which is responsible for facilitating educational improvement. Instructional/faculty developers are usually academics who take on the role of planning and providing programs, services, and activities for the colleagues and institutions. Since the overall intention of this work is to improve the quality of education through a development process, in this paper I refer to it as *educational development.*

Educational development (ED) arose at a particular period in time, in response to certain conditions specific university settings, and was promoted by individuals with particular backgrounds, skills and interests. It was shaped by those times, locations, persons and conditions. By reflecting on the course of ED over the years, and identifying some themes apparent in that history, we can discover the origins of our current expectations for educational development, and decide whether the reasons for ED programs and approaches to ED practice are still relevant and appropriate. An historical record of events can provide a broader perspective on the current situation. Less grandly, a narrative of key events in the growth of this field and information about the key players is just plain interesting and informative.

I am a practising educational developer trying to make sense of my work. Another reason I had for undertaking this project was to extend the range of research strategies available to me as a practitioner for examining and improving my practice. I wanted to explore

the usefulness of *critical historiography* for coming to understand the meaning of ED and for my own development. Educational development is continually re-imagined and re-created by the individuals who play the role of educational developer. I anticipated that a review of the history of ED work would be useful to me and my educational development colleagues in a number of ways. For example, it could:

- help educational developers anchor plans for the future in the reality of our own past experiences and the experiences of our colleagues;
- encourage reflection about assumptions underlying current practices;
- help individual developers put personal experiences in the context of events occurring throughout the field of educational development
- by providing a broader perspective on the purposes and goals of ED, loosen closely-binding ties to immediate demands, specific personalities, and particular situations.

I believe this topic should interest everyone concerned with the role of educational development in efforts to improve the quality of teaching and learning in higher education. Many regular faculty in Canadian universities are unaware that such a thing as educational development exists (sometimes on their own campus!), and newcomers to ED work are often surprised to hear that some Canadian university programs are more than 20 years old. Although I and others cite the Smith report (1991) as if it was the first notable event in terms of attention to teaching at Canadian universities, academics have been quietly working away on campuses across the country to initiate and provide ED programs since the 1960s. After many years of surviving on the margins of our educational institutions, educational development units have in recent years been the locus of considerable activity, actually managing to grow in number and influence in a time of retrenchment. Are these events indicative of new expectations for educational development? If so, how will educational development response to the pressure posed by these new expectations? Educational development faces the immediate and very real challenge of transforming itself so that it can play a meaningful role in the current movement to re-emphasize teaching in postsecondary institutions. A review of the history of educational development may help us meet this challenge; understanding the past can be a springboard for the future.

Method

To a large extent, this has been a participatory research project. My role has been to ask questions and record the answers of others who have intimately involved in development and delivering ED programs since the 1960s. I constructed this informal history from two sources: developers' written records of their work (published documents about ED, and documents recording past ED events/work); and most importantly, the memories of persons who have played key roles in programs and centres, as communicated to

me in conversations with them. In the spring of 1995, I interviewed eight educational developers (interviews of one to four hours duration were taped and transcribed), and a call for assistance through e-mail brought responses from ten additional developers who provided information or anecdotes concerning their experiences. I asked these developers: What did they consider to be key events, people, and documents in the history of educational development in Canada? How did the story of educational development unfold from their perspective? Also, what should I know about the past to help me do educational development work in the present?

All participants were volunteers. The sample was not exhaustive, but it was representative of a variety of perspectives and experiences. I tried to contact people who had had a long history of involvement and who had been involved at more than one site or played a variety of roles as a developer.

I will first describe my findings concerning: a) the origins and critical events in the early history of educational development; and b) the growth and expansion of educational development. I will then discuss some key issues concerning educational development work raised by my study of the historical context for ED work in Canada.

Origins and Critical Events

Educational development is best described as a *movement*, and some of this movement is towards becoming a defined field of study and practice. The origins of the Canadian movement lie in a combination of factors inside and outside Canada. The earliest ED records are those of academics across the country, in the late '60s and early '70s, trying to find out more about educational development — where it was happening, and what shape it was taking. Since the movement developed earlier in Britain, Australia, and the U.S., and was just becoming visible in Europe, there were other places, programs and people to inquire about; people undertook surveys and study tours to track and record the movement. Canada (especially Ontario) traditionally had had close ties with Britain, which naturally made it easier to keep in touch with teaching improvement efforts there; and many of the new faculty (including educational developers) hired in Canada at that time were Americans who undoubtedly were influenced by events in the U.S. So the British and American influences were particularly strong.

A small number of active and vocal faculty played a proactive role in pushing for teaching improvement programs. Individuals who were aware that something called instructional or faculty development existed got the ball rolling in Canada by raising others' awareness and by making openings for ED on the Canadian higher education scene wherever they had influence. Some advocates immediately lobbied for and/or established development services and many others were the driving force behind the formation of committees with a teaching improvement mandate. Some, but not all, of these faculty went on to do educational development work in the programs/units they helped to get

started. Most worked at a local level in their own institutions; while others worked on a bigger stage, trying to influence policy and practice at a provincial or national level.

If there was a single issue in Canada that focused people's attention on educational development at the time, it was the evaluation of teaching. Student evaluation of teaching was one of the first things that ED was expected to address (through related conferences, publications, committee work, institutional programs, etc.), and educational development came to be very closely associated with efforts to assess the teaching competence of faculty members.

There were five critical scenes in the early story of ED in Canada:

1. the opening (in 1969) and early development of McGill University's Centre for University Teaching and Learning;
2. the activities (1970–1980) of the Professional Orientation Committee (later the Teaching Effectiveness Committee) of the Canadian Association for University Teachers (CAUT);
3. the Ontario Universities' Program in Instructional Development (OUPID), 1973–1980;
4. the founding of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE), and the origins of the 3M Teaching Fellowships programs;
5. the existence of the Canadian Society for Studies in Higher Education (CSSHE), 1969– .

Each of these scenes will be discussed in turn after I present some of the stories of the individual developers.

Origins of ED

The origins of ED in Canada are perceived slightly differently by the various educational developers I interviewed, depending on the role they played in that movement. I have selected comments from five developers (Charles Pascal, George Geis, Ronald Smith, Patricia Cranton, and Christopher Knapper) to illustrate a range of views. Although these five are in close agreement with one another regarding the origins of educational development work, each chose to focus on a different aspect of the situation in describing their personal sense of the beginnings of ED in Canada. The five stories nicely illustrate the fact that the community of developers in Canada is a small one; all of the participants in my study have had contact with one another in the course of doing their ED work over the years, and their connections are an important aspect of this history.

Charles Pascal was born and educated in the United States and came to Canada as one of the first staff members for one of the first Canadian educational development units — at McGill University in Montreal. He later went on to direct the Ontario Universities

Program in Instructional Development (OUPID) and to chair the Higher Education Group at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). According to Pascal, the first important events in the story of ED in Canada are those associated with the opening of McGill's unit, reflecting a view that educational development is closely tied with organizational development in institutions.

> *In the late '60s at McGill there were several professors and instructors who were very innovative and who thought undergraduate teaching was far too important to be left to happenstance, and that just having Ph.D.s did not necessarily guarantee that the teaching and learning process would be effective. So people like . . . well there was a mathematician by the name of Donald Kingsbury who was quite innovative in terms of teaching and learning techniques . . . were pressuring the then Vice-Principal of McGill, Michael Oliver. Oliver himself was a fairly progressive individual and was the person who eventually set up the Centre for Learning and Development. Another professor of psychology by the name of Marcel Goldschmid. And then there were people like John Southan who was a young professor of biology, and a professor by the name of David Harp who was a young professor of chemistry. So there was a smattering of quite innovative professors or instructors and there was pressure put on administration to establish some kind of Centre, some enabling vehicle for instructional development, professional development for professors, and that led to the founding of the Centre for Learning and Development in 1969.*
>
> *The founding Director was Marcel Goldschmid and Goldschmid then had to recruit other professors and he did what I though was a smart thing. He looked around the world to see where instructional development was happening in some kind of mature form. I don't know everywhere he looked, but the first major center of its type in the United States was at the University of Michigan . . . and so he called up the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching in Ann Arbor, and asked the Director there, Stan Erickson, for the names of some promising graduate students who were very interested in instructional development. My name was mentioned and I guess I was the second person recruited.*

Pascal's experience also suggests that the origins of ED are in people — innovators, in particular. And he hints at the need to support the actions of innovators with expertise; that is, knowledge of instructional design and systems theory.

When the Centre for Learning and Development at McGill had a vacancy in 1970, Charles Pascal aggressively recruited George Geis, the American who had been his mentor at the University of Michigan, believing him to be "conceptually, the best in the world." Geis was director of McGill's Centre for a number of years and then went on to become a professor of higher education at OISE in Toronto, where he continues to

practise as a educational developer. The following excerpt from a conversation with Geis describes many of the broader influences on the early development of ED, from the perspective of someone who thinks of educational development as a field of study and practice, rather than an institutional service:

> *I left graduate school and my first job was at a college in upper New York state in the '60s — to develop programmed instruction. Because I had a degree in the psychology of learning and was interested in human learning, they said, "Well, you must know about programmed instruction . . ."*
>
> *The year after I went on this project, I saw an advertisement for the first meeting of the Programmed Instruction Society. So I thought I'd better hustle down there and find out what it is that I'm supposed to be doing! I arrived and the population was heavily military, primarily from the Air Force. The military had a problem of teaching to higher criteria large numbers of people who had diverse backgrounds and rather low skills with regard to studying and so forth. They had struggled during World War II and thereafter with methods of training that would make sure people threw the grenade after the pin was pulled and so on . . . they had to repair equipment which was always changing, they had complicated logistic plans and so on, and these were people like you and me, who suddenly got drafted or whatever, who would be put in charge of something. So they were very concerned with good ways of teaching that could be done all over; that didn't hang upon a particular locale or a given person . . . They had to develop these kinds of person-proof things. Remember that they came from an environment which, in the '50s and '60s, was very hot on systems analysis theory. And . . . they had some really bright people who tried to apply this kind of analysis to training — behaviourally oriented, performance oriented.*
>
> *Into that were feeding a number of streams. One was the very beginning of computers and rather a sophisticated time for audiovisual equipment. So there was a lot of emphasis on "could we use these supports to teach people?" and "couldn't they teach themselves, really?" If you could avoid teachers, it would be very good, because then you wouldn't have to train them. So they began to automate and task analyze a lot of stuff. Another stream coming in was behavioural psychology. People were saying, "Wow, we know how to analyze situations, so we can turn it into something teachable, then we can teach it without a teacher, and that would be just great." That was the milieu in which the projects were placed. So I got immersed in that.*
>
> *When you begin to look at the history of all this, you realize there were people a hundred years before who had been interested in the same kind of*

thing. In the mid- to late 1800s, the principal in Winnetka, Illinois, part of the Illinois school system, devised a way of systematically analyzing what he taught and putting together a system so that students could pull folders and take tests at the end to see if they'd passed and if they didn't pass, they'd get a remedial folder. There were three or four of these plans in the school systems around the turn of the century. This, remember, was a time of efficiency engineering, and that was a way to make education efficient . . .an engineering way of thinking . . . Very important . . .

I guess the context of all this is American. It's the idea that the sky's the limit and if we just get in there, we can make the world behave the way we want it to. Education's no different from food or transportation or anything else. We can increase the yield of a field of corn, we can breed better cows, we can build better cars — it was just a matter of getting down to it. From Watson on to Skinner was this idea of "let's take hold of our education system and engineer it. Why don't we engineer that, we engineer everything else?" Urban planning was going on . . . all this stuff was kind of emerging from World War II systems analysts — those people were back in civilian life and applying what they knew to current problems.

A number of things were happening in the 1960s in higher education that made improving teaching through instructional development seem like a good idea. One is what sociologists call the rule of the hammer — if you have a hammer, you're going to find lots of things to hammer. So here was this instructional systems design technology, it had all kinds of things going for it, so its own momentum kind of pushed it. Then, that was a time of a lot of student unrest, annoyance and upset on university campuses. Also, a time of the infusion into the postsecondary system of quite a different profile of students, a heterogeneous profile. And there was an expansion of the faculty which meant there weren't the same old boys . . . there didn't seem to be the homogeneity of either the students or the faculty. There was money available. Whenever governments offer money for programs, people say, "Well sure, that's what we ought to do." Concurrently, corporations and industries began to face somewhat similar problems: wanting to expand, having to take on personnel that weren't trained. The idea of training people efficiently . . . and the technologies were changing. Television was widely available, and computers came in . . .

Whereas Pascal emphasized the importance of people in getting educational development going, of the forerunners in setting the pace for others, Geis focuses on all sorts of things going on at the time that made educational development desirable, interesting, and something of which individuals were one small part. Geis tells a story of ED that puts it in the context of person-proof training, systems theory, technology, situation and task

analysis, and behavioural psychology — all contributing to the instructional design era. The perceived need for ED in universities arose as a result of particular concerns in that context — student unrest, changing profile of students and faculty, funding, changing technologies; but the solution was that used for most problems at the time: efficiency and engineering. An influence that Geis does not mention explicitly was the growth of adult education, with its range of special techniques considered useful for teaching adults outside the school setting.

Ron Smith, a mathematician who later did a Ph.D. in educational development with George Geis at McGill, and has been with the Learning Development Office at Concordia since it first opened, returns to the idea that the beginnings of ED in Canada were closely tied with the development of institutions:

> *I think the origins of instructional development, the story of how centres came to exist, is more a local phenomenon than a national one. I came to the university (then Loyola) in 1969. In 1969, we had a course evaluation system run by the students. The VP wanted to use the system to make personnel decisions, so he had the Senate pass a motion that faculty must participate in the system. A committee, the Senate Committee on Learning Development (SCOLD), was set up (1970) to: a) oversee the course evaluation system; and b) organize teaching development activities. I was on the Committee (and eventually became Chair), and we did various ID projects and managed the evaluation system. This committee eventually argued that there was too much work for a Committee, and proposed that an office be set up. The Learning Development Office (LDO) was created one month before the university (Concordia) was founded in 1974 (before the merger). I think this was done to protect the office, i.e., to ensure that there would be a place for it in the new university.*

Smith's experience suggests that there is a critical moment for establishing an ED program, that is different for each place. Smith responded to an immediate local need which in this case was an evaluation system as an institutional priority; so the educational development program at Concordia came into being associated with the evaluation of teaching. It is an interesting example of how teaching development activities were very closely tied with efforts to evaluate teaching — in this case, the same office, the same person. Smith also notes that:

> *Despite my contacts with McGill and George (Geis), I was not really influenced by instructional design because our office was founded so early. My first Ph.D. course at McGill was only in 1976; the LDO was founded in 1974, and I had been doing development work with SCOLD before that. I had taken the Bergquist course before the book even came out. I was more influenced by Bergquist's adult ed approach and by my adult ed colleagues at Concordia than by instructional design. Also, McGill was giving out*

> *grants for instructional design projects. We didn't have money for this at Concordia — it just wasn't possible to do this kind of ID. McGill had the money to take on big, systematic projects.*

Smith's comments confirm that Mathis' (1979) description of two divergent philosophies — humanist (associated with adult and higher education) and behaviouralist (associated with instructional design and measurement) — underlying approaches to educational development is meaningful in the Canadian context. Educational development strategies were influenced by the fields of adult and higher education, as well as the field of behavioural psychology, right from the beginning.

Patricia Cranton completed a doctorate in educational measurement at OISE in 1976, and immediately joined the academic staff at McGill's Centre for Learning and Development, where she remained for 10 years. She later went on to become a professor of adult education at Brock University, and founding director of Brock's Instructional Development Office. The following excerpt from an interview with Cranton emphasizes the early need for expertise in educational development, and expectations and reality concerning the kind of expertise required:

> *I started at McGill's Centre for Learning and Development in 1976 . . . The Office of Educational Development reported to the VP Academic and was faculty-directed . . . The Office had two support staff and an advisory committee which was chaired by the Director. Three separate units reported to the Office of Educational Development: the Instructional Resource Centre (media), the Teaching Improvement Clinic, and the Centre for Learning and Development. The Teaching Improvement Clinic was a technical service . . . run by staff, not faculty. They videotaped faculty and gave out the Teaching Analysis by Students questionnaire (Bergquist).*
>
> *The first assignment George (Geis) gave me was to design a system for the evaluation of teaching. Evaluation was going on in a rather haphazard way at McGill and they didn't want it standardized, but they did want it to be more systematic. The Centre was supposed to help . . . When George asked me to design the evaluation system, I wrote it all up before I started that first September.*
>
> *Actually, I had never taken an evaluation course. I used my own experiences as a student to come up with the evaluation system. I made it all up out of my head. I think that's why it turned out. It made sense . . .*
>
> *My system for the evaluation of teaching passed through the Senate and became mandatory at McGill. I would help people use the system — I would often give a 1/2 day workshop for a department to show them how to use it. Actually, I was invited all over the place (outside the university) to speak about the system. People liked it because it allowed faculty members and departments to make decisions about evaluation.*

> *Since we evaluated everything we did, I also evaluated the system after I had designed it. I also did other evaluation-type things. I wrote two modules: Constructing Tests and Course Evaluations. These evaluation projects took up my first couple of years there.*

Cranton was presumably recruited for her expertise in educational measurement, and this gave her the necessary qualifications for her job. But her work-useful knowledge came out of her own experiences — as a student. Also, it is to be noted that the university's request was for technical assistance with evaluation, which Cranton responded to with strategies that enabled not only measurement of competence, but development of competence; for change to come about, opportunities for faculty members and departments to make decisions were necessary. Finally, Cranton's story reiterates that staffing levels at McGill's centre allowed specialized, extensive projects like this; and that this deep engagement in long-term projects fostered developer's understanding of their work.

Christopher Knapper was born and received much of his education in Great Britain, coming to Canada to complete his doctorate in Psychology in the 1960s. He first became involved in educational development through his work as a member of the Professional Orientation Committee of the CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers). Knapper went on to become the first Coordinator for STLHE, and the founding director of two Ontario units — first at Waterloo and then at Queen's. The following excerpt from a conversation with Chris Knapper describes some of the early developments in the movement, from the unique perspective of someone originally involved in educational development as a form of professional service to the academic community, which extended beyond institutional boundaries:

> *It goes back to the establishment of the Professional Orientation Committee of the CAUT . . . around 1970 I would guess . . . In particular, its then executive director, a man called Berland (the same Berland who later wrote the report on OUPID) was very concerned that university professors never got any orientation to their professional responsibilities as academics. He believed that yes, they had served apprenticeship as researchers, but that was really the limit of their preparation. And he had a idealistic view of the university academic, who was somebody who was part of a sacred trust . . . I mean it wasn't to do with training . . . It was much more idealistic than that. How could you, if you like, inculcate people with the values of the professoriate.*
>
> *It was also influenced by the fact that CAUT believed very strongly that universities should be run by academics, and therefore that this (the responsibility to sit on committees, to work with other people) was taken very seriously, and imbedded in that was the issue of teaching. This committee was struck, and I was asked to be a member of it . . . I knew Berland because he had been a colleague of mine at the University of Saskatchewan*

> *. . . I was at that time on the Executive of CAUT. So you could say that the origins, well not exactly, but a big impetus for instructional development, came from the CAUT . . .*

The original terms of reference for the Professional Orientation Committee, written by Al Berland state:

> As a professional organization, the CAUT has an obligation to persons entering the profession of university teaching, and particularly to the young, which hitherto has been ill-defined and only sporadically implemented. No requirements for the specific function of teaching are set for those entering the profession, nor with very few exceptions are there systematic procedures for assisting new members of the profession in undertaking their teaching responsibilities.

Knapper continues:

> *The CAUT committee started to meet, the chairman of personal reasons resigned very early on in the affairs of the committee, and I became Chairman . . . And before the work of the committee had got underway, we were confronted, or the CAUT was confronted, with the developing a position on student evaluations of teaching. This was the era, we're talking the end of the 60s, when student activism was still quite strong in Canada. Student evaluations of teaching were becoming widely used in Canada and the CAUT felt it should have a position on this . . . and it was referred to this professional orientation committee . . . (The committee) produced a report and a series of recommendations which were eventually adopted as CAUT policy and although they seem to have disappeared, as far as I know, technically they are still CAUT policy . . . The committee then got asked to look at merit pay, in particular to what extent was merit pay used and to what extent was teaching involved in that . . .*
>
> *Very slowly over the next few years the committee really became the teaching committee . . . not the original intention at all. CAUT did various things through the committee, but all of them, nearly all of them, were related to teaching; . . . anything that ever came in to CAUT about teaching was referred to me as Chairman of the Committee. If somebody had a beef about a tenure case they would seek the committee's advice. If they wanted a speaker somewhere, I would generally be asked to do that . . . The CAUT launched a monograph series and it only every published two volumes and one of them . . . was about the evaluation of teaching, and I edited that one, "If teaching was important . . ."*

The committee was now dealing not only with teaching, but with the evaluation of teaching. In 1973–74 Knapper received a Canada Council sabbatical grant to take a study tour

to find out about formal efforts to improve university teaching around the world. In the following interview excerpt he comments on the broader philosophical origins of educational development.

> *The origins of instructional development in my mind do not derive from a radical critique of higher education. Those people existed in the 1960s and I'm sure they existed in the 1920s, but that's not the origins of this movement. It came from people who simply wanted to teach more efficiently and effectively and believed that this was an important process that needed better scrutiny. You see that in the Ruth Beard book and you see it in McKeachie's "Teaching Tips" which were very similar philosophically . . . The people who were critiquing higher education who came mostly from the radical left, I would say, had very little influence on professors; I find their ideas quite interesting, but they were too far out and they had another agenda. Ivan Illich, for example, wrote a very interesting book, but he really wasn't interested in improving university teaching and learning . . .*

When Knapper returned to Canada, he rejoined the CAUT committee:

> *Meanwhile, the Committee was starting to develop the Teaching Dossier approach . . . It had now become the Teaching Effectiveness Committee and eventually the Chair of that committee became Bruce Shore (from McGill) . . . And it was really Bruce who got the idea of the Teaching Dossier. The idea of it was that, alright, we've said that . . . we have a lot of cautions about (student evaluations of teaching) . . . that student evaluation of teaching is a fine thing for formative types of evaluation, but we were very nervous about it for tenure and promotion . . . So people said, "Well, you believe teaching is important, so what would you use for tenure and promotion?" And Bruce came up with this and we worked on it as a committee and that took a long time — it was very slow, the development of the Teaching Dossier . . .*

In Knapper's story, an interest in collegial service, done as one of an academic's responsibilities as a member of the academic profession, eventually develops into a focus on teaching — in particular, an appreciation for efficiency and effectiveness and the assessment of teaching competency.

Critical Scenes

In this section, I will comment on each of the five critical scenes in the early history of educational development in Canada. The first two (McGill and CAUT) will be brief, since the previous citations from developers have already introduced the main events and themes in these scenes. The OUPID program is important because it is closely tied to the first steps toward educational development taken by Ontario's universities, which account

for 40% of Canadian university faculty and students. Also, my own ED practice is in Ontario. Because the story of OUPID, and the subsequent story of STLHE, illustrate many of the critical issues in the early history of ED, I will describe in detail the key events in each of those stories so that my comments on the issues may be understood in the context of the events. Finally, I will briefly explore the ways that CSSHE has facilitated the growth of educational development in Canada.

McGill. Although McGill's Centre for Learning and Development was not technically, perhaps, the first ED unit, its opening is generally regarded as the first with real and lasting significance. Pascal noted its origins in lobbying by innovative young professors, which had the sympathetic ear of an innovative young vice-president, and also the recruitment of staff with educational expertise, particularly expertise in instructional design and measurement. The Centre stood out from other ED units during the 1970s and into the 1980s, because no other universities in English Canada adopted the same kind of comprehensive model (research and service inclusive, well-staffed) for an educational development unit. Its staff members were influential in the ED movement across the country, contributing to committee work, conferences, research projects, and publications.

The Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). This is a story of educational development that is not tied directly to the growth of ED units; it shows how interest in teaching was dominated by the evaluation of teaching issues, that is in finding ways to measure effectiveness. The Professional Orientation Committee of the CAUT was supposed to propose guidelines on training for teaching (and other academic responsibilities) for new faculty members, taking into consideration how programs could be conducted without interference with classroom privilege and academic freedom. Essentially, this professional development mandate was hijacked by the evaluation issue, and in time it because the Teaching Effectiveness Committee. The committee's work on the Teaching Dossier is especially noble. This is the initiative most clearly/commonly identified with ED in Canada and recognized as an important contribution to the international educational development scene.

The Ontario Universities Program in Instructional Development (OUPID). In 1970 Bernard Trotter prepared a report for the Committee on University Affairs (CUA) and the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario (predecessor to Council of Ontario Universities), *Television and Technology in University Teaching*. Trotter's report is noteworthy because in it he concludes that "it is not profitable to look at any single teaching/learning resource in isolation from others in use or in prospect. We must aim at nothing less than fundamental review of the instructional process" (p. 2); "most universities are a long way from looking at the instructional process comprehensively as a system in which resources can be deployed in a variety of ways to meet objectives" (p. 36). He recommended that the universities of Ontario establish a single centre for educational development:

> The Centre could combine several important functions. Perhaps most importantly, it would help to train instructional development consultants. In the first instance, this would probably mean providing the means whereby qualified academics could train themselves. The Centre would also provide consulting services to faculty in the universities and collaborate with discipline groups on a single or interuniversity basis in approaching the problems of defining objectives, choosing the appropriate mix of resources to be used, evaluating results, and so on. The Centre would also assist in setting up "instructional improvement" courses for university faculty. It would be encouraged to publish the results of research into any and all of these problems. (p. 54)

Trotter conceived of academics already holding appointments in any university in Ontario being seconded to the centre, these people continuing to receive their salaries from their parent institution. Only a small directing staff would be located at the centre in any full-time capacity. Eventually, every university in the province would have a small number of people associated with the centre, interacting with each other and bringing experience back to their own universities.

By December 1972, COU and CUA had both agreed to a significantly revised approach to educational development: a province-wide program (rather than a centre) "to assist faculties in Ontario universities in improving the effectiveness of instructional processes by systematic development of objectives, content, methods and evaluation for each course offered with economy in the application of instructional resources." Dr. Harold Good of Queen's University was appointed as Director of OUPID in April 1973. Good, a scientist, implemented a research grant approach to development; individuals at universities across Ontario competed for funds to engage in educational development activities/projects. Although Good had a healthy respect for instructional design and instructional systems theory (Good, 1975), his approach to funding meant that grants were distributed to academics who typically knew nothing about the design of instructional systems. In 1975, COU commissioned an independent evaluation of OUPID; although the recommendations were generally ignored, the program did then change its focus. Fred Parrett, director of OUPID in 1976, wrote that the program:

> . . . has evolved and shifted away from a small-grant function to an institutional-grant concept with considerably more emphasis on "staff" workshops and on information disbursement . . . (T)he long-term objective of the province-wide program is to ensure the continued and visible commitment to improving teaching and learning an individual university level, and when a university has made little organized effort in this direction, to encourage its development . . .

Although the new institutional grants were intended to help universities provide educational development for their faculty members, if a university tried to use OUPID money

to fund all its development programs it would fail — it wasn't enough. OUPID gave out too little money to support centres, on purpose, to send a message to the institutions that they needed to commit to their own programs/centres and couldn't rely on OUPID. The policy was to back winning centres. Of course, this meant that it was much easier for larger universities to afford development programs, because it took proportionately far less out of their budgets to fund a program. It also meant that there was a shakedown after the ending of OUPID.

Another aspect of the program was to train leaders to operate at a local campus level. Examples of this were two sessions called "Workshops on Designing Workshops," held in August 1976 at Queen's University. Twenty participants signed a contract that they would take the workshop(s) they designed in cooperation with other delegates back to their own universities and run them for the benefit of their colleagues.

When Parrett's term of office ended in 1977, Charles Pascal was hired as half-time Director (and half-time Chair of Higher Education at OISE), along with Marion Wilburn as full-time Coordinator; both had three year terms. Although the program formally came to an end of 1980, Wilburn stayed on for two more years, editing the newsletter and running conferences and workshops.

Many developers consider OUPID to have been a lost opportunity. Elrick (1990) believes the problems were fundamental: that the program had a focus on technical improvement and efficiency that clashed with the dominant academic culture of universities. Others believe it could have worked if the money had been distributed in different ways, or think that the timing was wrong, in that OUPID gave money away to individuals who knew nothing about ED. The later strategy of giving money only to institutions, or interinstitutional projects — not individuals — achieved something, but it was too little and too late to allow OUPID to have a major impact. It did help establish some new centres; although most eventually died with OUPID, at least there was a brief splutter of activity in some of the smaller universities. Although OUPID was helpful in consolidating the work of the larger centres, and there was some advantage to their being able to say that they got external funding, the important centres were already there before OUPID started giving out funds to institutions. They simply asked for the money that OUPID was giving out, used it to garner support for their centre, then carried on after the OUPID funds dried up.

At the same time, many developers also see OUPID as having an important and lasting impact, primarily because it legitimatized ED as a valuable thing on which to spend time and money. Apart from giving away grants, OUPID did a number of things that were quite helpful to the educational development movement. Under Charles Pascal and Marian Wilburn, OUPID formed a focus for, and aided, an embryonic network of educational developers; and it demonstrated that there was a community of people interested in these issues. Wilburn (with a background in adult education from OISE) placed more emphasis on such central and interactive activities as a newsletter, workshops for developers, and conferences for faculty at large. And Pascal had a very active advisory committee which met quite often in

Toronto and was an opportunity for these people to know each other and to find out what was being done. This networking was more important than the money and eventually led to the formation of STLHE, and to the idea for STLHE-sponsored conferences.

Interestingly, adult education principles and methods appeared to have greater influence on the strategies actually used in practice by developers, than did principles of instructional systems design. Although the systems approach was seen as desirable, in fact 'optimal' by many, it never really had a large impact — partly because there was no expertise available to train others, and also because people involved in the movement seemed to lose faith in it as a do-able approach to the improvement of teaching. Good and Pascal, for example, both believed strongly in a combination of organizational development and instructional design expertise; yet adult education and, notably, political strategy, won out over a strategy that might have emphasized instructional systems design. Charles Pascal comments on this issue:

> *Well, the whole idea of institutional grants was to get institutional commitment . . . the only way you could get OUPID money was to be able to say you had your own commitment and your own infrastructure. That had to be part of the plan. So in order for the U of T, for example, to get some instructional development money from the OUPID operation, they had to set up something. That's where I met people like John Kirkness and Arthur Rothman. But (most) . . . of them knew nothing (about instructional systems design). Interestingly, the most sophisticated ID person at U of T was its President, John Evans, who had redesigned McMaster's medical school.*
>
> *Should we have been more rigorous in saying to the universities, "You can't get this money unless you not only have an internal vehicle and show your own expenditures in this area, but we also won't give you any money unless you have one person trained in instructional systems design and organizational development"? That might have been a good idea in retrospect. On the other hand, it might not have been a good idea . . .*
>
> *(The government) believed, from a public policy point of view, in order to improve undergraduate teaching and learning, they should take money off the top of the university operating grant. The universities did not like that because it was a threat to autonomy. "Just give us the money through operating grants. We know how to spend it." So there was controversy on that. And the politics of forming an contract around what you could or could not do, what you needed to do to get the money, were pretty sensitive. I did think at the time that it would be nice to be able to up the ante a bit, but in some ways it's no different than learning how to play any kind of game . . . (P)robably the best thing is just to get out there and (play), just begin to feel comfortable. Learn to understand how important it is, how fun*

> *it can be, how valuable it is, and then you can begin to apply some more rigorous criteria. I think we took a longer term view of it.*
>
> *If you were to ask me right know, should every university . . . have a very sophisticated, well-trained instructional systems designer . . . the answer is yes. But it's not just having someone with . . . understanding of instructional systems and organizational development — it's having them as part of the power elite . . .*

The Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE). As I have already noted, during the time of OUPID educational developers tended to meet quite often and got to know each other fairly well. When OUPID ended, they decided to continue meeting informally, and centres took turns sponsoring conferences for the group as a whole. They wanted to involve faculty in these conferences, but were concerned that faculty would not attend because there was no formal sponsoring agency/association. So they formed an organization and, looking for a name that would communicate credibility, called it the "Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education." They advertised the conference as the 4th Annual Conference of STLHE, again to suggest legitimacy (this was not entirely dishonest given the earlier, post-OUPID, conferences) and charged a small registration fee which included membership in the new Society. The conference was quite successful, attracting 70 to 80 academics, and by the end of the conference people were asking if they could sponsor the next one. The conferences began to make money, which provided a small budget for the Society, illustrating how ED may be approached from the grassroots, independent of institutional or government funding. The society was run by a coordinator and a core group of active members from the Ontario universities with educational development units, but the organization was very informal, with no constitution, terms of reference, by-laws, etc. Membership still comprises both developers and educators, which is different from professional educational development organizations in other countries. The annual conference has always focused on the interactive, the informal, and the practical; developers and educators share and demonstrate activities and approaches they have had experience with.

Christopher Knapper, first coordinator of STLHE, in the following excerpt tells the story of the origins of the **3M Teaching Fellowships** program:

> *3M had a President of 3M Canada who was very interested in university teaching in an amateur way. He himself had got to where he had through the role model of a university teacher; he would meet the university presidents in his role as President of 3M Canada and he'd got a bee in his bonnet that they didn't really concern themselves with university teaching. He wanted to do something about this.*
>
> *3M sponsored an event (at the University of Western Ontario) which was for the teachers of biology, life sciences. People in biology or life sciences*

departments in universities across Canada were asked to nominate an excellent teacher to go to this event to discuss teaching, and all the costs of this were paid by 3M . . .

So that took place and the next year . . . it would be . . . about 1983, I would guess . . . there was . . . an advisor to the president of 3M and he came to Waterloo . . . The idea was that we (Waterloo) would put on the next one of these events, so he went to see the President, Doug Wright, and the President asked me if I would join them . . . I think the original money they were putting up was something like $30,000.00 . . . And I said, "I would be quite willing to come up with other ways of spending your $30,000.00, but I wouldn't be willing to (organize a biology teachers conference)."

So Wright said . . . we two should go away and have another meeting and decide what to do . . . and I said to him (the man from 3M) . . . , "Well . . . let me put a proposal to you. There is in Canada a Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education." I was (coordinator of STLHE) then. We'd had one conference by that time . . . I said, "It strikes me, this is a new society; this would be a wonderful partnership. The University of Waterloo is indifferent to this. This society would be very enthusiastic. You'd buy enthusiasm." He said, "Well, I don't know about that, but I'll take it back to the President of 3M and let you know." Anyway, they phoned back and . . . said, "We think that this is quite an interesting avenue to explore, but of course we need to find out whether this society of yours is capable of doing this. We thought we would send a team to the (next) STLHE conference." And I thought, "Ah, that's the end of that," because I knew that this . . . would not be what 3M expect in a conference.

I still remember arriving at registration at STLHE at the same time as this delegation from 3M, and they were all dressed in pin-striped suits and I thought, "My God, this is not going to be their cup of tea at all." For the next two days every I went at the conference, I seemed to run into one of these guys . . . Got to the end of the conference and . . . he said, "Well, we're very impressed . . . it's not quite what we expected, but it's clear these people are very committed teachers, and we really feel that you've got a good organization.

We (STLHE) then met as a group and we came up with about 4 or 5 different proposals . . . And one of the was the 3M Teaching Fellows. These were submitted to 3M and 3M selected the one they liked. The idea was very much the idea of not just selecting these people (Teaching Fellows), but that an event was attached to it . . .

And we had a huge number of applications the first year . . . It was an instant success. Because of the 3M name. Industrial sponsorship, they do

> *things in a different way, and it was successful right from the beginning, that project. We kept thinking it would change. Like when the President left 3M, and he had been personally the one who had supported it; but, no, the successor almost instantly confirmed that they would continue with the arrangements. Maybe they will abandon it one day, but I suspect it is pretty entrenched now, whereas the first few years they would only ever commit themselves year to year . . . it's been a very good partnership.*

So, the 3M fellowships program offered a way to legitimize teaching *and* educational development work, and to raise the profile of STLHE.

The Canadian Society for Studies in Higher Education (CSSHE). One other scene of relative significance to persons doing educational development work in Canada was the formation of the Canadian Society for Studies in Higher Education in 1969. The society's first annual conference was held in Winnipeg in 1970, and Edward Sheffield, whose study of exemplary university teachers continues to be widely cited today, served as the society's first president in 1971. While the society is devoted to the study of a very broad range of higher education topics and issues, and a wide variety of problems and contexts, one important area of scholarship has been the evaluation and improvement of university teaching. The annual conference has served as a gathering place for those educational developers interested in research on effective teaching and the improvement of teaching, and *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* (CJHE), published by the Society, has been an important venue for dissemination of research and commentary on educational development topics. Approximately 37 articles about teaching and learning were published in the *Journal* between 1971 and 1994, and the vast majority of these were written by Canadian scholars and focus on the Canadian higher education scene. Some highlights from the CJHE are listed in Table 1.

The Growth and Expansion of Educational Development

For a new educational developer in Canada, beginning the work is somewhat akin to arriving at a party late — it takes time to sort out how people are connected and what has been going on prior to your own arrival. Those already in attendance are welcoming, but there are no formal procedures for initiating new practitioners, and no single story that is told to orient them to the conventions of practice.

A process of "demystifying" occurred for me as I interviewed people and I began to see that the history of educational development is simply the stories of individual people who, for the most part, happened on to the field and made it a part of their lives. All had their own conception of educational development, and some kind of opportunity to do something in the field that suited their skills, career goals, academic interests, personal values, and so on. Networks formed among these individuals, their institutions and initiatives, and individual stories became a collective tale, identified (at least among those in the story) as educational development in Canada.

Table 1

Articles on teaching and learning published in *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education:* Highlights, 1971–1994.

Vol. IV, No. 1, 1974
- Accountability for Effective and Efficient University Teaching
  Harold M. Good & Bernard Trotter

Vol. IV, No. 2, 1974
- Instructional Development in Canadian Higher Education
  Bruce M. Shore

Vol. V, No. 1, 1975
- Research on Teaching
  Arthur M. Sullivan
- Instructional Development — What? Why? How?
  H.M. Good

Vol. IX, No. 1, 1979
- Special Issue on the Evaluation of Teaching

Vol. X, No. 2, 1980
- Teaching Improvement in Canada: Data Concerning What and How
  Stephen F. Foster & J. Gordon Nelson

Vol. XI, No. 1, 1981
- The Relationship Between Student Ratings and Instructor Behaviour: Implications for Improving Teaching
  Patricia A. Cranton & William Hillgartner

Vol. XI, No. 2, 1981
- A Review of Significant Contributions of Psychology to Canadian Higher Education
  Janet G. Donald

Vol. XIII, No. 2, 1983
- Faculty Development Practices in Canadian Universities
  Abram G. Konrad

Vol. XIV, No. 2, 1984
- Faculty Participation in Teaching Improvement Programs
  Elizabeth S. Botman & Alexander D. Gregor

Vol. XVI, No. 3, 1986
- Teaching and Learning in Higher Education in Canada: Changes over the Last Decade
  Janet G. Donald

Vol. XX, No. 2, 1990
- Improving Instruction in Universities: A Case Study of the Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development (OUPID)
  Mei-Fei Elrick

Vol. XXIII, No. 3, 1993
- The Role of Scholarship in University Teaching
  K. Lynn Taylor

Vol. XXIV, No. 3, 1994
- Perspectives on Improving Teaching in Canadian Universities
  Alan W. Wright & M. Carol O'Neil

I discovered that, in addition to educational developers, there is another group of persons central to the history of educational development in Canada: *ED champions* — advocates or lobbyists for ED, or persons in positions of power who use their power to support educational development initiatives. Because teaching is relatively undervalued in universities, ED is also, and champions are needed. These two roles, developer and champion, have sometimes been played by the same person, leading to some confusion about the role of the developer. Different developers chose to incorporate the champion role or to connect with champions in different ways. However, there was no dissension among respondents in my study regarding the impact of politics, nor regarding the importance of political action, on educational development. As Pascal says,

> *You show me the head of an instructional development unit who does not have an appreciation for politics of the university and I'll show you somebody who's going to have a very short-lived experience.*

This need for champions and leadership was an important clue for me, helping me to see that running parallel to the stories of individuals are the stories of universities. Social institutions such as universities are not static — they have their own history and their own developmental path which is separate from, but interwoven with, the stories of the people within them. This is particularly relevant in academic life, given the long-term relationship that most academics have with their institutions. The importance of champions and political action indicates a need for connections between the stories of individuals and the stories of institutions, and a need for developers to feel they have a legitimate place in their institution, so that an authentic relationship with that institution is possible. In fact, my own need to connect my personal educational development story with the story of my home institution led me to do a case study of the activities and events leading to the establishment of the ID unit where I now work. I found this exercise gave me a better feel for the "personality" of my institution, told me something about the past educational development experiences of faculty who had been on staff there for many years, and essentially helped me to understand better the expectations of those I now work with and for.

Unit Openings

When asked to describe changes in educational development over the years, most developers emphasized events surrounding the opening of institutional units across the country. This is interesting, because Canadian educational development centres are small, often staffed by the same persons who previously did very similar work as a member of the university's educational development committee. Whether it is absolutely necessary to have formal units in order to accomplish the educational development work that goes on in most Canadian centres is, I believe, open to question. I have concluded that unit openings are important in the stories of developers because the presence of institutional units legitimizes and honours what they do.

There have been three eras in unit openings — eras which mostly reflect the developmental history of universities, but which also have been shaped by the stories of individual developers and champions. In the following description I use a plant metaphor to describe these eras:

I. New young growth. In the 1970s there was an increase in the number of Canadian units and also rapid growth in the number of committees providing ED services or planning an ED unit.

An interesting phenomenon was the birth of new universities in the mid- to late 1960s. Newness in some cases provided an opportunity (critical moment) to set up ED centres. But new universities must also establish themselves; and ED was probably not the way to do this (research was). Also, a greater number of universities meant increased competition to prove the worth (typically through research) of an institution. So these new universities were generally less attentive to ED than they could have been. Certainly their developmental path as institutions has affected the developmental path of educational development in Canada.

II. Development of strong roots. The early to mid '80s were shaped by the cutbacks and the shakedown that followed on the closing of OUPID. Loss of this source of government funding meant that some units closed. Other units, however, carried on with their work and established themselves. In many universities, committees provided educational development services — without hope of getting funding for a centre. This was the time of increased networking among developers (STLHE formed, and researchers collaborated). The only unit that opened during that time was Alberta; that institutions implemented a peer consultation program from the start, coordinated by a staff position.

III. Flowering. In the late '80s and early '90s persistent educational development committees on campuses across the country were finally rewarded with institutionally-funded units; new technologies, accountability, and student pressure were issues in higher education once again, prompting administrations to develop a deeper interest in formal educational development programs. Some Ontario universities (for example, York, Queen's, Ryerson) reopened or re-vamped centres that had closed in the mid '80s. And educational development became a national activity, rather than a regional one, as the Maritimes and British Columbia opened their first units.

Program Developments

When asked to describe changes in educational development over the years, not many developers talked about developments in programming, services, or activities. Workshops and short courses, for example, have been an accepted feature of programs since the beginning of the educational development movement. Although programs may be addressing different topics in the '90s (diversity is one new area), the educational methodology used by practitioners (group work, discussion, and experiential activities) is predominantly the

same as in the '70s. It is difficult to say whether there have been changes in the approach to individual consultations (another common feature of ED work) since I am not aware of any Canadian models for the teaching consultation process (apart from the Massachusetts model imported to McGill by Chris Daggett in the 1970s); the most visible development in consultation has been the growth of peer consultation programs, in which regular faculty are trained to act as teaching consultants for their colleagues. There has been rather more development in the area of programming for teaching assistants (TAs): credit courses in university teaching and learning for graduate students have certainly grown in number (though some universities had quite extensive TA training programs in the late '60s, early '70s); diploma or certificate programs that include practica are now offered in several universities; and, graduate students are now more closely and actively associated with ED units than they were in the past, frequently taking charge of their own training programs (Marx, Ellis & Martin, 1979; Piccinin, Farquharson & Mihu, 1993; Piccinin & Picard, 1994). One other general trend that I realized through my interviews of developers is that when ED units open in a university, staff tend to take responsibility for activities and events that were previously the responsibility (either formal or informal) of individual faculty members and university committees. In other words, the opening of a unit often has more impact in terms of the way it gives recognition to ED as a legitimate activity in the university, than in terms of actual expansion or development of ED activity.

Most remarkable is the fact that a collection of accepted educational development activities has so quickly been developed and put in use in Canadian universities (Donald, 1986; Foster & Nelson, 1980; Konrad, 1983; Shore, 1974). I have described some of the ways programs have evolved over the years. However, the features of most activities have remained fairly fixed, and can now be described as conventions of ED work.

Changes in Developers

In contrast to the fact that I saw relatively few changes in programming over the years, I did become aware of changes in the perceptions, attitudes, and activities of developers, changes which seemed to arise through their participation in ED. For one thing, developers made changes in their own teaching, or observed changes in the teaching of their ED colleagues, as they learned more about teaching through engagement in educational development activities. Also, respondents spoke about changes in their own role as developers, changes in how they came to view educational development work and the process of educational development. George Geis, for example, talks about how he and others working at McGill's centre, in trying to increase the level of faculty participation in ED programs, were challenged to re-think their approach to ED:

> *(We) got to be more sophisticated about (our) clients . . . we got to be more interested in: what do they think about, how do they view teaching, how do they view their students, how do they determine what to put in a course . . . what's their thinking about knowledge . . . all these kinds of questions.*

> *Instead of just saying "you can package this better." That was a kind of move in our practice.*

Change was not always in relation to particular problems of ED practice; even those who commented on the positive nature of their experiences as developers reported changes in their views over time. Patricia Cranton, for example, stated quite clearly that her early experience working at McGill was so successful that it gave her the strong belief that educational development works, can be done, and helps, yet she also indicated that after leaving McGill and reflecting on her work there as part of her own process of development as an educator, her ideas about the role of the developer changed. She came to consider it preferable if educational development is "faculty-directed rather than developer-led". While there was no uniform direction of change among all developers, their engagement in and reflection on ED led to changes in perceptions about what their educational development role should and could be.

Issues

The changes that have occurred in educational development work — as the field establishes a burgeoning identity, becomes associated with certain conventions and practices, and is, to a certain extent, re-imagined by the individuals who play the role of educational developer — have all taken place in the context of broader issues and events. The movement as it is known today arose at a particular time, in response to particular conditions in specific colleges and universities, and was promoted by individuals with particular backgrounds, skills and interests. As a developing field of study and practice, it has been shaped by those times, locations, persons, and conditions. The experience of constructing this history of educational development in Canada has drawn my attention to three broad issues influencing ED work: the ways ED is conceptualized, the role of educational developers, and the legitimacy of educational development.

Conceptualizing Educational Development

Those who support educational development often frame resistance to ED as resistance to the idea that teaching is important in our universities, when in fact the resistance may be to the form that ED takes. Because teaching is perceived to be less valued than research in universities, and because many of the people who provide or support development programs are the same people who would like to see more attention given to teaching, a university's lack of support for ED is usually labeled as a lack of support for teaching. This draws our attention away from the possibility that the conceptual models shaping our approach to ED may be inadequate.

My historical review has taught me that concerns about competence have played a tremendously important role in the growth of educational development in Canada. Broadly speaking, the whole point of ED has been to assess and develop faculty members'

instructional competence. Barnett's (1994) argument that two opposing contemporary ideas of competence — academic and operational — are currently "jockeying for position in academe" therefore seems terribly relevant to educational development work. This intriguing thesis arises from Barnett's analysis of the dominant forms of knowing and learning in the modern university. The academic form of competence, explains Barnett, is built around a sense of mastery within a discipline, while the operational conception of competence reflects a wider societal interest in performance (especially economic performance, i.e., efficiency). The two rival definitions of competence are based on alternative interpretations of basic ideas about skills, communication, learning, evaluation, and epistemology (see Table 2), and reflect different sets of beliefs, values, and interests. Barnett states that the relationship between universities and society is changing; as a consequence, the older academic definition of competence, in which notions of understanding, disciplines, and truth have been central, is being displaced by the operational version of competence which is characterized by a focus on technical know-how, instrumentality, and practical effectiveness. This means that in the case of educational development work there is, in addition to the stories of individual developers and the stories of individual universities, the story of universities as a whole — a story that is currently about their changing relationship with the wider society.

The ED movement started at a time when the operational conception of competence was growing in favour in many higher education circles. Technical strategies (such as instructional systems design) for developing instructional competence held promise for resolving an ongoing issue in higher education. That is the need for faculty to have some form of preparation for teaching which gained prominence in the '60s: People with a commitment to teaching or people who happened to be playing a role in higher education's efforts to address this issue became part of a movement to provide formal ED programs in universities, a movement to make teaching better — in which 'better' was operationally, technically defined. The operational approach (which is, incidentally, favoured by management everywhere because of its interest in outcomes, efficiency and effectiveness) is in opposition to the collegial culture of Canadian universities, which have traditionally been dominated by scholarship and the disciplines and learning for its own sake. We are presently (mid 1990s) in a time of increased attention to accountability, fewer resources, and threat of government intervention that makes the operational model even more appealing, which may explain why more universities have funded ED in the past five years. The current high degree of interest in student learning, although seeming to offer a new take on what it means to be competent, is simply the operational model coming to the foreground. This outcomes-based technical production model, which proposes that teaching is effective to the extent that it improves student learning, is in opposition to the prominence of the teacher as the representative of the discipline in the traditional academic model of university teaching. It appeals to some faculty because it reflects what all educators accept as a truism: that attention to student learning guides the effective teacher. It appeals to governments and university administrators for the same reason, but also

Table 2

Two rival versions of competence.

	Operational competence	Academic competence
1. Epistemology	Know how	Know that
2. Situations	Defined pragmatically	Defined by intellectual field
3. Focus	Outcomes	Propositions
4. Transferability	Metaoperations	Metacognition
5. Learning	Experiential	Propositional
6. Communication	Strategic	Disciplinary
7. Evaluation	Economic	Truthfulness
8. Value orientation	Economic survival	Disciplinary strength
9. Boundary conditions	Organizational norms	Norms of intellectual field
10. Critique	For better practical effectiveness	For better cognitive understanding

From Barnett, R. (1994). *The limits of competence: Knowledge, higher education and society.* Buckingham: Open University Press and the Society for Research into Higher Education.

because a focus on learning outcomes (rather than teaching actions) can be used as an argument for increased use of technology, decreased faculty-student interaction, and less faculty control of instructional systems — all of which could save money and shake the power of faculty autonomy.

Barnett's analysis of competence allows a useful interpretation of the resistance to educational development that is identified by many Canadian educational developers. It suggests that the ED movement, which has been supported for reasons that are primarily operational/technical, has come up hard against the academic model that dominates the university environment. Some developers, recognizing the discrepancies between the two interests, have worked to improve teaching through an academic model, rejecting or downplaying the technical model and using instead the research/disciplinary approach that seems to be more in line with the academic mission of universities. Other developers have established (perhaps unconsciously) strategies that circumvent the two models. The field of adult education, with its humanist bent and its origins outside the influence of traditional academic disciplines, has shaped many of the approaches most commonly used to bring about change in university teaching. It is worth noting, however, that many adult education scholars (e.g., Collins, 1991) are lamenting the stranglehold that the technical/operational model of competence has had on their field as well, largely unbeknownst to practitioners.

Interestingly, a close reading of Barnett suggests that both conceptions of competence, one reflecting the traditional world of academe and the other reflecting the societal world of work, are limited and narrow views that constrain higher education. There is increasing evidence that learning can be neither 'operationally' nor 'academically' defined; if that is true, we need a new, more complicated conception of teaching competence, arising from realistic conceptions of learning, to guide a new, more useful conception of ED.

The Role of Developer

At this point in Canada, the history of educational development is a story of people (their motives, needs, connections) and a story of institutions, more than it is a story of a field of study or a story of professional practice, although this is beginning to change. The people (educational developers and educational development champions) and the institutions (Canadian universities) share the common experience of providing and/or supporting services to improve the quality of teaching. It seems to me that the story of educational development as a field of study and practice will grow out of this common experience and will also include the stories of higher education as a social phenomenon (as Barnett reminds us), the stories of the faculty members who teach there, and the stories of students who come there to learn. Educational developers are in the unique position of having reason (and the responsibility?) to define the meaning of educational development in this setting, and it is through them that a comprehensive story of ED is likely to be articulated.

My interviews with educational developers, and my review of documents recording the course of events in educational development in Canada, suggest that two different visions of ED expertise colour the ways that developers do their work. These have interesting implications for the advancement of educational development as a field of study and practice. In fact, I propose that developers in some ways see themselves as either *pragmatics* or *intellectuals,* although they do not use these terms, or make explicit the assumed differences.

Let me outline the differences in the ways these two groups define themselves and each other. I must emphasize that ability and commitment are high in both groups, but their orientation to ED work is different. Pragmatics are people who do their personal best in a local situation, relying on informal knowledge. They look to others with access to formal knowledge for guidance about "how" to do it, or they get these others to do it for them. Intellectuals rely on a formal body of knowledge. They look to a discipline or a field of study for guidance (and may try to contribute to that field through their ED work). If intellectuals believe their skills will not be appreciated, recognized, or used in the field at its current level of development, they may leave ED work, or maintain only tenuous connections with it, or they may try to advance the field. Pragmatics tend to continue doing the work as it is conventionally defined/practiced. Some pragmatics, in bursts of enthusiasm, energy, and commitment make significant contributions to the field, and then return to regular academic life. Others do ED conscientiously as a service to the academic community, or capably as their job. Some pragmatics recognize that academic has more cachet and act "as if" ED has academic/intellectual status. Champions of ED work are particularly keen for it to have that kind of status, i.e., validation through evidence from the disciplines. The number of persons doing ED work in Canada is relatively small; pragmatics and intellectuals have frequent, if superficial, connections and interactions. Pragmatics and intellectuals hesitate to engage in real conversations with each other, because of intellectuals' feeling that they can't learn from pragmatics, and pragmatics' resentment of the time intellectuals spend in defining or critiquing practice rather than doing the ED work that needs to be done. It seems to me that pragmatics need to articulate the informal expertise that they may have developed, or at the very least need to acknowledge that it is possible and worthwhile to articulate professional practice; instead, many seem intimidated. Similarly, intellectuals need to acknowledge where their formal expertise meets its limits. Both need to find the common ground, probably in a body of knowledge arising through engagement in common problems of educational development work.

I believe it is important to recognize this split into two types of persons doing ED because it touches the very heart of what it means to engage in ED work. It suggests that the dichotomous views of competence described by Barnett are shaping, and perhaps dividing, the field of ED as it is defining itself, with pragmatics following an operational model and intellectuals following an academic model.

While the pragmatic approach may offer excellent solutions to immediate problems, and the intellectual approach may contribute to the development of the field and also to the design of strategies/models for addressing problems, both approaches are grounded in ways of viewing teaching and learning that may not reflect the reality and complexity of the ED process. Neither approach helps to build a comprehensive body of ED knowledge and a model for ED that reflects the true nature of educational development work. In addition, expertise becomes either the property of individual developers or a formal contribution to the knowledge base in related but separate disciplines. It is not easily passed on to persons entering the field other than through the very crude mechanism of telling colleagues what you do, or through the roundabout route of the formal disciplinary knowledge bases.

I propose that the term *practitioner* embodies the best of the pragmatic and intellectual roles in ED work. It seems to me that developers need to acknowledge that their own ED knowledge is developed primarily through reflective practice (and that formal knowledge can stimulate and guide reflection) and need to articulate that knowledge. Also, developers must pay more attention to the fit (or lack of fit) between their underlying assumptions about ED, the assumptions underlying ED conventions, and the assumptions underlying universities' demands for ED services/programs, and be assertive about articulating their assumptions and constructing a model to address them. Although reflective practice has been proposed as a model for learning about teaching, I am not sure to what extent it shapes conceptions of ED work. Smith (1995) has made efforts to encourage critical reflection among educational developers.

Legitimacy

While developers may have had doubts, not about the need for an ED of some kind but about the effectiveness of the ED strategies they are using, these doubts have been overshadowed by ED's fight for survival as a legitimate and accepted activity in universities. Andy Farquharson, longtime Director of the Learning and Teaching Centre at the University of Victoria, comments poignantly on this aspect of ED work:

> It has been a real struggle to keep teaching on the agenda at the university over the years . . . the research agenda seems to drive the place. (We) now hear lots of good things, but in the beginning I was often asked 'Why on earth do you want to be the Director?'

It is unwise for developers to speak of any doubts they might have about the methods and approach they are using when trying to gain support for ED work. Most developers have had the experience of knowing their work has made a difference to people they know and care about; they do not want to lose the opportunity to continue that work. The fight for legitimacy has meant that Canadian developers have spent far more time speaking about their successes than their difficulties, failures, and doubts. Essentially, survival is the measure of success in ED, more so than advancement in the approach taken to the work.

I would hazard, however, that the fight for legitimacy has essentially been won at a macro level. ED certainly has enough credibility to be functionally effective, if we look at educational development activities and experiences across Canadian universities as a whole. At a micro level (the level of the individual institution) an institution's degree of support for ED probably says more about that institution's stage of development than it does about the legitimacy of ED activity in Canadian universities. Research activity is the defining characteristic of universities, and institutions still trying to prove themselves on that playing field are less likely to see an institutionalized ED program as accruing any meaningful benefits unless the program includes extensive educational research activity. ED has established enough legitimacy that a well-regarded university (in terms of research) may gain some additional benefits by providing an ED program. Such a step suggests that it takes all aspects of its mandate seriously. In fact, in the current climate of increasing public demands for accountability from their educational institutions, some universities may consider it a risk not to have an ED program. Since the cost/benefit analysis for institutional ED programs is reputational, rather than financial (dedicated and resourceful practitioners have demonstrated that a fairly comprehensive ED program can be run on a shoestring budget), programs may be less at risk in times of budgetary cutbacks than might be supposed by the individuals running those programs. In a certain sense, it is only now that educational development has established itself, as a small but essential component of university services, that it will be expected to solve real problems of practice, and demonstrate that the approaches used are effective ones.

Conclusion

Delving into the history of educational development in Canadian universities was an empowering and enlightening experience for me as a newcomer to educational development work. My conversations with colleagues who had been doing ED work for many years served as a form of initiation for me, a rite of passage in which I was given access to the knowledge that others had gained through their experiences. Constructing this history helped me to see my place in relation to those others, and the ways my own learning may contribute to a body of ED knowledge growing out of our collective experiences. I hope this paper will serve a similar purpose for readers who are new to the educational development scene in Canada.

While the history of educational development work that I tell here has taken place surrounded by such broad issues as the changing role of higher education in society, and changing conceptions of learning and knowledge, it is largely a story of individual people ñ individuals who are interested in teaching, who are committed to learning and to the educational mission of universities, who have chosen to do work that helps universities do a better job of fulfilling that mission. May there be many more new people and new stories of educational development to come as we move into a new century of teaching and learning in Canadian universities.

References

Barnett, Ronald. (1994). *The limits of competence: Knowledge, higher education and society.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press and the Society for Research into Higher Education.

Collins, Michael. (1991). *Adult education as vocation: A critical role for the adult educator.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Donald, Janet G. (1986). *An inventory of programs, courses, and other forms of pedagogical training of higher education personnel in Canada: Report to the European Centre for Higher Education.* Montreal, PQ: Centre for University Teaching and Learning, McGill University.

Foster, Stephen & Nelson, J. Gordon. (1980). Teaching improvement in Canada: Data considering what and how. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 10*(2), 120–125.

Konrad, Abram G. (1983). Faculty development practices in Canadian universities. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 13*(2), 13–24.

Marx, Ronald, Ellis, John F., & Martin, Jack. (1979). The training of teaching assistants in Canadian universities: A survey and case study. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 9*(1), 55–64.

Mathis, B. Claude. (1979). Faculty development. In Erickson, S.C. & Cook, J.A. (Eds.), *Support for teaching at major universities,* (pp. 9–19). Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Research on Leaming and Teaching, University of Michigan.

Piccinin, S.J, Farquharson, A., & Mihu, E. (1993). Teaching assistants in Canadian universities: An unknown resource. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 23*(2), 104–117.

Piccinin, S.J., & Picard, M. (1994). Credit courses on university teaching for graduate students in Canadian universities. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 24*(3), 26–70.

Shore, Bruce M. (1974). Instructional development in Canadian higher education. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 4*(2), 45–53.

Smith, S. (1991). *Report of the commission of inquiry on Canadian university education.* Ottawa, ON: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.

Trotter, B. (1970). *Television and technology in university teaching.* Toronto, ON: Committee on University Affairs and Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION
Previous Issues

OPHE #1

A Review of Achievement Motivation and Performance in College Students from an Attributional Retraining Perspective
Raymond P. Perry, et al. (1992)

OPHE #2

A Bibliography on Quality and Excellence in Colleges and Universities
Gilles G. Nadeau (1993)

OPHE #3

Public Attitudes Toward the University: The 1991 Winnipeg Area Study
Alexander D. Gregor & Frank J. Hechter (1993)

OPHE #4

Effective Teaching in the College Classroom: Current Perspectives and Future Directions
C. Ward Struthers & Raymond P. Perry (1993)

OPHE #6

Faculty in Transition: The Adjustment of New Hires to Postsecondary Institutions
Raymond P. Perry, et al. (1996)

OPHE #7

Bibliography on Higher Education in Canada and Index to the Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 1971-1999
Edited by John D. Dennison & Alexander D. Gregor (1996, rev. 1999)

These publications can be ordered from:

Centre for Higher Education
Research and Development
The University of Manitoba
220 Sinnott Building, 70 Dysart Road
Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2
Phone: (204) 474-8309 Fax: (204) 474-7607

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").