

COUNCIL OF
ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES
CONSEIL DES
UNIVERSITÉS DE L'ONTARIO

October 2006

Dear Reader,

This is the fifth volume in the *Working Paper Series (2005 – 2006)*. It represents the work of the COU Academic Colleagues who, in 2001-2002, began a series of working papers to provide input to Council on academic issues.

The author(s) prepare, present and revise their papers according to discussion at their meetings. In this sense, the papers remain the work of the author(s), but also reflect contributions from other Colleagues. They do not, however, represent COU policy.

The four papers completed in 2005-2006 as part of the fifth volume are:

- *Changes in Student Learning Behaviours* by Bob Sharpe, Academic Colleague, Associate Professor, Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, Wilfrid Laurier University
- *Academic Citizenship* by Paul Thompson, Academic Colleague, Director, Institute of History and Philosophy of Science and Technology, University of Toronto (Victoria College); Philippe Constantineau, Academic Colleague, Vice-Dean, Continuing Studies, Department of Politics and Economics, Royal Military College; and George Fallis, Academic Colleague, Professor, Department of Economics, York University
- *Research Chairs: A Systematic Change in Ontario's Universities* by Antoni Lewkowicz, Professor, Department of Geography, University of Ottawa; and Paul Schellenberg Chair, Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo
- *Internationalizing the Curriculum: An Inventory of Key Issues, Model Programs and Resources* by Kathryn Shailer, Dean, Faculty of Liberal Studies, Ontario College of Art and Design

Through this series, we hope your understanding of academic issues facing Ontario's publicly assisted universities is broadened. If you have any comments or questions, please contact Jennie Piekos at COU (jpiekos@cou.on.ca or 416-979-2165 ext. 223).

Marilyn Rose
Co-Chair, COU Academic Colleagues
Brock University

Alan Shepard
Co-Chair, COU Academic Colleagues
University of Guelph

WORKING PAPER SERIES

by
COU ACADEMIC COLLEAGUES

Volume Five 2005 - 2006

Council of Ontario Universities
11th Floor, 180 Dundas Street West
Toronto, Ontario M5G 1Z8

Requests for further information should be directed to:
Research, Analysis and Policy Division
Phone: 416.979.2165 ext. 223
Email: jpiekos@cou.on.ca

COU NO. 781

ISSN: 1704-412X (Print)
ISSN: 1704-4197 (Online)
ISBN: 0-88799-411-3

COUNCIL OF
ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES
CONSEIL DES
UNIVERSITÉS DE L'ONTARIO

Council of Ontario Universities, Academic Colleagues
Membership 2005-2006

Dr. Marilyn Rose
Dean, Graduate Studies
Brock University

Dr. Jean-Guy Godin
Dean, Faculty of Science
Carleton University

Dr. Alan Shepard
Associate Vice-President (Academic)
University of Guelph

Dr. Bruce Muirhead
Graduate Coordinator, Dept. of History
Lakehead University

Dr. Ellen Rukholm
Professor, School of Nursing
Laurentian University

Dr. Susan Elliott
Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences
McMaster University

Dr. Chris Sarlo
Director, School of Business & Economics
Nipissing University

Dr. Carolyn Byrne
Dean of Health Sciences
University of Ontario Institute of Technology

Dr. Antoni G. Lewkowicz
Professor, Department of Geography
University of Ottawa

Dr. Susan Cole
Canada Research Chair in Cancer Biology
Queen's University

Dr. James Dianda
Professor, Dept. of Philosophy
Ryerson University

Dr. Paul Thompson
Director, Institute of History and Philosophy of Science &
Technology
University of Toronto (Victoria College)

Dr. James Neufeld
Professor, Dept. of English Literature
Trent University

Dr. Paul Schellenberg
Chair, Dept. of Combinatorics & Optimization
University of Waterloo

Dr. John Doerksen
Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs & Admissions
Faculty of Music
The University of Western Ontario

Dr. Bob Sharpe
Associate Professor
Dept. of Geography & Environmental Studies
Wilfrid Laurier University

Dr. Lynne Phillips
Head, Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology
University of Windsor

Dr. George Fallis
Professor, Dept. of Economics and
Division of Social Sciences
York University

Dr. Kathryn Shailer
Dean, Faculty of Liberal Studies
Ontario College of Art & Design

Dr. Philippe Constantineau
Vice-Dean, Continuing Studies
Department of Politics and Economics
Royal Military College

Changes in Student Learning Behaviours

Bob Sharpe, Academic Colleague
Wilfrid Laurier University
December 2005

The Working Papers Series consists of short papers on academic issues prepared by Academic Colleagues. The topics chosen by the caucus of Academic Colleagues are championed by one or two colleagues. Although drafts of each paper are discussed by the full caucus, the final version of the paper represents the opinions of the author(s) and not a consensus reached by the Colleagues. The authors present their paper to the full Council as a matter of interest and to stimulate discussion. The papers as finalized do not represent COU policy. They are simply a mechanism for investigating and opening discussion on matters of interest to the Colleagues and the Council – and their readership at large.

Conditions for student learning in Ontario universities are undergoing changes that pose challenges to effective pedagogy. Larger class sizes, a more diverse student population, a younger first-year cohort, technological innovation, efficient modes of course delivery, and the distinctive learning behaviour of the current 'Net Generation' of students comprise some of these challenges.

This paper explores various changes in teaching environments and learning behaviours, and questions their cumulative effect on the quality of learning at Ontario universities. It is timely to raise these questions prior to the administration and analysis of the National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE) across Ontario's universities. Reflective discussion now helps guide future analysis and interpretation of the NSSE's findings.

CHANGING CONDITIONS FOR LEARNING

1. Ontario's universities experienced success with the prompt construction of space and the rapid expansion of student services to address the double cohort of students. Can the same be said of teaching? Adjustments to the effects of the double cohort are still ongoing as students progress to their senior years and prepare for graduate studies. Faculty members have responded to the larger number of students with new forms of course delivery and other teaching innovations, but there is a strong sense that the greater numbers have made student/faculty contact more difficult.
2. The first-year students of the double cohort are younger than previous cohorts and not yet of drinking age. Furthermore, these students have graduated from a new high school curriculum which has experienced problems in its implementation. Is there evidence that these students are any different, less mature, or less well prepared than previous cohorts? For example, instructors have expressed concerns about the inadequacy of basic literacy and numeracy skills among recent high school graduates. NSSE findings over several years may help to establish whether these effects are transitional or if they have more lasting consequences.
3. Student populations within Ontario's universities have become increasingly diverse. A typical undergraduate class will include students who have a range of nonacademic employment and domestic commitments, learning and physical disabilities, differences in learning styles and second language limitations.
4. A substantial proportion of students experience excessive workloads and scheduling difficulties because they work, often full-time, or do volunteer work, or they have dependents in their care.
5. Learning disabilities in general affect 1 in 10 students. In the classroom we can expect to encounter students with physical disabilities as well as those experiencing Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), depression, eating disorders, obsessive-compulsive behaviours, and Oppositional Defiant Disorder (ODD).
6. Effective teaching also needs to accommodate the different learning styles of students. Instructors are expected to apply different approaches to foster visual and verbal learning, active and reflective learning, sensing and intuitive learning, as well as global and sequential learning.
7. International students are a growing population with different expectations, language barriers, and issues of cultural adjustment.

8. In order to accommodate these differences among students, faculty members are expected to have some understanding of them and to make changes in the classroom, in course delivery and in expected outcomes. But what motivation is there for the faculty to effectively respond to this challenge?
9. A significant shift has been noted in the attitude of students towards responsibility for their learning. There is a strong sense of entitlement among students and their parents to access higher education. Students are perceived to be consumers who purchase an education service from the university. Associated with this attitude is the increased involvement of parents who want to ensure that the money spent contributes to their child's success. Viewed from this perspective, students are less likely to take responsibility for their own learning. Instead they are at risk of becoming passive consumers of education rather than independent and critically-minded learners.
10. The major influence of innovation in communication, information and learning technologies on universities is discussed in a previous COU Working Paper (Sharpe and Fox, 2004). Many issues were identified that arise when universities adopt new learning technologies inside and outside the classroom. What that paper did not address is the growing facility of students with the new technologies and the way they have independently embraced technology as part of their learning. To what extent do universities need to adopt technological innovations that meet the expectations of these students? Do universities need to keep up with the students?
11. The possibilities for technology in learning are extensive, and increasingly student-oriented. They include laptops, personal digital assistants (PDAs), learning management systems (LMS), student response systems (clickers), wireless tablets, iPods, web searching, electronic document delivery, virtual fieldtrips, turn-it-in.com, video streaming, spell/grammar checkers, and numerous specialized and discipline-specific software. Further, the Internet is making accessible new software which is mass customizable allowing more interactive functions such as instant messaging, blogs, wikis, tiddlywikis, podcasts, collaborative filtering, gaming and simulation, and virtual learning environments. To what extent will our students learn how to use these new technologies? Do faculty members need to keep up with the students?
12. Furthermore, much of this innovation in teaching and learning technologies is happening in the context of a variety of institutional pressures to streamline content and delivery - to make learning more entertaining, agreeable, measurable, and above all, convenient for everyone concerned. How will universities ensure that they balance better pedagogy with their use of technological innovations to achieve efficient delivery?
13. A potentially useful and integrative way of thinking about the cumulative result of these changes is in terms of the differences among generations of students. What learning conditions are experienced by the current generation? What are their characteristic learning behaviours? What are the prospects and pitfalls for the next generation?
14. The literature differentiates among four generations, the Great Generation, Baby-boomers, Generation X, and the Net or Millennial Generation (Oblinger and Oblinger, 2005; Oblinger, 2003; Tapscott, 1997, 1999). There are broad differences in the values and expectations of each of these generations, and an extensive literature in the USA suggests that the current, Net Generation thinks and learns differently than previous generations.
15. The Net Generation possesses sophisticated technological adaptability and a remarkable capacity to incorporate multitasking into day-to-day academic activities. Frand (2000) suggests that a distinctive information-age mindset "...is common among students growing up in the globally connected, service- and information-intensive, digitally based culture." He attributes the following characteristics to the Net Generation, reflecting their common values and behaviours. Four attributes relate to broad observations of change:
- Computers Aren't Technology
 - Internet Better Than TV
 - Reality No Longer Real
 - Doing Rather Than Knowing

Three address how people do things:

- ❑ Nintendo over Logic
- ❑ Multitasking Way of Life
- ❑ Typing Rather Than Handwriting

Three are “subliminal needs conditioned by the cyberage”:

- ❑ Staying Connected
- ❑ Zero Tolerance for Delays
- ❑ Consumer/Creator Blurring

Some of these values, expectations and behaviors create enhanced opportunities for learning while others pose a challenge. For example, familiarity with computers and the Internet provide students with a rich resource for interactive learning. But these same technologies also make it easy to plagiarize the work of others. Faculty members are hugely concerned that ‘sampling’ from the Internet not become a substitute for independent research, critical thinking and coherent writing.

NSSE may help to assess how Ontario’s universities have engaged the Net generation of students. It may also help to determine if there is a discrepancy between the universities’ infrastructure and learning technologies, and the students’ personalized facility with information.

Finally, all of these changes must be understood in the context of Ontario’s highly differentiated university system. Change has not occurred to the same degree, or at the same rate, or had the same effects, among all 20 publicly-assisted institutions. To what extent will the findings from the 2006 Ontario cycle of NSSE show that the nature of students and their learning environments differ between the universities in Toronto, as compared to those in Waterloo or northern Ontario? Such differences will attest to the importance of local cultural component in the nature and quality of the educational environment, and the need to customize our understanding to the local context.

CHALLENGES TO EFFECTIVE PEDAGOGY AND STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Changes in the teaching environments and learning behaviours are to be expected, but the cumulative effect of these changes on the quality of student learning may be less obvious. Do the changes noted

above pose a substantial challenge to Ontario universities? Are students getting the right opportunities for a high quality education?

In order to assess the contribution of changing student learning practices on the quality of their education, some priorities and standards of effective pedagogy are needed. The most widely cited foundation work in this area is Chickering & Gamson’s (1987) “Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education”. They established the following seven principles as prerequisites for engaging students in learning:

- ❑ Encourage contact between students and faculty.
- ❑ Develop reciprocity and cooperation among students.
- ❑ Encourage active learning.
- ❑ Give prompt feedback.
- ❑ Emphasize time on task.
- ❑ Communicate high expectations.
- ❑ Respect diverse talents and ways of learning.

These general principles, expressed in various forms, have been affirmed by several empirical studies, including a recent and comprehensive study of colleges in the USA (Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005). It is reassuring to note that recent evidence suggests that the basic principles of good teaching are perceived to be the same across generations even though student behaviours, attitudes and expectations are changing (Hartman, Moskal, and Dziuban, 2005).

Research studies based on the growing body of NSSE findings from US colleges have contributed to the further refinement of principles of good learning. Much of this literature is interested in the how well universities provide opportunities for ‘deep learning’, which refers to exercising higher order, integrative, and reflective skills (Weigel, 2001). The instructional methods needed to promote opportunities for deep learning, include, for example:

- ❑ Encouraging faculty/student interaction (e.g. meet groups to plan projects, “personalize” teaching)
- ❑ Encouraging student interaction (e.g. group projects, peer tutoring, supplemental instruction)

- ❑ Using active and interactive teaching methods (e.g. case studies, buzz groups)
- ❑ Making links with what students already know to encourage sense of structure
- ❑ Allowing students input into course goals and methods
- ❑ Discussing/teaching learning skills explicitly
- ❑ Seeking interdisciplinary and cross-curricular links

Another definition of learning, broader in scope, is advocated by scholars and professionals working in the area of student affairs. They have reconsidered learning to be a comprehensive, holistic, transformative activity that integrates academic learning and student development, two processes that have for the most part been considered separate and even independent of each other. From this perspective, the meaning of learning shifts from information transfer to the development and transformation of personal identity. To enable transformative education, "...every aspect of the student experience must be examined and a new configuration of learning processes and outcomes created. All of the resources of the campus must be brought to bear on the student's learning process and learning must be reconsidered' (Keeling, 2004: 11). Shifting the priority of learning in this direction requires the support of the entire university community, and suggests some redefinition of the role of faculty members.

Are Ontario universities providing the necessary conditions to enable student engagement, deep learning, and transformative education? Although examples of innovative learning practices can be found across Ontario's institutions, there is a danger that the wide extent and rapid pace of change in learning environments and behaviours will overwhelm the capacity of the universities to provide the right opportunities for effective learning.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UNIVERSITIES

There is clear need to better understand the nature of change in learning behaviours and its relationship to the quality of higher education in Ontario. To this end it will be helpful to have the findings from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Of immediate interest is the use of NSSE to help answer questions about the effectiveness of student learning.

We need to ask, for example: To what extent do our universities challenge and support students in ways that foster deep learning and personal development? Who are our least engaged students and how do we reach them?

NSSE is expected to provide us with an educational metric that tells us what to measure and how to measure it, but in order to make the best use of this data, universities will need to devise a means for analyzing the findings and for using them to inform academic policy-making. In the words of the 2005 NSSE Annual Report, "Some person or group must take the lead in coordinating and monitoring improvement initiatives and seeing that the change efforts bleed down into academic departments and front-line student support programs and services" (NSSE, 2005: 7). Over the intermediate term, Ontario universities will gain more from NSSE if processes for responding to its findings are clearly defined, and if those processes include faculty members.

A variety of innovative learning practices can be expected to emerge from NSSE and related initiatives. It will be of benefit to each institution, to the entire system, and to the students of Ontario to develop mechanisms for sharing the best practices that emerge. Collective efforts such as this may help to counter some of the issues that arise with recent changes in student learning behaviour and to affirm a broader culture of excellence in learning in Ontario.

To the extent that the changes in learning behaviours identified in this paper are accurate, universities will also need to think strategically about investments in technical infrastructure and professional development. Means must be found to plan for and design facilities and programs that are flexible to emergent technologies and pedagogies. It can be anticipated that future generations will have expectations of different pedagogies than those currently practiced. Likewise, one can only imagine how universities will change as members of the Net-generation become administrators. Universities will do well to monitor changes in learning behaviour as well as technology developments and their impact on the student population so they are better able to anticipate the needs of the class of 2025.

REFERENCES

Brown, John Seely. 2000.
 Growing Up Digital. *Change* vol. 32, no. 2: 10–11.
<http://www.aahe.org/change/digital.pdf>

Chickering, A. and Z. Gamson. 1987.
 The Seven Principles for Good Practice in Higher Education.
AAHE Bulletin, vol. 39, no. 7: 3-7.

Dede, Chris. 2005.
Planning for Neomillennial Learning Styles: Implications for Investments in Technology and Faculty
<http://www.educause.edu/PlanningforNeomillennialLearningStyles%3AImplicationsforInvestmentsinTechnologyandFaculty/6069>

National Research Council 1999.
Being Fluent with Information Technology. Washington, D.C.: National Academies.

EDUCAUSE Review. September/October 2005, Volume 40, Number 5
<http://www.educause.edu/apps/er/erm05/erm055.asp>

Frand, Jason. 2000.
 The Information-Age Mindset: Changes in Students and Implications for Higher Education.
EDUCAUSE Review, vol. 35, no. 5: 15-24.
<http://www.educause.edu/apps/er/erm00/articles005/erm0051.pdf>

Hartman, Joel, Patsy Moskal, and Chuck Dziuban, 2005
Preparing the Academy of Today for the Learner of Tomorrow
 University of Central Florida

Howe, Neil and William Strauss. 2000
Millennials Rising. New York: Vintage Books.

Keeling, Richard P. (editor). 2004
Learning Reconsidered: A Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience.
 National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and
 American College Personnel Association (ACPA).

Komives, Susan R. and Dudley B. Woodard, Jr., & Associates. 2003
Student Services: A Handbook for the Profession, 4th Edition
 San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Also available as an e-book

Kuh, George D. 2005

Engaged Learning Communities: Students, Faculty, and Institutions

Presentation to the Association of American Colleges and Universities, Burlington, Vermont.

nsse.iub.edu/pdf/conference_presentations/2005/engaged_learning.pdf

National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE). 2005.

Exploring Different Dimensions of Student Engagement: 2005 Annual Survey Results

http://nsse.iub.edu/pdf/NSSE2005_annual_report.pdf

Oblinger, Diana G. 2003

Boomer, Gen-Xers, and Millennials: Understanding the ‘New Students’

EDUCAUSE Review, vol. 38, no.4.

Oblinger, Diana G. and James L. Oblinger, editors, 2005

Educating the Net Generation, EDUCAUSE e-Book

http://www.educause.edu/content.asp?PAGE_ID=5989&bhcp=1

Pascarella, E.T. and Terenzini, P.T. 2005

How college affects students (Vol 2): A third decade of research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Prensky, Marc. 2001

Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants. On the Horizon. NCB University Press, Vol. 9 No. 5.

<http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20-%20Digital%20Natives,%20Digital%20Immigrants%20-%20Part1.pdf>

Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants, Part II: Do They Really Think Differently?.

On the Horizon. NCB University Press, Vol. 9 No. 6.

<http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20-%20Digital%20Natives,%20Digital%20Immigrants%20-%20Part2.pdf>

Sharpe, Bob and Michael Fox. 2004

“Learning Technology Issues in Higher Education”, Working Paper Series by Academic Colleagues,

Volume Three, Council of Ontario Universities, COU No. 775, 8 pages. <http://www.cou.on.ca/>

Tapscott, Don. 1997.

Growing Up Digital: The Rise of the Net Generation. New York: McGraw Hill

1999: Educating the Net Generation. *Integrating Technology into the Curriculum*, vol. 56, no. 5.

Weigel, Van B., 2001.

Deep Learning for a Digital Age: Technology's Untapped Potential to Enrich Higher Education.

San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Academic Citizenship

*Paul Thompson, Academic Colleague
University of Toronto*

*Philippe Constantineau, Academic Colleague
Royal Military College*

*George Fallis, Academic Colleague
York University*

March 2006

SUMMARY

Universities are facing a critical challenge; university citizenship has steadily declined over the last few decades. As a self-governing entity, most of the foundational elements of a university community are within its own control. As a result, the health and future welfare of the institution depends greatly on the quality of its leaders and robustness of its governing structure. These in turn depend on the quality of those undertaking leadership roles and serving on governing bodies and on the degree to which they reflect its values and aspirations. Maximising the probability that these desiderata will be achieved requires a broad-based faculty willingness to serve conscientiously on these bodies and to serve as administrators to be involved in selecting members, and to be involved on the myriad of sub-committees, task forces, departmental committees, and the like. It is not only an abdication of citizenship to leave governance and administration of the institution to a few willing faculty, it is dangerous and puts at risk the welfare of the institution. Even if these few were all able to place the welfare of the institution above their own particular agendas and their self-interest (not something on which to count), the process of self-selection could not be expected to result in a group that would adequately reflect, represent or understand the breadth and depth of the needs, aspirations and complex circumstances of the entire institution. The larger the pool of willing participants, the greater the probability that those selected will reflect best the institutional diversity.

This paper draws out the rights and obligations of faculty citizens embedded in the structural arrangements common to universities in the western world. In part A we examine three fundamental components of those arrangements, components that collectively define certain rights and entail certain obligations of citizenship. These obligations flow in part from essential rights, and also in part from what is necessary to sustain the viability and vibrancy of the community. In Part B, we examine some of these essential obligations of citizenship. In Part C, we make recommendations about how to promote effective citizenship; these recommendations are collected after Part C under the heading “Recommendations”.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Universities are facing a critical challenge; university citizenship has steadily declined over the last few decades¹. It is true that, fond memories of senior faculty members notwithstanding, we found no evidence that there was a “golden age” of citizenship but it is also true that several decades ago a larger percentage of faculty participated in the administration and governance of universities and had greater visibility in community life.

As largely self-governing and self-regulating entities, universities depend completely on the participation and commitment of their members. For a variety of reasons, a number of which are explored in this paper, citizenship (participation and commitment) has steadily declined in most major North American universities to the detriment of individual faculty and the collective; a smaller

¹ This might strike some as unduly alarmist. We think not. Citizenship is a huge issue for universities and things are bad. US academic leaders seem to be much more willing to air their worries on these sorts of issues. For example, Henry Rosovsky is always trenchant on such things (see, Rosovsky (1998) and (2001). Rosovsky makes an analogy between universities and the professions (e.g., law and medicine) and notes that they have explicit codes on professional conduct, whereas professors do not. Rosovsky also takes up the same themes in an analysis of governance - governance is an interesting lens through which to view the citizenship question.

percentage of individuals carry an increasing administrative and governance load and fewer faculty participate in the social life of their departments, faculties or universities. This decline needs at a minimum to be halted and ideally reversed. The future vitality of universities will likely depend on successfully characterising citizenship in the 21st-century university, correctly diagnosing the causes of its decline, accurately determining the effects of the decline and carefully implementing steps to re-engage faculty in the life and governance of their university. This paper begins the analysis and dialogue necessary to address these issues.

Employing the term “citizenship” presupposes the existence of a community in which one can be meaningfully a citizen². In this paper, the community is an academic institution and faculty are its citizens of primary interest. As with civil society, structural features of universities determine the many rights and obligations of faculty³. Some of these rights are explicit and are entrenched in policies (e.g., academic freedom and tenure), and some obligations are also explicit and entrenched in policies and/or collective agreements (e.g., teaching responsibilities). Others are implicit; they flow from an understanding of what is required to sustain a viable, vibrant social community – such as minimal supervision or determination of time management on the part of its participants. The responsibilities (duties) that accompany the rights and privileges embedded in the social structure depend largely on individual integrity and good will, although most, if not all, institutions employ incentives – course release,

stipends, etc. – which encourage and enable participation in governance.

Although some aspects of citizenship (a particular class of duties) are entrenched in policy, many essential aspects are implicit – part of the culture. Those embedded in policy are clear and usually enforceable. Those that are implicit range from obvious to arcane. In this discussion paper, we examine three fundamental rights accorded faculty (self-governance, academic freedom and tenure, and self-directedness) and we examine five obligations of citizenship without which the viability and vibrancy of the community would be at risk, and, hence, upon which the continuation of the institution and the rights enjoyed by faculty depend.

This paper concentrates on citizenship obligations within individual institutions. There are, of course, wider obligations to the inter-university community (nationally and internationally) and to society. To adequately address these obligations would add significantly to the length of this paper⁴. In addition, these wider obligations, given the current organisation of the academic enterprise⁵, depend on well-functioning individual institutions, which is the focus of this paper.

Inevitably, the faculty citizen described in a paper canvassing wide-ranging features of citizenship will be a model citizen, a model from which actual faculty will, in idiosyncratic ways, deviate. The model citizen, however, provides an ideal by comparison with which deviations in degree and quality can be assessed. Significant deviations can be expected to have a negative effect upon the university and to be unacceptable. Minor variations simply reflect individual priorities, strengths and weaknesses.

The meaning, grounding and implications of rights and obligations (responsibilities) as well as the relationship between them have been the subject of

² Discussions of citizenship in civil society are rich and varied. Many of the issues of citizenship in civil society are found in microcosm in academe. A useful collection of historical essays on citizenship is Clark (1994) and a useful collection of contemporary essays is Beiner (1994).

³ It is heuristically useful to link university-focused discussion to the recent, general political science/political theory discussions of citizenship. There are two conceptions of citizenship: a republican ideal and a liberal ideal. Almost all our talk within universities uses a republican ideal of citizenship - with its strong obligation to actively participate in political life. But over most of the twentieth century, the liberal ideal has triumphed. Liberal virtue theorists are now struggling with a recognition that liberalism has too much emphasized freedom and rights, and has emphasized responsibilities too little. The university is like current political life (see: Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman (1999))

⁴ An earlier Academic Colleagues' Paper by George Fallis addressed one of these wider obligations, that of the public intellectual.

⁵ Opinions vary on the appropriateness of the current organisation of the academic enterprise. Some hold that the current organisation is not appropriate for a post-modern society and world. Nonetheless, it is the organisation that is likely to persist for the foreseeable future.

disputes for centuries⁶. As a way of avoiding being ensnared by the continuing controversies, this paper exploits some common ground and appeals to widely shared intuitions: for example, whether a right taken in isolation entails an obligation is highly controversial in political, legal and ethical theorising. Less controversial is the claim that a collection of rights and a collection of obligations flow from specific social arrangements. Hence, this paper draws out the rights and obligations of faculty citizens embedded in the social and legal arrangements common to universities in the western world.

In Part A we examine three fundamental components of those arrangements, components that collectively define certain rights and entail certain obligations of citizenship. These obligations flow in part from essential rights, and also in part on what is necessary to sustain the viability and vibrancy of the community. In Part B, we examine some of these essential obligations of citizenship. In Part C, we make recommendations about how to promote effective citizenship; these recommendations are collected after Part C under the heading “Recommendations”.

PART A CITIZENSHIP RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

1. Self-governing and Self-regulating

Universities in Canada are self-governing and largely self-regulating institutions. They, like municipalities, are creations of the Provincial Governments⁷. Universities have different kinds of citizens with different rights and obligations (faculty, administrative staff and students). All, to some extent, participate in governance and in the life of the institution. This paper focuses on faculty and their role as citizens of the university.

⁶ See for example, Locke (1690), Rousseau (1762), Bradley (1876), Hughes (1944), Prichard (1949), Brandt (1962), Raphael (1967), Meldon (1974), Dworkin (1978), Waldron (1984), White (1984).

⁷ Obviously, universities are organizations that belong to Civil Society, in the contemporary sense of the term, and are constituted like many other not-for-profit organizations, with a charter outlining their governance structures. A provincial law recognizes universities as degree-granting institutions. This is true even of RMC as a Federal institution.

As self-governing and self-regulating institutions, universities largely determine their own patterns of activity, standards, values, requirements and the like. Ultimately, these are determined by faculty members, hence, faculty, as a collective, have the right of self-determination on these matters.

2. Academic Freedom and Tenure

Academic freedom is a cornerstone of the modern western-world university. It is the guarantor of free, independent and broad enquiry. It is the principal justification for the institution of tenure. Faculty, within limits delineated by civil laws, are empowered to investigate any matter and to communicate views and discoveries on those matters in any manner they wish⁸.

Tenure, of course, does not absolve one of responsibility, integrity or adhering to standards of conduct. Tenure is not a protection from consequences arising from actions such as falsifying data, failure to carry out one's contractual obligations (in teaching, for example), sexual, or other, harassment of students, colleagues and administrative staff. Indeed, the justification and success of the institution of tenure is inextricably tied to individual good will and citizenship – where citizenship is broadly understood to encompass participation in the life of the community, a commitment to its values and a fostering of its welfare.

There, of course, will be grey areas where citizens will differ on specific matters of content in each of these broad features of faculty citizenship. The policies, procedures, governing bodies, appeal processes, and the like are designed to ensure that, as in all open, self-regulating communities, there are fair, open and revisable mechanisms for resolving these differences.

3. Self-directedness

The determination, by the university, of when and how faculty members discharge their research, teaching and service obligations is minimal (mostly confined to classroom teaching obligations). The fulfilment of other

⁸ De George (1977)

expectations, such as when research work is undertaken, when to meet with students, when to declare a piece of research ready for publication, which conferences and lectures to attend, and when to schedule student assignments and exams, is largely at the discretion of the faculty member. Some kinds of research work constrain that discretion but the university-imposed constraints are almost non-existent.

Apart from respecting scheduled classroom teaching, a faculty member has the right to decide how to organise her time. This right provides a degree of flexibility consistent with the complex, dynamic, inter-university character of undertaking research and assisting students outside the classroom. It has served academe well and derelictions with respect to research and teaching are few. Just how to weave the service elements of citizenship into this fabric, however, is less clear and seldom explicitly addressed.

PART B CITIZENSHIP OBLIGATIONS

1. Serving on governance bodies

For the most part, the values of the university and its collective understanding of its interests and welfare are articulated in internally legislated policies and procedures. Some of these are departmentally or faculty based but the most significant and character-defining are enacted by councils, boards and senates. These bodies are essential to the self-governance of universities and the quality, and validity, of the policies and procedure depends crucially on the full participation of faculty⁹.

As a self-governing entity, most of the foundational elements of a university community are within its own control. As a result, the health and future welfare of the institution depends greatly on the quality of its leaders and robustness of its governing structure. These in turn depend on the quality of those undertaking leadership roles and serving on governing bodies and on the degree to which they reflect its values and aspirations.

⁹ See, Thompson (2005)

Maximising the probability that these desiderata will be achieved requires a broad-based faculty willingness to serve conscientiously on these bodies and as administrators, to be involved in selecting members, and to be involved on the myriad of sub-committees, task forces, and the like. It is not only an abdication of citizenship to leave governance of the institution to a few willing faculty, it is dangerous and puts at risk the welfare of the institution. Even if these few were all able to place the welfare of the institution above their own particular agendas and their self-interest (not something on which to count), the process of self-selection could not be expected to result in a group that would adequately reflect, represent or understand the breadth and depth of the needs, aspirations and complex circumstances of the entire institution. The larger the pool of willing participants, the greater the probability that those selected will reflect best the institutional diversity.

Of course, as it must be noted, universities do not exist simply to exemplify a well-functioning, self-governing institution but principally to engage in teaching and research. Hence, these must be given primacy but not to the exclusion of those features upon which the ability to effectively engage in teaching and research ultimately depend, namely, a collegial set of arrangements, policies and procedures that foster research and teaching, reasonable financial allocations, and related matters.

2. Maintaining competence

The welfare of the institution depends upon its members maintaining competence in research and teaching. Tenure is not intended to protect indolence and many universities include failure to maintain competence in research and teaching among the grounds for disciplinary action or dismissal, tenure notwithstanding. There may be special arrangements under which a faculty member is not required to engage in teaching or is not required to engage in research. Under such arrangements maintaining competence is restricted to either teaching or research. Maintaining competence in teaching is often understood to involve staying abreast of pedagogical innovations and best practices.

Students are essential to the academy. Faculty citizenship involves recognising the importance of this constituency and ensuring that the goals of the university with respect to student learning and student life are achieved. A failure of individual faculty to attend to this feature of a university undermines its welfare, social importance and *raison d'être*. Maintaining competence in teaching and research are required in order to consistently and fully participate in achieving the university's goals and social obligations.

3. Mentoring

Early enculturation into the university community – its values, processes, expectations, and general welfare – is the most effective way to secure the university's present and future welfare. This, of course, requires that faculty in mid-career and beyond, as part of citizenship, undertake to mentor new colleagues.

Unfortunately, even if mid-career colleagues are willing to be engaged in mentoring, from the perspective of the young colleague, there are numerous impediments and tensions involved. The demands on young faculty are numerous and nurturing all the elements of citizenship exposes inherent conflicts. For example, the time and the attention required to establish a research program and trajectory consistent with the demands of a tenure review at most universities has led to some combination of reduced teaching in early years, relief from serving on committees before tenure and release time. Understandable, and perhaps defensible, as this is, it delays, and sometimes thwarts the inculcation of other aspects of citizenship that are at least equal in significance to furthering the welfare of the university.

Mentoring a new colleague is a duty that is widely held to rest with the department head alone. This obligation is hardly, if ever, delegated to other departmental colleagues, because it is hardly ever recognised as an essential duty of faculty members. Consequently, failures to effectively fulfil this "moral" obligation are hardly ever noted. Underlying, in part, the explanation for the widespread absence of this duty is the perception that, in the institutional culture of

universities, all faculty members, new and not so new, are to be held ultimately responsible for their performance and career. But, there is nothing incompatible with simultaneously accepting this locus of ultimate responsibility and insisting that mentoring is the most effective way of enhancing the chances of success and is in the institution's best interests. Indeed, looking at the genesis of the modern university, mentoring could well be considered as the archetypical form of higher education - an activity that could be dispensed with, if at all, only when a faculty mentoree has become a full professor.

4. Leadership

Leadership is obviously connected to a number of the above elements of citizenship but it is worth separate consideration because it is more than serving on committees or undertaking chair or decanal responsibilities. Leadership is articulating and working to achieve a progressive future for the institution, one that tracks the changing internal and external realities and finds ways to adjust institutional activities, policies and goals for the benefit of the institution.

This is an ongoing responsibility of citizenship and it occurs in all aspects of one's university life since some changes are as local as introducing or promoting pedagogical opportunities and others as large as changing social priorities and conditions¹⁰. Some can only be responded to by instructors in the context of individual classes, others require the involvement of large numbers of faculty (curricular revision, for example), and yet others require extra-university activities such as negotiating government-university frameworks.

5. Promoting the welfare of the collective

The quality of students and faculty that a university can attract has a profound influence on the vitality of its community life. A significant element in creating an ambiance and reputation that attracts excellent students (especially at the graduate level) and faculty is the dissemination of information about the interest, achievements and relevance of the

¹⁰ See Simpson (2003) and (2004)

research and courses offered by faculty. In addition, giving credit and exposure to the achievements of students provides a window on the community's accomplishments in inspiring and communicating knowledge and skills to its students.

A university can create offices to ensure that materials are produced and disseminated, media are constantly informed, and researchers are connected to interested reporters. Such offices depend, however, for success on faculty members who are engaged in a broad dissemination of their research – inside and outside the academy – and in making their expertise available beyond the confines of the academy. Clearly, not every faculty member will function effectively in the variety of venues that are available for promoting their individual achievements and the contribution they are making to their academic community and the broader society, but most are likely to be able to make a contribution in some fashion. When the face of the institution centres on a handful of high-profile individuals it provides a distorted sense of the impressive range of research accomplishments and activities of the institution and can leave the impression of a vast sea of mediocrity buoyed up by a few luminaries. The same can happen when one area of research is disproportionately profiled (e.g., the success of medical research).

All faculty benefit in a host of ways from the reputation of their community. Hence, one can reasonably expect every faculty member to participate in an appropriate way to securing and maintaining the benefits. To not do so is, with respect to this range of benefits, to be a free-rider, something that cannot be regarded as good citizenship.

PART C STRIKING AN APPROPRIATE BALANCE¹¹

¹¹ There are two aspects to balance: balance between rights and responsibilities (we've tilted too much toward rights and away from responsibilities); and balance among obligations (we've tilted too much toward research, and teaching, away from service).

The multifaceted demands of citizenship (broadly: teaching, research, and service to the institution, to the scholarly community and to the general public) have proved difficult to balance. Research has become dominant in many universities. There are many reasons for this. Faculty obtain personal and institutional satisfaction and rewards from it; the reputations of universities depend on it; external funding flows to the universities on the basis of it; external assessments of the social value and relevance of universities involve it; it is easier to obtain data about outcomes and, hence, easier to assess success; and so on. In addition, university professors today are cosmopolitans, less and less rooted in the history and specifics of their institutions. There is often a great tension between obligations to the wider academic community and obligations to one's university and department.

Recently, however, many universities have recognised the negative impact a strong emphasis on research can have on teaching and service to the community, and are exploring ways to impress on young faculty the importance of teaching to its *raison d'être* and welfare and to put in place ways to assist young faculty. Although it is essential to find ways to place greater emphasis on, and provide greater support for, teaching, attempts to do so have frequently simply served to highlight the tensions. It is still widely believed by young faculty that career advancement (especially tenure and promotion) is driven by research. The perception (many would say the reality) is that career advancement is more certain for an excellent researcher who is an adequate teacher than for an excellent teacher who is an adequate researcher. Many universities, with varying degrees of success, have, and are, working to change this perception and any reality on which it is based.

Whatever success universities have experienced in changing this perception and reality, other elements of citizenship have barely received passing interest. Mentoring, service on committees and governing bodies, and administering such entities are essential to the welfare of the community and, in turn, of its members. Active involvement in these is sometimes taken as a sign of a failed academic career or one past its zenith. There is a genuine danger in this attitude – even if false at one point in time – that it will usher in a reality in which those who undertake these duties are indeed failed citizens in fundamental ways. Verbal expressions designed to promote the idea that administrators

must be well-respected researchers and teachers fall short of the task. Such pronouncements clash with the perception that administrative service, committee work and mentoring are not among the real determinants of career success. Indeed, they take time away from things that really do matter to career success. However, in the absence of a clear and shared vision of the institution's welfare, and without talented, dedicated individuals in whom resides the values of the institution being engaged in the elements of citizenship, the direction and policies of the institution increasingly will be dominated by those least suited to exemplify its values and welfare. Some mechanisms need to be put in place that will rebalance the internal incentives so that these service elements of citizenship are promoted.

When looking for mechanisms to promote a "good" within a university, attention often turns to the processes and criteria involved in a tenure review. Natural as this propensity is, tenure has a specific purpose in the institution; including a plethora of factors in a tenure evaluation process can be expected to unacceptably dilute all of the criteria. It is reasonable to expect that tenure will be most firmly tied to the dominant goals of teaching and research, embodying as these do the larger social justification for a university. But recognising the primacy of these elements doesn't remove the importance to the life, health and future of the institution of the quality of its governance, internal dialogue, mentoring of the next generation of faculty. Hence, some mechanisms for fostering (encouraging and rewarding) participation in these other features of citizenship must be found.

A natural place to start is with Ph.D. candidates. Faculty, especially those who have engaged in more than modest service, should mentor Ph.D. candidates. An emphasis on the importance of teaching – tied to the edge it provides when competing for positions – has yielded remarkable results; results that have improved the ability of search committees to make a judgement about teaching quality, made newly hired faculty more competent and confident, and placed teaching in a more positive space.

RECOMMENDATION 1:

Universities should find ways of encouraging and assisting departments in mentoring ABD

graduate students in how to be effectively engaged in the life of their university.

A complementary initiative would be to include, more consciously, consideration of indicators of willingness to engage in citizenship in hiring decisions. These indicators, of course, are not easy to specify but probably their specification is no less difficult than specifying, at the time of hiring, indicators of willingness to put solid effort into teaching and indicators of likely success. That said, all hiring processes tacitly or explicitly, include a consideration of personal suitability, in addition to educational background, record of publications (as an indicator of ability to conduct research), and teaching experience. Thus, advertisements for faculty positions could easily include readiness to serve on committees and to assume other service functions, as desired, among those qualifications expected from candidates for the position. This simple addition to an advertisement would signal at the outset the importance of the service and citizenship components in the duties expected to be performed by the faculty member.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

Indicators should be developed that provide evidence of the likelihood and quality of citizenship contributions a candidate will provide.

A third measure might be that during the pre-tenure years, a few minimal committee duties could be judiciously selected to provide different and attractive glimpses of the governing of the institution.

RECOMMENDATION 3:

Pre-tenure faculty should not be given a "normal" service load but some carefully selected ways for them to participate in service should be found.

A fourth measure would consist of conducting an institution-wide survey of the service component of faculty members aimed at measuring the average time spent by chairs and members on various committees established by the institution or on other tasks taken on by faculty that are of value to the institution. Such a survey should also include questions about time spent by faculty serving in disciplinary associations, on review boards for

journals, scholarships, prizes, working on websites, or in work on behalf of whatever organization the institution considers to be of benefit to the academic community or the general public, whether local, provincial, national or international. Setting up and administering such a survey would alone and on its own send a strong signal to faculty members as to the value the institution places on academic citizenship.

RECOMMENDATION 4:

Research should be undertaken by Academic Vice-Presidents to determine the service component of faculty members aimed at measuring the average time spent by chairs and members on various committees established by the institution or on other tasks taken on by faculty that are of value to the institution (including serving in disciplinary associations, on review boards, for journals, scholarships, prizes, working on websites, or on behalf of whatever organization the institution considers to be of benefit to the academic community).

A fifth measure would consist in better defining and identifying an adequate level of service to the institution such that failure to meet this level might result in grounds sufficient to deny tenure or promotion to Associate or Full Professorship, even when a solid performance in research and teaching can be attested. Such a measure would provide a powerful incentive to all faculty members who would not be otherwise active to enlist in institutional committees, task forces and other necessary institutional endeavours.

RECOMMENDATION 5:

Based on the results of recommendation 4, a reasonable level of service should be determined.

A sixth measure would consist in effectively rewarding those faculty members, through course relief or increases to their professional development allocations, for their involvement in service activities that are of real value to the institution, when it can be shown that they already meet or exceed expectations with regard to the research and teaching components of their duties as faculty members.

Establishing, as some universities have done (York, for example¹²), a Prize honouring every year a professor who has shown leadership in all three components of academic life, teaching, research and service to the community, is a straightforward and visible way to recognise and reward service; better yet, a Prize for Academic Leadership, to honour every year a professor whose contribution to the academic governance of the institution has been outstanding permits those who have made excellent service contribution and acceptable research and teaching contributions to be recognised. Ideally, such a Prize should not be awarded to a professor who is currently a president, vice-president or dean, or the like, but to a professor whose involvement in the academic life of the institution has made a big difference.

RECOMMENDATION 6:

Ways of recognising and rewarding service should be instituted; awards for service should be a first step in this process.

A seventh measure would consist in establishing workshops in academic citizenship and leadership for new faculty members.

RECOMMENDATION 7:

Workshops should be established by each university and by universities as a collective to assist faculty in making contributions to the university governance, administration, and collegial life.

All these recommendations depend on revitalising the governance and administration of universities. There is a widespread view among faculty that most committees, task forces and the like take a considerable amount of time but often make little difference to the policies, practices or directions of the university. Perhaps the most cynical attitude is reserved for governance where numerous boards, committees and sub-committees, faculty committees, department committees, and the like

¹² The York honour is a "University Professorship." It is not awarded every year. There are a limited number which can be held at any one time by all professors. It also has an award for research - a "Distinguished Research Professor" (also limited in number). The University Professorship is for distinguished contribution in all areas, but with special attention to service contributions.

deliberate on the same matters, usually sequentially, with imperceptible, if any, added value. This is a waste of faculty time, is dispiriting and breeds ennui.

RECOMMENDATION 8:

Universities should systematically examine every layer and step of governance. Those aspects that do not have clear added-value should be eliminated.

RECOMMENDATIONS: CONSOLIDATED

RECOMMENDATION 1:

Universities should find ways of encouraging and assisting departments in mentoring ABD graduate students in how to be effectively engaged in the life of their university.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

Indicators should be developed that provide evidence of the likelihood and quality of citizenship contributions a candidate will provide.

RECOMMENDATION 3:

Pre-tenure faculty should not be given a “normal” service load but some carefully selected ways for them to participate in service should be found.

RECOMMENDATION 4:

Research should be undertaken by Academic Vice-Presidents to determine the service component of faculty members aimed at measuring the average time spent by chairs and members on various committees established by the institution or on other tasks taken on by faculty that are of value to the institution (including serving in disciplinary associations, on review boards, for journals, scholarships, prizes, working on websites, or for whatever organization the institution considers to be of benefit to the academic community).

RECOMMENDATION 5:

Based on the results of recommendation 4, a reasonable level of service should be determined.

RECOMMENDATION 6:

Ways of recognising and rewarding service should be instituted; awards for service should be a first step in this process.

RECOMMENDATION 7:

Workshops should be established by each university and by universities as a collective to assist faculty in making contributions to the university governance, administration, and collegial life.

RECOMMENDATION 8:

Universities should systematically examine every layer and step of governance. Those aspects that do not have clear added-value should be eliminated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boyer, E.L. (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Beiner, R. (ed.) (1994) *Theorizing Citizenship* Albany: SUNY Press.
- Bradley, F.H. (1876) *Ethical Studies* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brandt, R.B. (ed.) (1962) *Social Justice* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Clarke, P.B. (ed.) (1994) *Citizenship* London: Pluto Press.
- De George, R.T (1997) *Academic Freedom and Tenure: Ethical Issues*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Dworkin, R.M. (1978) *Taking Rights Seriously* London: Duckworth.
- Hughes, G.E. (1944) "Motive and Duty," *Mind* 53: 314-331.
- Kennedy, D. (1977) *Academic Duty* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. and Norman, W. (1999) "Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory." *Ethics*.
- Locke, J. (1690) *Two Treatises of Government* Harmondsworth: Penguin (1964)
- Meldon, A.I. (1974) *Rights and Persons* Oxford: Blackwells.
- Prichard, H.A. (1949) *Moral Obligations* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Raphael, D.D. (1967) *Political Theory and the Rights of Man* London: Macmillan.
- Rawls, J. (1971) *A Theory of Justice* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rosovsky, H. (1998) "A Neglected Topic: Professional Conduct of College and University Teachers" in William Bowen and Harold Shapiro *Universities and their Leadership* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rosovsky, H. (2001) "Some Thoughts on University Governance" in Werner Hirsch and Luc Weber *Governance in Higher Education: The University in a State of Flux*.
- Rorty, R. (1994) "Does Academic Freedom have Philosophical Presuppositions?" *Academe*, pp.52-63.
- Rousseau, J.J. (1762) *The Social Contract* Harmondsworth: Penguin (1984)
- Simpson, E. (2003) "The Faculty of the Future," *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 1: 49-58.
- Simpson, E. (2004) "The Leadership of Service," *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 2: 199-207.
- Thompson, P. (2005) "The Accountability of Academic Leaders within and without the Academy," *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 2: 187-197.
- Waldron, J. (ed.) (1984) *Theories of Rights* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- White, A.R. (1984) *Rights* Oxford University Press.

Research Chairs: A Systematic Change In Ontario's Universities

*Antoni Lewkowicz, Academic Colleague, University of
Ottawa*

*Paul Schellenberg, Academic Colleague, University of
Waterloo*

June 2006

The Working Paper Series consists of short papers on academic issues prepared by Academic Colleagues. The topics chosen by the caucus of Academic Colleagues are championed by one or two colleagues. Although drafts of each paper are discussed by the full caucus, the final version of the paper represents the opinions of the author(s) and not a consensus reached by the Colleagues. The authors present their papers to the full Council as a matter of interest and to stimulate discussion. The papers as finalized do not represent COU policy. They are simply a mechanism for investigating and opening discussion on matters of interest to the Colleagues and the Council – and their readership at large.

ABSTRACT

This short Academic Colleague Working Paper highlights the increasing differentiation in workload conditions for faculty that is taking place in Ontario universities. The position of research chair, funded externally or internally, has assumed a significant role in many of the Province's institutions. A recent review of the Canada Research Chair program indicates that considerable benefits can accrue from these appointments. Partly in consequence, half of the Ontario universities have supplemented the CRC program by creating internal research chairs. Despite uncertainties concerning the long-term impact of research chairs on the university system, these positions appear to be here to stay, at least in the medium-term.

INTRODUCTION

In "The Brains Business – A Survey of Higher Education", from *The Economist*, September 10, 2005, we read that "... these tradition-loving (or -creating) institutions are currently enduring a thunderstorm of changes so fundamental that some say the very idea of the university is being challenged. ... This is happening for

four reasons. The first is the democratisation of higher education—"massification", in the language of the educational profession. ... The second reason is the rise of the knowledge economy. ... The third factor is globalization. ... The fourth is competition. Traditional universities are being forced to compete for students and research grants, and private companies are trying to break into a sector which they regard as "the new health care". The World Bank calculates that global spending on higher education amounts to \$300 billion a year, or 1% of global economic output. There are more than 80 million students worldwide, and 3.5 million people are employed to teach them or look after them." [1]

The Ontario university system is not immune to these forces. This Working Paper describes one impact of global and national competition on Ontario universities: the development of research chairs.

CANADA RESEARCH CHAIR PROGRAM

Endowed Chairs have existed since before the 16th Century at universities in Europe but these chairs were held by only a very small percentage of university professors. One sign of increasing global competition in academia is the Canadian Government's establishment of the Canada Research Chairs Program to promote greater research intensity, to help repatriate Canadian academics, and to attract the world's leading research scholars to the Canadian academic community. "In 2000, the Government of Canada allocated \$900 million to create 2000 university Chairs in addition to \$250 million in infrastructure funding from the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI). ... it is expected that the 2000 chairs will be filled by 2007/08." [2] The program is well-known internationally and appears to be highly regarded.

As of March 13, 2006, the Canada Research Chairs Program reported that 1577 chairs have been created, consisting of 755 Tier 1 Chairs and 822 Tier 2 Chairs. An important element of both the CRC and CFI programs was the requirement that universities identify their strategic research areas and use the programs to strengthen them.

Canadian universities and colleges have recruited 501 chairholders from outside Canada, consisting of 235 expatriates and 266 international recruits [4]. This is a significant accomplishment and a success story for the

program since it is unlikely that most of these top-rate researchers would have moved (or moved back) to Canada without the incentive of a CRC. On the other hand, the statistics also show that Canadian universities created 1076 CRCs in order to retain the services of internal candidates, or to attract research scholars from one of their sister institutions. While some of these researchers might have left Canada if they had not received a CRC, a recent 5-year study of the program suggests that relatively few would have done so. [2]

Universities provided, on average, about \$69,000 in research funding for each CRC during 2002/2003 [2]. This has clearly focused attention on the assessment of the research excellence of academic scholars, both internally and externally. It has also created a new form of recognition for the most successful research scholars inside the academy.

A total of 750 CRCs were allocated to Ontario universities up to April 2005 (Table 1). Because allocations are primarily based on past success in research funding at the three granting councils, they are not uniformly distributed across the system. Nine universities with lower levels of research funding have benefitted from a special allocation of CRCs designed to offset the "track-record" approach. Nevertheless, more than 75 % of the CRCs in the province are attached to just one-third of the universities.

The ratio of CRCs to full-time faculty members in Ontario averages about 6% but by individual institution ranges from 1% to more than 10% (Table 1). Although the latest data for faculty numbers that we could obtain is for 2003-2004, new hires will not greatly change the overall ratios in Table 1. Half of the universities in Ontario will have 1 in 25 or more of their faculty members designated as CRCs by the time all chairs are filled. We feel that this represents a significant change to the system.

University administrations have publicly embraced the CRC program as a vehicle to increase research intensity and in some cases, enlarge the faculty complement. Most universities have invested significant internal funds (see above), especially for Tier II CRCs who do not receive sufficient funding from the program itself to support competitive salaries and benefits. It appears that some of the Tier II positions may not have been base-funded, creating a potential problem if CRC funding ends, especially because the elimination of mandatory retirement in the Province means that prediction of future retirements, which might have been "bridged" with CRC positions, may not occur.

The Fifth Year Evaluation of the Canada Research Chairs Program report [2] appears to be one of the few sources of information on the overall impacts of the program. It is based on a fairly extensive survey of CRCs, institutions and non-CRC faculty members. Among other findings, it indicates that in relation to comparison groups among SSHRC-, CIHR- and NSERC-supported researchers, between 1999-2000 and 2002-2003, CRCs had a higher level of research funding, had greater increases in research output, supervised more graduate students and post-doctoral researchers, and taught fewer courses at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. Given the increase in funding and the reduction in teaching and administration that generally accompanies a CRC, these findings are not really surprising.

A pertinent question is whether the recognition and the leadership that CRCs represent inspire the 90-95% of faculty who are non-chair holders to greater research intensity or discourage them from competing on a playing field that is perceived as increasingly uneven. The Fifth Year Evaluation report shows that CRCs were associated with increasing numbers of research centres which suggests that they were helping to focus institutional and individual research thrusts. In addition, research productivity rose for both CRCs and non-chair faculty between 1999-2000 and 2002-2003 (but by greater amounts for the former).

Feedback from our COU Academic Colleagues suggests a wide spectrum of outcomes relative to the impact of CRCs on regular faculty. Highly successful results have been obtained where several CRCs have been used to create a research focus or node. CRCs have also been used by smaller institutions as flagship appointments that demonstrate the importance of research. On the other hand, almost one-third (31%) of non-CRCs agreed that the CRC program "has resulted in decreased morale among the faculty generally due to the segmentation of the faculty corps resulting from the Chairs program" [2]. According to our Colleagues, this has happened even where more than one CRC has been appointed to a single unit because members outside the focus of the CRC can feel devalued as they do not have access to the same resources and carry heavier teaching loads. The Fifth Year Report notes that 35% of regular faculty members agreed that non-Chairs had been negatively affected by the greater concentration of resources (space, funding, equipment) in CRCs. Another issue associated with the CRC programme that has received considerable negative publicity is the under-representation of women among successful CRCs.

A final impact of the CRC program on the institution as a whole was not mentioned by the Fifth Year Report but was discussed extensively by the Colleagues. The creation of research chairs seems to have encouraged non-CRC faculty to increasingly request teaching load reductions in order to intensify their own research. This may account for the higher rate of research activity by regular faculty mentioned above, but it appears at odds with increasing emphasis in Ontario institutions on student engagement and accountability, and on undergraduate teaching.

ONTARIO RESEARCH CHAIRS

The Ontario Research Chairs program is supported by a \$25 million endowment transferred from the Provincial Government via the COU to six universities. The eight chairs, which were announced in 2006, have prescribed research foci and are to be located at McMaster, Queen's, University of Toronto (3 chairs), Waterloo, Windsor and York. Working conditions for prospective chair-holders have not been released and may vary, just as CRC conditions are non-uniform.

INTERNAL RESEARCH CHAIRS

One of our goals in writing this paper was to investigate some of the unanticipated effects of the CRC program. We were aware that some Ontario universities had created internal chairs. Some are specifically identified by their host institutions as designed to encourage retention of non-CRC holders. Given their sudden development from 2002 onwards in tandem with the CRCs, however, it is likely that this was a universal goal even if it is not explicitly stated. We wanted to examine whether this phenomenon might be sufficiently large-scale to be recognized as another form of faculty segmentation. Information was provided to us by COU academic colleagues or was obtained by searching university websites. The following is a summary of each program at the nine Ontario universities that have programs which can broadly be described as 'Research Chairs'. In all, about 100 internal research chairs are in the process of being filled at Ontario universities. Like the CRCs, numbers of positions and conditions of the chairs are non-uniform.

Brock University

The *Brock University Chancellor's Chairs for Research Excellence* were established in 2001 to recognize the excellence of scholarship and to assist in retention. These

three-year chairs carry a \$15,000 annual research grant plus \$5,000 for use as a stipend or to apply towards a teaching release (providing teaching remains at or above 50% of normal load).

University of Guelph

Three *University Research Chairs* (one Tier I and two Tier II) were established in 2004 within the College of Social and Applied Human Sciences to increase research visibility and offset the large number of NSERC-funded CRCs. Support for the chairs is for five years and includes an honorarium, research funding and a two-course teaching release. No further details are available.

McMaster University

Five *Senator William McMaster Chairs in the Humanities or Social Sciences* were established in 2004. The five-year chairs are awarded for research excellence, distinguished and sustained scholarly work, and commitment to education. No details are available on the conditions of the appointments.

University of Ottawa

Two internal awards have been created:

- i) University Research Chairs (URC):* 25 are to be awarded for outstanding accomplishments in research. The program started in 2002 and 16 chairs have been appointed to date. URCs have a duration of five years and must fall into the cluster areas that are used for CRCs and the Strategic Areas of Development used for CFI applications. Chair-holders receive research funding of \$15,000/year, an additional \$5000 for supplementary duties associated with a cluster, and a one-semester course reduction (provided the total teaching load is not less than two one-semester courses).
- ii) Research Chairs in Canadian Francophonie:* the program started in 2004 and five of eight chairs have been awarded to date. These chairs are linked to the special mandate of the University of Ottawa and are targeted for specific areas of francophone studies (e.g. literature, education and public policy). Chair-holders receive the same research funding and teaching reduction as University Research Chairs and have been recruited from inside and outside the institution.

Queen's University

Two internal awards have been created, in principle equivalent to Tier I and Tier II CRCs:

Queen's Research Chairs (QRC): a maximum of 25 five-year chairs (all are currently filled) have been created since 2002 as a means to recognize, and retain, research scholars of exceptional merit. The QRCs include funding of \$20,000 per year for direct and indirect costs of research, and to provide release time.

Chancellor's Research Awards: five awards of \$50,000 over a five-year period designed for junior faculty (less than eight years since initial appointment), primarily to support graduate students supervised by the faculty member with up to \$10,000 of the award for travel and teaching release. Up to \$10,000 in additional funds is available for applicants in the arts, social sciences and humanities.

Ryerson University

A program of *Ryerson Research Chairs* with 2-year terms existed until the program was suspended in February 2006. Approximately four awards were made annually. The Ryerson Research Chairs awarded \$25,000 per year of research funding, a stipend of \$10,000 per year, and reduced teaching loads (if needed) to two per year.

University of Waterloo

Waterloo has introduced the title *University Research Chair* to recognize exceptional achievement and pre-eminence in a particular field of knowledge. These chairs are awarded for a 7-year term, and entitle the chair holder to a \$10,000 stipend or teaching release from one course each year. (If the chair holder elects teaching release, the department receives the \$10,000 grant.) At most five University Research Chairs will be awarded in any year.

Faculties also initiate forms of recognition to retain highly productive research scholars. For example, the Mathematics Faculty has introduced a 3-year Faculty Fellowship, which provides one course teaching release or a \$12,000 stipend each year.

Wilfrid Laurier University

Wilfrid Laurier has what appears to be a unique award termed *University Research Professor* that relieves the recipient of teaching for one year and awards a research grant of \$5000. Strictly speaking, this is not a Research

Chair but the amount of time made available for research is equivalent to that of some of the shorter-term internal chairs elsewhere.

University of Windsor

In 2004, the University of Windsor introduced a program of 12 *Research Leadership Chairs*, nine of whom are senior and three are junior. Chairs are appointed for five-year renewable terms, have slightly higher salaries than ordinary appointments, and a \$40,000 annual research grant which can be used for operating expenses, travel and course release.

OTHER RESEARCH CHAIRS AND AWARDS

Most institutions have a number of privately endowed chairs and/or chairs related to specific granting council programs, such as the NSERC Industrial Chairs which receive funding from NSERC and an industrial partner, or the NSERC Northern Chairs. In certain Ontario universities, they represent a significant number of positions. Conditions attached to some of these Chairs cap teaching and administrative duties at low levels or explicitly prohibit them.

Many institutions have developed honorific titles such as Distinguished University Professor (e.g., McMaster, Ottawa and Western), University Professor (e.g., Waterloo) or Distinguished Research Professor (York) which are given for exceptional scholarly achievement or a combination of scholarship, teaching or service and have limited numbers of active professors holding the title at any one time. In some institutions (e.g. Ottawa and Western) modest levels of research funding are attached to the title. In addition, most universities have prizes for research excellence that are awarded annually.

DISCUSSION

The CRC program, the ORCs, and the URCs (or equivalent) that accompany the two government programs in many universities in Ontario are part of a broader movement that emphasizes research and research funding. It has been argued that an emphasis on obtaining research grants inevitably leads to academics being influenced to reduce their time spent on the other core mission of the university - undergraduate instruction [6]. A similar shift to spending less time on academic leadership and decision-making is also likely as faculty identify research activity as their highest priority.

When we suggested this topic for a COU Academic Colleagues' Working Paper we expected to find literature dealing with the concentration of research dollars, their effects on those able to attract such dollars, and on the system as a whole. To our surprise, we found such information to be virtually nonexistent. In essence, the only detailed study to date has been done as an assessment of the CRC program, and that study pointed out that research has long-term pay-offs that cannot yet be properly evaluated.

Through support of CRCs and through URCs, Ontario universities are currently committing significant funding to a small percentage of the professoriate. The longer-term impact of this change is not known. In 2002, Polster correctly predicted that one impact of the CRC program would be the rise in interest of university administrations in encouraging individual faculty members to seek Granting Council funding [5], an interest that has now led many institutions to employ research facilitators in an effort to improve funding success rates. She also suggested that high achievers would increase their demands, while simultaneously reducing their loyalty to their institutions, leaving the institutions "ever more vulnerable to the demands of academics who are too costly both to keep and to lose" [5].

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] The Brains Business – A Survey of Higher Education, *The Economist*, September 10, 2005, http://www.economist.com/displaystory.cfm?story_id=4339960
- [2] R. A. Malatest & Associates Ltd., Fifth-Year Evaluation of the Canada Research Chairs Program – Final Evaluation Report, <http://www.chairs.gc.ca/web/about/publications/fifth%5Fyear%5Freview%5Fe.pdf>
- [3] Response to the Fifth-Year Evaluation of the Canada Research Chairs Program <http://www.chairs.gc.ca/web/about/publications/fifth%5Fyear%5Fresponse%5Fe.pdf>
- [4] http://www.chairs.gc.ca/web/about/statistics_e.asp
- [5] Polster, C. (2002). A break from the past: impacts and implications of the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Canada Research Chair initiatives. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 39(3), 275-299.
- [6] Polster, C. (2005). "Provide or perish" – a new imperative in Canada's Universities? *Our Schools, Our Selves*, 14(4), 109-114.

FINAL THOUGHTS

At the end of this paper, we are left with questions rather than conclusions. It is demonstrable that Ontario universities have concentrated increasing resources on a small percentage of their faculty in order to stay globally competitive. Because of the paucity of broadly-based studies, it is not clear what impact this will have in the long run.

Among the questions that we feel are worth asking are:

- (1) What are the best practices for CRCs and other research chairs to maximize the positive outcomes of these programs? Does a concentration of researchers in a single area always work?
- (2) Are best practices the same in Sciences, Engineering, Health Sciences, Social Sciences and Humanities?
- (3) What can be done to minimize any negative impacts of the research chair programs on regular faculty who *de facto* will continue to constitute the foundation of the institution?

We believe that these questions and others deserve further study, possibly by the COU.

Table 1: Canada Research Chairs allocated to Ontario Universities

University	CRC allocation ^a					Total FT profs. (2003-04) ^b	% CRCs
	SSHRC	CIHR	NSERC	Special allocation	Total		
Brock	3	-	4	3	10	429	2.3
Carleton	7	1	19	-	27	687	3.9
Guelph	4	4	26	-	34	720	4.7
Lakehead	2	-	2	3	7	204	3.4
Laurentian	-	1	4	3	8	342	2.3
McMaster	10	28	32	-	70	951	7.4
Nipissing	-	-	-	1	1	90	1.1
Ottawa	15	30	21	-	66	918	7.2
Queen's	10	15	29	-	54	636	8.5
Ryerson	3	-	5	3	11	495	2.2
Toronto	43	142	82	-	267	2430	11.0
Trent	2	-	4	3	9	192	4.7
MC	-	-	2	3	5	90	5.6
Waterloo	7	2	44	-	53	774	6.9
Western	13	31	27	-	71	1209	5.9
Wilfrid Laurier	3	-	2	3	8	393	2.0
Windsor	3	0	11	3	17	444	3.8
York	15	2	15	-	32	1014	3.2
<i>Totals</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>256</i>	<i>329</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>750</i>	<i>12018</i>	<i>6.2</i>

^a Allocation as of April 20, 2005 www.chairs.gc.ca

^b CAUT Almanac of Post-secondary Education 2006, Table 2.12.

Internationalizing the Curriculum: An Inventory of Key Issues, Model Programs and Resources

*Kathryn Shailer, Academic Colleague, Ontario College of
Art and Design*

October 2006

The Working Paper Series consists of short papers on academic issues prepared by Academic Colleagues. The topics chosen by the caucus of Academic Colleagues are championed by one or two colleagues. Although drafts of each paper are discussed by the full caucus, the final version of the paper represents the opinions of the author(s) and not a consensus reached by the Colleagues. The authors present their papers to the full Council as a matter of interest and to stimulate discussion. The papers as finalized do not represent COU policy. They are simply a mechanism for investigating and opening discussion on matters of interest to the Colleagues and the Council – and their readership at large.

Introduction

Internationalization of the university means far more than interpersonal or even inter-institutional cooperation across borders. It is a necessary, vital and deliberate transformation of how we teach and learn and it is essential to the future quality of higher education in Canada, indeed to the future of Canada.

*AUCC Standing Advisory Committee on
International Relations, 1994¹³*

The heart of the internationalization of an institution is, and will always remain, its curriculum precisely because the acquisition of knowledge... is what a university is all about

*M. Harari, Internationalization of
Higher Education, 1989¹⁴*

In the year 2000, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada released two seminal reports on international education at Canadian universities, *Progress and Promise* by Jane Knight (OISE/University of Toronto) and *Canadian Efforts to Internationalize the Curriculum* by Fraser Taylor (Carleton). Both publications take stock of initiatives undertaken during the politically tumultuous decade from 1989 to 1999 that included the collapse of Eastern Bloc dictatorships; civil war and “ethnic cleansing” in the Balkans, Rwanda and other parts of Africa; the end of apartheid in South Africa; the US invasion of Iraq; renewed *jihād* in the Middle East; the “opening” of China and the end of British rule in Hong Kong – all of which had a profound effect on immigration patterns worldwide, which in turn have indelibly altered the face of cultural diversity in Canada, especially in its urban centres. By 1999 Vancouver had essentially become an Asian city and Toronto was well on its way to becoming one of the most multicultural cities in the world. The impact of the ensuing globalization on higher education would be immense.

If the reports by Knight and Taylor in 2000 placed more emphasis on “promise” than “progress” in their assessment of how Canadian universities had risen to the challenge of internationalization, the 2006 update afforded by York University’s symposium on Internationalizing Canada’s Universities was not much more heartening. AUCC Director of International Relations, Pari Johnston, reported that universities are continuing to move “from an ad-hoc to a strategic approach to internationalization” and that more institutions are “developing comprehensive and valuable ‘mobility portfolios’” (“International Dimension,” slides 5-6). But there seems to be a widening gap between policy and practice, for change “on the ground” is happening at a snail’s pace. Despite a growing number of bilateral agreements to create opportunities for students, faculty and researchers, 2003 data still indicated that less than 1% of university students participated in short-term, for-

¹³ As cited in Robert Giroux’s “Foreword” to J. Knight, *Progress and Promise: The AUCC Report on Internationalization at Canadian Universities*, 2000.

¹⁴ As cited in F. Taylor, *Canadian University Efforts to Internationalize the Curriculum*, AUCC, 2000.

credit international education opportunities (compared to 3% in the US, see Shubert).

The chief barrier appears to be lack of financial resources: all the good will, strategic rhetoric, and genuine interest in expanding internationalization programs will not translate into higher participation rates until exchange programs become affordable and faculty are provided with the incentives and supports required to overhaul the curriculum. Canada's per capita spending on international education lags badly behind major competitors, e.g., Germany \$5.02, UK \$3.29, US \$2.64, Canada \$0.70 (Johnston, slide 16).

While there are notable examples of internationalization among individual universities – York, Waterloo, UVic, Calgary, Laval come to mind – the absence of a national strategy hampers Canada among global competitors (we are singular among OECD countries in having no federal office responsible for higher education, cf. Shubert), and the absence of a provincial strategy places Ontario universities at a greater disadvantage (Quebec, Alberta, New Brunswick, British Columbia all have well-developed provincial strategies). For some reason, internationalization has never been a priority for COU.

The purpose of this working paper is to synthesize the current discussion among international education stakeholders in Canada, underscore the centrality of curriculum reform to internationalization efforts, and broaden the discussion among faculty and administrators to include those who may view their academic discipline or sphere of activity as culturally neutral. Knight underscores the need to be “mindful of the larger and more philosophical questions” surrounding the internationalization agenda. At the conclusion of *Progress and Promise*, she asks us to consider how our efforts to internationalize Canada's universities will be viewed from the year 2020:

What achievements and values will be attached to internationalization – development, partnership, exploitation, solidarity, quality, commercialism, prosperity, homogenization, competitiveness, pluralism, advancement – when stakeholders and researchers of the future reflect on the past 20

years? ... Are we aware and alert to what the consequences of our actions might be? (90)

Some Terminology and a Few Definitions

Although *globalization* and *internationalization* are intimately related, educators go to great lengths not to refer to the “globalization of education.” Knight defines *globalization* as “the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values and ideas ... across borders. Globalization affects each country in a different way due to a nation's individual history, traditions, culture and priorities. Globalization increases and reflects the growing connectivity and interdependence among nations” (Knight & de Wit 1997, p. 6, as cited in Knight 2006, p. 2). She proposes the following working definition of *internationalization*: Internationalization at the national/sectoral/institutional levels is defined as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight 2003, p. 2).

Further, internationalization is an “ongoing, intentional process that affects the way we construct knowledge and is systemic; this changes the fabric and culture of the university” (Green).

Since 1999, educators have distinguished between *internationalization abroad* and *internationalization at home* (Nilsson 1999). The former describes the more conventional crossborder activities of individuals: student mobility programs and exchanges, and faculty conferences, sabbaticals, exchanges and research networks. The latter encompasses students and faculty as a collective on the domestic front and “refers to the international and intercultural dimension of the curriculum, the teaching/learning process, research, extra-curricular activities, in fact a host of activities which help students develop international understanding and intercultural skills without ever leaving campus” (Knight 2006, 7)

Internationalizing the curriculum = “The process of curriculum development or change that is aimed at integrating an international dimension into the formal and operational aspects of the curriculum where formal refers to course content and materials and operational to teaching and learning methods,

grouping of students, the place and time of courses, etc.” (Van der Wende 1995, as cited in Taylor, 4).

Multicultural generally refers to domestic ethnic and racial diversity; *intercultural* describes an encounter with cultures of other nation states or diasporas (Green).

Internationalization at Home: The Curriculum

While *Progress and Promise* expressed concern with the lack of interest and low priority accorded internationalization of the curriculum, Taylor’s study drew a more positive conclusion: “from the evidence presented in this study, albeit partial, it seems that Canadian institutions are responding to the need for international curricular change. Some of our practices and approaches are even innovative in both national and international terms” (27).

Taylor’s study utilized the analytical framework of the six-nation research project, “Education in a New International Setting,” initiated by the OECD’s Centre of Education Research and Innovation (CERI) in 1993, adding Canada to the comparison of Australia, Denmark, France, Germany, Japan and the Netherlands.

OECD Typology of Internationalized Curricula:

1. Curricula with an international subject (e.g., international relations, European law, etc.)
2. Curricula in which the traditional/original subject area is broadened by an internationally comparative approach (e.g., international comparative education)
3. Curricula which prepare students for defined international professions (e.g., international business, management, accounting)
4. Curricula in foreign languages or linguistics which address explicitly cross-cultural communication issues and which provide training in intercultural skills
5. Interdisciplinary programs such as area studies covering more than one country
6. Curricula leading to internationally recognized professional qualifications
7. Curricula leading to joint or double degrees

8. Curricula of which compulsory parts are offered at institutions abroad staffed by local lecturers
9. Curricula with content especially designed for foreign students.

(It was recognized these were not mutually exclusive categories and that some internationalized curricula fell into more than one category.) (Taylor, 4)

Taylor’s pool of evidence, however, was limited primarily to 60 HRDC-funded projects and submissions to the Scotiabank-AUCC Awards for Excellence in Internationalization in the “Curriculum Change” category. His results, then, are based on relatively few cutting edge programs, the majority of which entail student mobility. They do not provide a good picture of “internationalization at home.” The OECD/CERI typology is useful, however, and one we should keep in mind.

Presenters at the York University symposium in March 2006 were less encouraging: again and again throughout the two-day conference we heard reports of how many faculty either reject or are uncomfortable with the concept of internationalizing the curriculum. At the heart of that discomfiture is the implicit threat to the established view of knowledge as universal and based on objectivity, truth, and rationality. Truly internationalizing the curriculum entails embracing new forms of knowledge and acquiring more than a passing understanding of “multi-varied modes” of thinking and learning (Bond 2006). In this worldview, knowledge is a cultural construction.

In a less threateningly polemical exposition of the challenge, Darryl Reed and John Dwyer view internationalization in terms of the goal of the university: the search for knowledge that is truthful. Their critical framework is nevertheless post-modern:

Truth seeking must always be indeterminate and can never be completely neutral. It always needs to be able to interrogate or deconstruct itself. The appropriate stance of the professional seeker of truth, therefore, has to be **reflexive**. That stance requires three foundational propositions: 1) the cultivation of a self-reflection as an account of one’s own presuppositions, 2) a critical edge that provides alternative possibilities, and 3) an openness to other viewpoints. In other words,

truth seeking has to consider its own origins, purposes, relations of means to ends, and position with respect to other discourses. Truth seeking requires intellectual freedom and implies an interrogative or questioning stance to *whatever* is given as knowledge, including the *canonical* beliefs and artefacts of the academy and its disciplines. (“From Critique to Contribution,” 2)

What is clear from the presentations of educators such as Sheryl Bond (Queen’s) and Reed and Dwyer (York) is that faculty are now much more aware of the complexities of internationalizing the curriculum. Far beyond the rather simplistic notion of adding international dimension to existing aspects of the curriculum (which most of the OECD typology implies), internationalizing the university curriculum is in fact educational reform and entails at least as much reform/re-education/redirection of faculty as revision of curriculum. The operative word is transformation and with this in mind, Bond calls on faculty to “embrace a more meaningful definition of internationalizing learning” that involves:

- substantive knowledge about the social-cultural content of other societies
- alterations in how one responds to cultural differences
- how one behaves in intercultural circumstances, and
- how one maintains one’s own cultural integrity while understanding and working with others (“Transforming the Culture of Learning,” 2-3).

The Macro-Dimension and the Micro-Dimension

It may be useful to distinguish between two levels of activity or decision-making in connection with internationalizing the curriculum. The *macro-dimension* refers to the set of activities that requires decision-making at the level of the program, academic unit, or institution (Schuerholz-Lehr/vanGyn, 5), such as the creation of programs, special degrees, or graduation requirements (e.g., second language

proficiency¹⁵). One could also add hiring policies and practices to the list.

The *micro-dimension* “is that part of curricular innovation and change over which individual faculty members have control” (Schuerholz-Lehr/van Gyn): course revision, personal research, and individual professional development. It is the micro-dimension that is of greatest interest to Schuerholz-Lehr and van Gyn, who have developed and implemented a course re-design workshop they view as “a powerful method for transforming faculty perspectives on the importance of internationalization of the curriculum and of a learner-centred curriculum in general” (“Internationalizing Pedagogy,” 24).

Another faculty development program has been developed at Malaspina University-College in BC with the intent of providing faculty with “the tools to integrate intercultural perspectives into the redesign and delivery of their curriculum through the development of each individual’s level of intercultural sensitivity” (“Internationalizing Faculty,” 20). Again, the focus is on the faculty member.

Internationalization vs. Cultural Diversification

These are two intimately related and yet different motivations for curricular revision/reform. Internationalization of the curriculum has the goal of preparing students to live, work and function as citizens of a global society; it acknowledges globalization as a persistent and pervasive trend in the creation and transmission of knowledge. Cultural diversification of the curriculum, on the other hand, recognizes that Canadian society is increasingly less Western, less Northern, and less homogenous.

While these two motivations go hand in hand, the latter is far more disturbing to the Western-trained

¹⁵ Notable in this context is the alarming decline in second language proficiency requirements for undergraduate degrees since 1990: 1991 = 35% of survey respondents, 1993 = 16%, 1999 = 12.5% (*Progress and Promise*, p. 48). With the growth of cultural diversity in student populations, language-learning resources have shifted significantly to ESL. The hidden resource of heritage languages is frequently overlooked and almost never leveraged.

and oriented academic than the former. How does, for example, an art historian or political scientist whose education, research, and expertise are grounded in the Western experience speak to and connect with students whose backgrounds and experiences are non-Western? Cultural sensitivity training is not the only issue here. What are the implications for the many PhD students whose research interests and training are steeped in the Western canon? Is there a ‘core knowledge’ that is essential to the Canadian university experience?

Implications and Issues

- Internationalization strategies need to clarify what is meant by “internationalization” within the context of the specific institution.
- How much of the strategy is driven by curricular reform and what does that entail? Who is responsible for internationalizing the curriculum? What is the timeframe?
- Research and frameworks: Is the student-centred education reform model the only or even the best model for internationalizing the curriculum? Transformation is underway, but who is steering this ship?
- Research and frameworks: The Australian experience. There are vastly differing views of what that experience has been and adds up to. Is it a model to be emulated or avoided? Cf. Simon Marginson, York University Symposium Papers.
- What are the implications of internationalized curricula and “multi-varied modes of learning” for academic honesty, intellectual property issues, and the advancement of knowledge in a given discipline? Where and how do new learning technologies and networks fit into the picture?
- Does it make sense for Canadian (Ontario) universities to go it alone? Who should be at the table in developing an Ontario internationalization strategy? A Canada-wide

strategy? What other areas / forms of collaboration should be explored?

Recommendations

- Establish a joint COU/MTCU Task Force to develop a coherent internationalization strategy for the Province of Ontario that goes beyond the current emphasis on recruitment initiatives (e.g., NAFSA and Trade Missions) and fosters the development and coordination of cross-regional and inter-institutional collaborations for student and faculty exchanges, joint programs and research projects. The strategy should include concrete goals and plans for developing the necessary infrastructure to support these initiatives.
- As a first step: Create a provincial inventory of existing student and faculty exchange programs, including information about how they are administered and how academic credit is awarded.
- As another step: Establish an International Travel Bursary program that can be accessed by every university student in Ontario. The greatest deterrent to international study is financial resources.

WORKS CITED

Bond, Sheryl. "Transforming the Culture of Learning: Evoking the International Dimension in Canadian University Curriculum." *Papers from the York University Symposium on Internationalizing Canada's Universities, March 2nd – 3rd, 2006*. www.yorku.ca/yorkint/global/conference/canada/papers.htm [retrieved May 4, 2006]

Farquhar, Robin H. *Advancing the Canadian Agenda for International Education*. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education, 2001.

Green, Madeleine F. "Internationalization of higher education: Closing the gap between rhetoric and reality." Keynote Presentation (PowerPoint slides). *Papers from the York University Symposium on Internationalizing Canada's Universities, March 2nd – 3rd, 2006*. www.yorku.ca/yorkint/global/conference/canada/papers.htm [retrieved May 4, 2006]

Johnston, Pari. "The International Dimension of Canada's Higher Education and Research: Key Trends, Issues and Priorities." (PowerPoint slides) *Papers from the York University Symposium on Internationalizing Canada's Universities, March 2nd – 3rd, 2006*. www.yorku.ca/yorkint/global/conference/canada/papers.htm [retrieved May 4, 2006]

Knight, Jane. "The New World of Crossborder Education: Concepts, Complexities and Challenges." Plenary Panel, _____. [retrieved May 12, 2006] Adapted from J. Knight, *Crossborder Education: Programs and Providers on the Move*. Research Monograph. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education, 2005

Knight, Jane. *Progress and Promise: The AUCC Report on Internationalization at Canadian Universities*. Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 2000.

Marginson, Simon. "Expert Panel: Presentation from an Australian Perspective." *Papers from the York University Symposium on Internationalizing Canada's Universities, March 2nd – 3rd, 2006*. www.yorku.ca/yorkint/global/conference/canada/papers.htm [retrieved May 4, 2006]

Odgers, Todd and Isabelle Giroux. "Internationalizing Faculty: A Phased Approach to Transforming Curriculum Design and Instruction." *Papers from the York University Symposium on Internationalizing Canada's Universities, March 2nd – 3rd, 2006*. www.yorku.ca/yorkint/global/conference/canada/papers.htm [retrieved May 4, 2006]

Reed, Darryl and John Dwyer. "From Critique to Contribution: Investigating the Purposes of Universities in an Age of Globalization." *Papers from the York University Symposium on Internationalizing Canada's Universities, March 2nd – 3rd, 2006*. www.yorku.ca/yorkint/global/conference/canada/papers.htm [retrieved May 4, 2006]

Scheuerholz-Lehr, Sabine and Geri van Gyn. "Internationalizing Pedagogy or Applying pedagogy to Internationalism – The Journey of a Professional Development Workshop." *Papers from the York University*

Symposium on Internationalizing Canada's Universities, March 2nd – 3rd, 2006.

www.yorku.ca/yorkint/global/conference/canada/papers.htm [retrieved May 4, 2006]

Shubert, Adrian. "Internationalizing the University: A Canadian Perspective." Keynote Address for the Symposium on Languages and Cultures across the Curriculum, Binghamton University, October 23, 2004.

<http://international.yorku.ca/about/resources/lecture1.htm>. [retrieved May 12, 2006]

Taylor, Fraser. *Canadian University Efforts to Internationalize the Curriculum*. Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 2000.