Framework for Reforming the PhD Program in the Department of Curriculum & Pedagogy

(submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee on the Doctoral Program)

Stephen Petrina, EDCP Graduate Coordinator
September 2008

Problems that preoccupied scholars two generations ago, primarily defined by curriculum development, are much less germane to researchers today. "The curriculum," whether it is official, unofficial, taught, ignored or lived in any variety of schools, is only one among many possible plural curricula that attract scholars today. Curricula, literacies and pedagogies of the malls, parks, streets, or web 2.0 are as likely to be of interest to scholars today as the British Columbia elementary school curriculum or curriculum of liberal arts majors in the universities. Researchers are likely to disregard the noun "curriculum" to address how children, adolescents or adults experience curriculum (i.e., its infinitive form "currere" as a process or method). Subjects or disciplines common to schooling for the last century (i.e., art, business, home economics, language arts, math, music, physical education, social studies, science, technology) are few in comparison to the proliferation of new disciplines and their articulation into hybrids and interdisciplinary forms. Profound, new issues have arisen, partially through globalization, environmental degradation, multiculturalism, and digitalization, which cannot be contained by any single discipline or the ten historical subjects of the North American school curriculum. Curriculum researchers are as likely to explore curricula of new subjects such as cultural studies, multiliteracies, queer theory or new media as that of mathematics or physical education in the K-12 system. Teaching is distributed across a range of inexhaustible agencies and institutions and is no longer the filter through which curriculum scholars study learning. Nor is learning filtered through schooling anymore. Guiding students and teachers through "the curriculum" with "curriculum materials" is not the primary problem that animates scholarship in curriculum studies today.

In addition, each discipline or subject that we normally think of when we mention "the curriculum" is over-determined in that it can be explained through any number of theories, described through any number of methods or practiced any number of ways. If we could map these various representations of all the disciplines across a grid, we might eventually locate curricular intersections and commonalties. Yet, intersections we locate today may not be the intersections we locate tomorrow. In *The Order of Things*, Foucault argues that the way we organize or map disciplines or locate intersections is somewhat arbitrary or provisional for any given moment or place. Particular conventions and specific modes of practice stabilize components of disciplines yet, even here, disciplines remain complex, fluid, dynamic and interdependent.

Various disciplines within curriculum studies have complex phenomena and systems in common. Each discipline is complex but more importantly, each takes as its foci of study complex phenomena. We may assume independence or linearity among these phenomena from a disciplinary perspective but this is merely an obstacle to understanding their complexity. Inasmuch as the disciplines are over-determined,

complex phenomena or systems cannot be understood, or even described, from a single, self-referential, disciplinary point of view. They require interdisciplinarity or transdisciplinarity. Curriculum studies, in providing venues for interdisciplinary work in understanding complex phenomena, such as classrooms or cyberspace, extend, as Pinar suggested, various disciplines "to society, to historical moment, to subjectivity and to popular culture." However important teaching and learning of a single subject may be, research directions in curriculum studies are toward this work of contextualization, cultural disassembly, mobility and relationality.

Pedagogy, as it were, also has what Mariolina Rizzi Salvatori called a "disturbing history," and its relationship to curriculum studies has proven unsettling as well. For example, Pinar (2007) described the "inflated status of pedagogy," explaining the reconceptualist era as at least attempting to "stuff the learning genie — and its complementary concept, instruction — back in the bottle by subsuming these within various discursive efforts to understand curriculum" (p. xiii). But after exhausting our wishes, it is now unclear whether the genie was pedagogy or its more specific derivative, teacher education. Pedagogy, perhaps, prompts us to return to the profound question of what is the purpose of teacher education (e.g., Britzman, 2003; Cochran-Smith, 2000)? As it is, pedagogy has come to be distributed across various cultural and social practices and no longer refers to teaching per se, or to the teaching of teachers. And although andragogy has a long history in adult education, it never really took hold in English speaking countries (Conner, 2004): *pedagogy* remains the conceptual term for taking up the processes of helping people learn, understand, explain, interpret, deconstruct, etc.

Pedagogy helps contradict the days when teachers— school, adult, or otherwise— were seen as functionaries, and learners as passive empty vessels hungry for knowledge that was static and fixed. Indeed, it is difficult to talk about pedagogy without qualifying it with the term "critical." Pedagogy, as Lusted (1986) describes it, allows us to render problematic these three agencies (teacher, learner, knowledge) and the way they are co-produced and represented. Hence, like the reconceptualization of curriculum studies, critical pedagogy has presented scholars with new insights and reasons to study pedagogies and their manifestations in popular culture, formal education, and the theatre of the oppressed.

For years, adult educators argued that teacher education is inadequate to account for or inform the varied pedagogies that emerge in encounters outside of classrooms and across life's courses. Just as curriculum studies managed to transcend the confines of K-12 education, pedagogy throws into relief instruction, teaching and teacher education. No single discipline, be it teacher education, cultural foundations of education, or instructional design, adequately inform the dialogues that transpire among teacher, learner and knowledge. One could argue that, at least since the mid 1960s, a key orientation, intention or mandate of curriculum studies *and* pedagogy has tended toward interdisciplinarity and trans-curricular *and* trans-pedagogical approaches. This trend is particularly poignant in the history of curriculum studies at UBC.

Graduate Curriculum & Pedagogy…

The disassembly and multiplicity of curricula and pedagogies, proliferation of disciplines and interdisciplines, and study of complex phenomena necessarily challenge graduate students of curriculum and pedagogy to come to terms with current research practices. Graduate programs are similarly challenged to provide a core of courses and experiences that direct students through the disciplines of curriculum studies *and* pedagogy, various research methodologies, *and* a specialization (e.g., K-12 subject curicula, identity formation, nurse or teacher education, media & technology studies, etc.). Graduate programs in curriculum and pedagogy are challenged to provide a series of experiences (i.e., courses, research activities, public presentations of knowledge, etc.) that help graduate students become what Lave and Wenger call a "full participant in a sociocultural practice" of a discipline or "community of practice." For example, courses in curriculum theory introduce students to dynamic and exciting theoretical approaches and debates, curriculum history helps students come to terms with a destabilized and contested past and lived present, and the politics of curriculum provides a survey of how education differentiates among what and whose knowledge is of most worth. Courses in pedagogy, the scholarship of teaching and learning, and teacher education provide insights into pedagogy as disputed, historically situated, and polyvalent. Courses in research methodology provide opportunities for students to explore the ways in which knowledge is produced and circulates, and the ways in which various participants and phenomena are theorized for meaning through protocols, narratives and rhetoric.

References

Britzman, D. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2000). The future of teacher education: Framing the questions that matter. *Teaching Education, 11*(1), 13-13-30.

Conner, M. L. (2004). "Andragogy and pedagogy." Ageless learner, 1997-2004. http://agelesslearner.com/intros/andragogy.html

Lusted, D. (1986). Why pedagogy? *Screen, 27*(5), 2-14.

Pinar, W. F. (2005). The problem with curriculum and pedagogy. Paper given at the Oklahoma State University.

Pinar, W. F. (2007). Intellectual advancement through disciplinarity. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Salvatori, M. R. (1996). *Pedagogy: Disturbing history, 1819-1929*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

A Brief History of the Department of Curriculum & Pedagogy

The history of the Department of Curriculum Studies (CUST), now the Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy, is coincident with UBC's Faculty of Education. School subject and curriculum divisions and programs were maintained from the earliest days of the Faculty, established at UBC in 1956. Of specific interest to the history of CUST, in 1965 a group of four faculty members proposed the creation of a Department of General Curriculum Theory, which Dean Neville Scarfe made a reality in 1966. The new department was responsible for "coordinating the curricular interests of those persons involved in: (a) curriculum theory and practice; (b) programmed learning; (c) audio-visual education; (d) teach teaching; and, (e) curriculum materials laboratory."

> Provision was also made to: (a) invite members of staff interested in curricular studies and research to participate in the work of the Department; (b) consult with Curriculum Committees of the British Columbia Teachers Federation, the Department of Education, and particular school systems in the province. The aforementioned provisions were incorporated in the following statement of purpose: (a) The study of practical and theoretical problems involved in selecting, organizing and presenting bodies of knowledge in formal and informal learning situations; (b) The examination of historical, sociological, cultural, and philosophical determinants of curriculum programs and practices; (c) What should be taught, to whom, in what form, at what level, and to what purpose; (d) How concepts, values and skills in various subject matter areas may be organized so as to make more efficient the teaching-learning process; (e) How subject matters may be best organized for radio, tape, and television presentation; (f) The design a administrative, supervisory, and evaluative procedures for academic, vocational, technical and technological programs of study; (g) The theoretical and practical problems involved in the design and development of instruments and instructions for programmed learning and team teaching curricula. (Katz, 1966, p. 86)

Under the direction of Chairman Joseph Katz until 1977, this unit shifted identities from the Department of Curriculum (1967-1969) to the Department of Curriculum Theory and Library Education (1970-1980) and the Department of Curriculum and Instructional Studies (1981-1983).

From its beginnings in 1966, the Department of Curriculum had an interdisciplinary, trans-curriculum mandate of foundations, theory and practice, however problematic the distinctions. Indeed, this was to be celebrated as Katz clarified in 1967: "Students interested in an interdisciplinary preparation for work in curriculum are now able to enter programmes of study suitably arranged for them. The Department of Curriculum has promoted the cooperative endeavour of all subject matter departments in the study and development of curricula" (Katz, 1967, p. 96). In that same year, Katz invited the renowned curriculum scholar Ralph Tyler to give a seminar and symposium "On Achieving a Balanced Curriculum." Recall that it was in 1968 that the *Journal of*

Curriculum Studies was launched with the same mandate that Katz articulated for the new department.

Katz continued with an emphasis on unifying the disciplines through his retirement: "Subject matter specialists in and out of the Faculty have cooperated in helping to shape an interdisciplinary approach to curriculum design and development," he wrote in 1972. "Much more needs to be done along these lines to overcome the effects of unfortunate fragmentation of learning experiences. Given staff, it would be possible to introduce courses in general curriculum at the undergraduate level" (p. 46). A scholar of language, since the mid 1950s, his research had focused on comparative education through his retirement in 1977.

In 1981, the Faculty of Education consolidated from twenty-two departments or quasi-departments to eight departments. The Department of Curriculum Theory and Library Education was re-formed into the Department of Curriculum and Instructional Studies (CINS) as a consolidation of Business Education, Communications Media and Technology, Curriculum and Instruction, Early Childhood, Elementary Education, Industrial Education, and School Librarianship. CINS was dissolved in 1983, with the various specializations distributed among the remaining seven departments. By that point, the General Curriculum and Instruction Ed.D. was overseen by the Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction (CSCI).

The Faculty's first Ph.D. was introduced in 1982, for a specialization in Human Learning, Development and Instruction, and a second Ph.D. in Social Foundations of Educational Policy followed in 1983. By the mid 1980s, a student could get an Ed.D. degree in any of twelve specializations within the Faculty, reflecting rapid growth throughout the 1970s. The residency requirement continued as a means to assure the standards of the specialized discipline for the doctorate. The General Curriculum and Instruction degree in the Faculty by then included fifteen specializations: Art Education, Business Education, Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, English Education, General Curriculum & Instruction, Industrial Education, Mathematics Education, Modern Language Education, Music Education, Reading Education, School Librarianship, Science Education, Social Studies Education and Teacher Preparation. In 1993, the height of the Ed.D. era, a student could choose among 11 Ed.D. programs with 21 different specializations. The Curriculum and Instruction Ph.D. was introduced in 1992. The Ph.D. became more restrictive for specialization, but was preferable. The Ph.D. in Curriculum Studies, approved in 1996, displaced four Ed.D.s and eight specializations for instance (i.e., The Ed.D. degree in the individual subjects— art, music, science, social studies, etc.— was made dormant and a common CUST Ph.D. was the preference). In 1994, coincident with a restructuring of the Faculty, Ph.D. programs were added beside most of the Ed.D. programs and course requirements helped mark the transition to a Ph.D. emphasis. For example, by the end of the 1990s, the Ph.D. in Curriculum Studies required the completion of two doctoral seminars within 18-24 credits of total coursework. Currently, the only Ed.D. left in the Faculty is in Educational Leadership and Policy.

In CSCI, under the coordination of Ted Aoki, the mandate for curriculum established for the Department of Curriculum in the mid 1960s was maintained. Aoki was appointed the first Coordinator of CSCI, beginning 1 July 1976. Extremely influential in curriculum theory to this day, Aoki directed the Centre until 30 June 1978, when he left to Chair the Department of Secondary Education at the University of Alberta. CSCI was actually a product of a report submitted by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) in June 1975. The NWREL report, headed up by Arliss L. Roadin & James R. Sanders in Portland along with Blaine R. Worthen in Tennessee, was commissioned by UBC's Faculty of Education in 1974 to provide direction in curriculum and instruction. Within "A Design for Program Development in Curriculum and Instruction" are specific recommendations for CSCI and its concomitant graduate program.

George Tomkins followed as Coordinator of CSCI until 1984. A member of the UBC faculty for 25 years, Tomkins (e.g., 1979, 1981) made key contributions to curriculum theory, history, school geography, and Canadian Studies. With an increasing number of graduate students and courses in CSCI, Tomkins was able to coordinate a series of courses that remain integral to the EDCP graduate program. CSCI's courses, EDUC 562: Foundations of Curriculum, EDUC 563: Curriculum Evaluation, EDUC 564: Curriculum Development, and EDUC 508: Curriculum Implementation, are all courses or components within EDCP.

Leroi Daniels succeeded Tomkins in 1984, directing and building CSCI through the summer of 1991, when John Willinsky was appointed Director and Hillel Goelman Associate Director. For nearly twenty years, CSCI offered an alternative to, or interdisciplinary study of, school subject-based graduate studies in curriculum and instruction (C&I). In 1992, CSCI Director Willinsky and Associate Director Goelman explained the distinction this way: "The academic difference between Departments and Centre [CSCI] might be characterized by the tendency of students in the Departments to pursue a school-subject concentration in their course work and thesis, while taking one or more courses in the area of C&I. Students in the Centre's program, on the other hand, take the majority of courses on broader issues in curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation" (pp. 66-67). At this time, it was still possible to draw distinctions between structures for graduate work versus teacher education. These differences were immediately called into question once the Department of Curriculum Studies (CUST) was re-formed. On the surface, intellectual differences between CSCI and CUST appeared minimal. As Willinsky and Goelman acknowledged in 1994, “the emphasis in C&I [and CSCI] has been on what might be better termed Curriculum Studies" (p. 3).

In 1994, CUST was formed as a consolidation of Mathematics and Science Education (MSED) and Visual and Performing Arts in Education (VPAE). To complete the creation of CUST, social studies was moved from the Department of Social and Educational Studies (SEDS) and physical education was moved from the School of Physical Education and Recreation (PHED). Over a five-year period, C&I courses from CSCI were migrated to CUST, transforming the C&I programs to curriculum studies.

Distinction from CUST dissolved through the final days of CSCI, and the under the leadership of Karen Meyer the Centre was pressed to establish a unique identity. She described the mandate as follows: "the Centre is committed to inquiry into pedagogy as it is lived with the purpose of deepening understandings and re-imagining curriculum and pedagogical practices. Within spaces and tensions of interdisciplinarity, the Centre is a place where learners can gather to write and interpret new lines of curriculum, lines that communicate, collaborate, and connect" (Meyer, 2003, p. 21). If CUST's mandate reiterated the earlier Department of Curriculum's mandate of teacher education *and* graduate work in curriculum studies, then in effect, CSCI became somewhat redundant. In 2003, CSCI was scaled down and converted into a Centre for Cross Faculty Inquiry (CCFI).

In the spring of 2008, CUST culminated one process of reform by revisiting its mandate of curriculum studies *and* pedagogy, renaming itself to the Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy, and establishing EDCP as a common acronym for all courses (on this process, see Petrina, 2006). Currently, as EDCP resolves historical trends and challenges of identity, it may help to remember the original intent of UBC's Department of Curriculum— that of maintaining an interdisciplinary, trans-curriculum study of curriculum.

References

Katz, J. (1966, May). Department of General Curriculum Theory. In N. Scarfe (Ed.), *Dean's Annual Report: Faculty of Education*, *University of British Columbia* (pp. 86-87). Vancouver: UBC.

Katz, J. (1967, May). Department of Curriculum. In N. Scarfe (Ed.), *Dean's Annual Report: Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia* (pp. 96-98). Vancouver: UBC.

Katz, J. (1972, June). Department of Curriculum Theory and Library Education. In N. Scarfe (Ed.), *Dean's Annual Report: Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia* (pp. 48-51). Vancouver: UBC.

Meyer, K. (2003). (In)different spaces: Re-imagining pedagogy in the academy. In E. Hasebe-Ludt & W. Hurren (Eds.), *Curriculum intertext: Place/language/pedagogy* (pp. 11-22). New York: Peter Lang.

Petrina, S. (2006). C&I high. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, *3*(2), 125-147.

Willinsky, J. & Goelman, H. (1992). Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction. In Faculty of Education (Eds.), *A report prepared for the faculty review* (pp. 66-68). Unpublished document.

Willinsky, J. & Goelman, H. (1994). *Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction graduate programs*. Vancouver: UBC Faculty of Education.

On the Proposal to Increase Requirements in the EDCP PhD Program

There were dramatic transformations of graduate education in Canada during the 1970s, including the creation of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) in 1977. Faculties of education significantly expanded graduate education options and doctoral degree programs rapidly increased throughout the 1970s. Like other faculties in Canada, faculties of education combined both the American model (emphasis on substantial course work) and the British and French models (emphasis on a long period for original research and a lengthy thesis) (Williams, 2005). The Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree was first introduced in the Faculty of Education in 1961, as somewhat of a hybrid of the British, French and American models. In 1970, the following course of study guidelines were introduced:

> Each candidate's committee will recommend the kind and number of courses to be taken by the students in relationship to background and the requirements which are appropriate to the doctoral level in the chosen major field. No uniform course requirements can be applied to all departments at the doctoral level. (*UBC Calendar*, 1970, p. 156)

The coursework of each candidate was "supervised by a Candidate's Committee consisting of not less than five members." This Committee planned the course of study, which was to consist of "seminars, required readings, consultations, and such formal courses as may be deemed essential for the fulfillment of the requirements for the degree" (p. 156). The doctoral students were required to spend a minimum of two winter sessions in residence, with the Candidate's Committee recommending more time in residence if necessary.

The Faculty's first Ph.D. was introduced in 1982, for a specialization in Human Learning, Development and Instruction, and a second Ph.D. in Social Foundations of Educational Policy followed in 1983. By the mid 1980s, a student could get an Ed.D. degree in any of twelve specializations within the Faculty, reflecting rapid growth throughout the 1970s. The residency requirement continued as a means to assure the standards of the specialized discipline for the doctorate. The General Curriculum and Instruction degree in the Faculty by then included fifteen specializations: Art Education, Business Education, Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, English Education, General Curriculum & Instruction, Industrial Education, Mathematics Education, Modern Language Education, Music Education, Reading Education, School Librarianship, Science Education, Social Studies Education and Teacher Preparation. In 1993, the height of the Ed.D. era, a student could choose among 11 Ed.D. programs with 21 different specializations. The Curriculum and Instruction Ph.D. was introduced in 1992. The Ph.D. became more restrictive for specialization, but was preferable. The Ph.D. in Curriculum Studies, approved in 1996, displaced four Ed.D.s and eight specializations for instance (i.e., The Ed.D. degree in the individual subjects— art, music, science, social studies, etc.— was made dormant and a common CUST Ph.D. was the preference). In 1994, coincident with a restructuring of the Faculty, Ph.D. programs were added beside most of the Ed.D. programs and course requirements helped mark the transition to a

Ph.D. emphasis. For example, by the end of the 1990s, the Ph.D. in Curriculum Studies required the completion of two doctoral seminars within 18-24 credits of total coursework. Currently, the only Ed.D. left in the Faculty is in Educational Leadership and Policy.

Why are we again increasing course requirements for the Ph.D. program?

There are three fundamental reasons to increase Ph.D. course requirements at this point in time. First, interaction among doctoral students and professors within a course setting constitutes a special type of pedagogical and social relationship (Green & Lee, 1995; Kerlin, 1997; Metcalfe & Kiley, 2000). In a Faculty of Education, where this social interaction and relationship are highly valued, a Ph.D. program must provide a balance of coursework and research experiences. The first two years of a student's Ph.D. program in a Faculty of Education should provide for a serious engagement with content and peers through courses (four each year) and an engagement with her or his research proposal toward candidacy by the end of the second year. The proposed increase to four courses or equivalent formal credit-hour experiences also increases probability of a pedagogical relationship with a diverse range of professors or scholars and engagement with depth of curriculum.

The second reason involves the challenge of inter-departmental expertise, collaboration and interdisciplinarity or transdisciplinarity. The increase of coursework and mandate of two courses outside of the student's Department responds to this challenge. Indeed, 24 credits of total coursework is a minimum of preparation for a Ph.D. in a discipline and Ph.D. level expertise across two or more disciplines. Increasing course requirements at this moment with the recommendation that two courses be taken outside the student's Department is to re-assert that postgraduate pedagogy and interdisciplinarity matter.

The third reason is that comprehensive exams can no longer be considered "comprehensive" (if they ever were). The two-year residency requirement is no longer operative within the Faculty, and nor (in most cases) does a Candidate's Committee of five work closely with the student through a course of study during the residency. Increasingly, universities are reconsidering the comprehensive or qualifying exams as adequate or necessary in a Ph.D. program (Mullens, 2003). One key option, especially for education faculties' interests in pedagogical practice, is to forgo the comprehensives and increase coursework and the rigour of the research proposal within the first two years of the program. What a Ph.D. is in any particular discipline or sub-discipline is dependent on standards of what a new scholar should know. With comprehensive exams becoming less and less reliable, an adequate depth and range of coursework remain effective for assuring integrity. Indeed, when Canadian deans were surveyed on way to reduce time to completion rates for Ph.D.s, the least favourite option was reducing courses (Berkowitz, 2003; Elgar & Klein, 2004). The Dean's proposed increase to a minimum of 24 credits may be met through a variety of courses of study in a program (e.g., 2 core courses, 2 methodology courses, and 4 specialization / research topic courses).

Does this mean that the Comprehensive Exams may be eliminated?

We need to review the Comprehensive Exam process and consider options. Currently, and over the past decade or so, the comprehensive exams have been used in place of coursework. For example, in 2004 when I formally petitioned the CUST Graduate Advisory Committee for revising the comp policy to two papers plus the dissertation proposal (i.e., accept the dissertation proposal as a third comp paper, effectively reducing the exams to potentially two) the response I received was the students take so few courses that three comprehensive exam papers are necessary to provide an adequate background for Ph.D. level research and discourse.

In the memo to the GAC, I indicated that "we are feeling the pressure exerted by FOGS in moving students through to candidacy and need all the flexibility we can muster in this process without compromising the integrity of the program." The pressure to reach candidacy within 24 months continues, and the average time to candidacy for EDCP students exceeds the requirement by nearly a year (avg. = 35.6 months).

My recommendation remains that of reducing the number of comprehensive exams and increasing the rigour of the research proposal with a defense. Both of these components, comprehensive exams and proposal should be folded into one process. **I recommend revising the process to one comprehensive exam with an oral defense, adding an oral defense to the proposal, and increasing course requirements to 24 credits.**

But wouldn't this place EDCP out of line with the rest of the Faculty of Education?

The comprehensive exam process differs drastically across the university, the Faculty of Education, and within departments and programs. Some programs require just one paper while others, such as EDCP and LLED, require three. Some programs require an oral defense of the exams while others do not (see Table 1).

Table 1. Comprehensive Exam Formats in the Faculty of Education

Program / Dept	# of Comp Papers	Oral Defense	Clinical Exp.
ECPS			
CNPS	1	✓	✓
HLDC	1		
MERM	1		
SPED	1	✓	
EDCP	3		
EDST	3		
HKIN	1		
LLED	3		

Within EDCP, the process differs, often quite drastically, from student to student. With regards to the timeframe for completing the comps, some students need / take / require less than three months while others expand the process to over a year. In terms of volume, some students average 50 pages per paper while others average 25— some are publishable papers, others are exhaustive reviews of literature; some write chapters for the dissertation, others write papers that have little or nothing to do with their research; some demonstrate facility and expertise with curriculum studies plus one or two other disciplines, others focus specifically on a very focused research topic. In other words, practices within EDCP reflect quite a discrepancy in what the purpose of the comprehensive exams is or ought to be.

References

Berkowitz, P. (2003, February). The long haul. *University Affairs*, 8-12.

Elgar, F. J. & Klein, R. M. (2004). What you don't know: Graduate dean's knowledge of completion rates. *Higher Education Policy, 17*, 325-336.

Green, B. & Lee, A. (1995). Theorising postgraduate pedagogy. *Australian Universities Review, 38*(2), 40-45.

Kerlin, R. (1997). *Breaking the silence: Toward a Theory of Women's Doctoral Persistence*. Unpublished Ph.D. diss., Portland State University.

Lee L. & Green B. (1995). Postgradutae studies / postgradute pedagogy. *Australian Universities Review, 38*(2), 2-4.

Metcalfe, M. & Kiley, M. (2000). Arguing for PhD coursework. *Australasian Journal of Information Systems, 17*(2), 52-59.

Mullens, A. (2003, November). Questioning the comps. *University Affairs*, 11-14.

Williams, G. (2005). *Doctoral education in Canada, 1900-2005*. Ottawa: Canadian Association for Graduate Studies.

Comprehensive Exam Policies (FOGS & EDCP)

UBC Calendar: The doctoral student will take the following examinations: A comprehensive examination, normally held after completion of all required coursework and intended to test the student's grasp of the chosen field of study as a whole, and the student's ability to communicate his or her understanding of it in English or in French.

http://students.ubc.ca/calendar/index.cfm?tree=12,204,342,617

FOGS Website: A comprehensive examination, normally held after completion of all required coursework and intended to test the student's grasp of the chosen field of study as a whole, and the student's ability to communicate his or her understanding of it in English or in French. The candidate's committee will set and judge this examination in a

manner compatible with the policy of the graduate program concerned. Programs should make available to students a written statement of examination policy and procedures. The comprehensive examination is separate and distinct from the evaluation of the doctoral dissertation prospectus.

http://www.grad.ubc.ca/policy/index.asp?menu=008,004,001,000

Recommended Guidelines for Graduate Programs' Comprehensive Examination Statement

FOGS website: Although all doctoral students in the Faculty of Graduate studies are required to successfully complete a comprehensive examination before being admitted to candidacy, the nature of the examination may vary significantly from graduate program to graduate program. It is important that graduate programs develop and make available to all new doctoral students (and faculty) a written statement clearly outlining their policies and procedures for the examination including; purpose, timing, examination format, examination committee, scope, criteria for evaluation, and adjudication.

Purpose of Exam

Clearly outline the purpose of the examination, which normally includes assessment of whether the student has developed:

- strong analytical, problem-solving and critical thinking abilities
- required breadth and in-depth knowledge of the discipline
- required academic background for the specific doctoral research to follow
- potential ability to conduct independent and original research
- ability to communicate knowledge of the discipline

Admission to Candidacy

The comprehensive exams are a required component for admission to candidacy. The basic requirements for a doctoral student to be admitted to candidacy are:

- all required course work has been successfully completed
- the comprehensive examination has been passed
- the research supervisory committee has certified that the thesis proposal has been approved.

Students are normally expected to complete their comprehensive examination within 24 months from the date of initial registration. A student who is not admitted to candidacy within 36 months from date of initial registration must withdraw from the program. Extension of this period may be permitted by the Dean of Graduate Studies in exceptional circumstances.

EDCP Comprehensive Exams (From *The Ph.D. Program Guidelines*)

The comprehensive examinations provide an opportunity for the student to demonstrate an understanding of his or her chosen field of study, and the various requirements for substantive research in that field (e.g., appropriateness of a particular research method). When the process is successfully completed, it provides an indication of the student's readiness to undertake the dissertation project that is to follow.

Comprehensive examinations are required by the Faculty of Graduate Studies in all doctoral programs. The Ph.D. comprehensive examination in the Department consists of three papers on a) curriculum studies, b) research methodology, and c) field of specialization / inquiry. The student usually drafts three possible questions and reading lists related to each. A student meets with his/her committee to discuss key references and the focus of the argument within each paper. After the initial period of consultation and topic development, students complete the papers independently of the faculty members who are to examine the resulting work. Each paper should have the format and length of a typical academic article (3000 to 5000 words), and is usually written over a 2 - 3 month period. A copy of the comprehensive exam questions is filed with the Department's Graduate Secretary.

Within three weeks of receiving the papers, the supervisor will schedule a meeting of the supervisory committee and student to discuss the three papers. The committee may request that a student revise one or more of the papers, before evaluating the comprehensive examination on a pass/fail basis. The student has the right to appeal the committee's decision through the Department's Graduate Coordinator.