CTL Enrolment Plan: 2016-2018

This document has been prepared with contributions from CTL Associate Chairs, CTL Program Coordinators, and an ad hoc committee comprised of interested CTL faculty. In this document, we provide a rationale for new CTL enrolment targets. We begin by presenting last years’ targets, our actual enrolments, and our proposed targets for next year. This is followed by a discussion of some of the challenges currently facing the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning and a brief vision of how we would like our department to grow over the next five years. The document concludes with a presentation of five strategies that will help us hit our targets and achieve our goals.

Target Summary:

2015 CTL targets (domestic)
- Full-time PhD: 20
- Flex-time PhD: 17
- MA full-time: 6
- MA part-time: 6
- M.Ed full-time: 85
- M.Ed part-time: 50
- MT: 350

2015 CTL registrants (domestic)*
- Full-time PhD: 17
- Flex-time PhD: 13
- MA full-time: 6
- MA part-time: 10
- M.Ed full-time: 57
- M.Ed part-time: 38
- MT: 319
* Note: These figures are likely to increase slightly. Some students have accepted our offers but have not registered yet.

2016 CTL proposed targets
- Full-time PhD: 20 (no change in target)
- Flex-time PhD: 12 (with a further decrease to 7 in 2017) (decrease in target by 5)
- MA full-time: 6 (no change in target)
- MA part-time: 10 (increase target by 4)
- M.Ed: 135 (no change in target)
- MT: 360 (increase in target by 10)
- Ed.D (in 2017): 5 (introduction of new program)
Challenges Facing CTL:

The Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning is currently facing many challenges. These include:

- **Loss of faculty complement**: CTL faculty numbers are rapidly decreasing due to retirement, secondment, and lack of faculty renewal. A large number of faculty are currently on a retirement path. Our numbers are decreasing so quickly that some faculty members are concerned that their programs may not viable in a few years.

- **Excessive doctoral supervision loads**: High supervision loads are consuming and overwhelming faculty time and energy. Eight of our faculty members have a doctoral supervision load of 10 or more students. The average supervision load across the department is 6.0. We estimate we should be admitting 27 doctoral students in the coming year, down from the 37 that we were assigned last year. We have also recently lost Sarfaroz Niyozov, who had a high supervision load. This has produced a situation where a large number of established Ph.D students are now searching for new supervisors. Unfortunately, most of the people who could take over supervisory duties for Sarfaroz’s students are already overloaded. Faculty supervision loads are not sustainable; we need to decrease our doctoral student admissions.

- **Large imbalances in class size and Ph.D supervision loads across the faculty**: Some CTL faculty members teach large classes and have many supervisions. Others have difficulty attracting students, despite their desire to have larger classes and more doctoral supervisions.

- **Year-over-year decreases in M.Ed enrolments**: We missed our M.Ed enrolment targets last year. We've been experiencing year-over-year decreases in our M.Ed enrolments. It's not clear what's causing this problem, although some have theorized it may be due to a proliferation of AQ courses, which offer an alternative means of advancement among teachers. Last year the departmental M.Ed target was 135 students. Only 95 M.Ed students have registered so far.

- **An excessive reliance on sessional faculty in the MT program**: Currently, sessional faculty teach over 80% of the courses in the MT program. This is a serious problem. The low number of tenure-stream faculty make it difficult for OISE to credibly argue that the MT program is qualitatively different than a two-year B.Ed program. It may put us at risk of losing our OCT accreditation, or losing our status as a Masters program.

- **The inability of international students to enrol in flex (non-funded) doctoral programs**: The "practicing professional" requirement of the Flex-time Ph.D. program makes it extremely difficult for international students to enrol in OISE doctoral programs. Moreover, our quotas on international students prevent them from being accepted into our full-time Ph.D programs. Highly qualified international students
(many of whom are quite willing to pay international fees) are effectively shut out of all of our doctoral programs. In addition to losing access to their talent, this is also a lost financial opportunity for OISE.

- **Multiple problems with the Master of Teaching Research Project (MTRP):** The Master of Teaching Research Project (MTRP) was designed, in part, to provide students with enough research experience that they can apply for PhD programs following graduation. However, the MTRP is not a suitable replacement for an MA thesis. In addition, the MTRP requirement is time-consuming; many MT students find it challenging to complete it in the allotted time. Many MT students do not have any plans to pursue doctoral work and do not value the MTRP exercise. We need to seriously re-think the MTRP and the path that students take from an MT degree to a doctoral degree.

**Our Vision:**

As we plan for the next five years, we want to work with the Deans Office to address each of these problems and strengthen our department. We aspire to be a global leader in our graduate programs, in initial teacher education, and in educational research. To achieve this vision, we need faculty renewal. At the same time, we need to overcome some of the financial hurdles facing both our department and OISE more broadly. Our plan is to re-work the distribution of our masters and doctoral students. We are top-heavy; we need a larger base of professional masters degree students and fewer doctoral students.

**Plan of Action:**

Our plan of action is as follows:

1. **Reduce our PhD intake:** CTL faculty feel overloaded working with large numbers of doctoral students — and, in particular, flex-time students who tend to require more support and tend to be less familiar with academic culture. It's critical that we address this problem. We envision a future in which we conduct our research in collaboration with a handful of exceptional, full-time Ph.D and MA students. Accordingly, we are adjusting our Ph.D targets as follows:

   A) We will maintain our current target of 20 full-time Ph.D students. These are the students who work on faculty research teams, to whom faculty can offer the greatest mentoring and supervisory support and who in return provide faculty with the greatest support for their research. These students tend to be the ones that are awarded grants, attend conferences, and co-publish papers with us.

   B) We will reduce the current target of 17 flex-time Ph.D students to 7 flex-time students. This decrease will be spread over two years. Next year, we will set a target of 12 students. In the following year we will set a target of 7 students. Flex-time students
contribute disproportionately to faculty load as they are, on average, are more challenging to supervise. Many CTL flex-time students are naïve about what it means do original research and have scheduled in the time they need to write their thesis. CTL flex-time students also, on average, provide faculty with little research support. CTL has been unable to meet its flex-time PhD target for several years now, suggesting that the current target is unrealistic. In addition, many faculty have already informed me that they do not have the capacity to take on more PhD students in the next two years, particularly flex-time students. We recognize that the decrease in flex-time students will have a negative impact on OISE income in the form of lost tuition and BIUs. We intend to compensate for this by increasing registrations in our Masters programs.

2. **Increase the number of MT registrations:** The MT program has seen tremendous growth over the past four years. However, we’re still having difficulty hitting our targets. Last year we set an target enrolment of 350 students. We received 349 acceptances, but only 319 students actually registered. We propose increasing our targets to 360 in 2016-17 and then increasing our targets again to 378 in 2017 as the CTEP program draws to a close. To ensure we hit these targets, we will implement the following strategies:

   A) We will develop combined programs with other University of Toronto faculties that will feed students into the MT programs, particularly the secondary program. Currently we are in the process of negotiating agreements with the Department of Music and Victoria College as well as other UT groups. This will significantly reduce the number of students that we need to recruit through traditional means, making it easier to hit our targets.

   B) We will substantially overhaul the MT admissions web site. The current MT admissions web site is unappealing, confusing, and difficult to navigate. A program’s web site is generally the first stop for prospective applicants. We need to develop an admissions site that makes the admissions process much easier and appealing for applicants. We are currently in the process of developing such a site (see [http://www.mtoise.weebly.com](http://www.mtoise.weebly.com)).

   C) We will support Sheldon Grabke’s initiatives in the Registrar’s Office to further advertise the strengths of the MT program and build awareness across Ontario.

   D) We will support faculty member Tara Goldstein’s efforts to recruit students enrolled in her third and fourth year Equity Studies undergraduate course “Equity, Activism and Education” into the MT program. Goldstein offers an information session on the MT and the M Ed/MA/PhD programs for her students each time she teaches the course.

3. **Increase the number of M.Ed registrations:** M.Ed programs across the Institute have seen gradual decreases in student intake over the past few years. In the coming years, we want to increase the number of registrations from 95 (this year) to the targets we established last year (135 students in CSTD and LLE combined). To ensure we hit these targets, we will implement the following strategies:
A) We will substantially overhaul the M.Ed admissions web site. Program web sites are generally the first stop for prospective applicants. We hope to develop admissions pages that make the admission process much easier for applicants. We plan to develop a site that is similar to the one that we have prepared for the MT program (see [http://www.mtoise.weebly.com](http://www.mtoise.weebly.com)), but one that highlights faculty research.

B) As part of strategy (A), we plan to build the site in such a way that it highlights some of the research of faculty members who work in fields that have traditionally not attracted large numbers of students. The goal is to provide more exposure to faculty and their courses. Many of these are of excellent quality and have much to offer M Ed students, but are not well-known to our students.

C) We will support Sheldon Grabke's initiatives in the Registrar's Office to further advertise the strengths of our M.Ed programs and build awareness across Ontario.

D) We will explore the possibility of using new strategies for recruiting M.Ed students. For example, we can use Associate Teacher mailing lists, drawn from the MT program (i.e., 300-400 email addresses) to advertise our M.Ed programs broadly across the GTA to teachers in our partner schools.

4. Introduce an Ed.D degree: Over the next year or so, CTL will explore the possibility of introducing an Ed.D degree as an extension of the MT degree (i.e., a new doctoral degree in the “Teaching” program). This will provide a natural transition for MT graduates who want to pursue doctoral studies. The Ed. D. degree will also be open to international students who are currently shut out of our full-time and flex-time Ph.D programs. Ed. D. students will be permitted to take CSTD and LLE courses. While much planning still needs to be done, we are currently leaning toward a program in which Ed.D. students can choose from two pathways:

Pathway 1: Students who elect to take Pathway 1 will take six courses, pass a comprehensives requirement, and complete a traditional thesis supervised by a research-stream faculty member. Pathway 1 will provide a way for highly qualified international doctoral students to take our doctoral programs. To be eligible for Pathway 1, applicants will have to demonstrate that they have a solid research record (e.g., an MA thesis).

Pathway 2: Students who elect to take Pathway 2 will take eight courses and produce a culminating “Final Project” rather than a thesis. The Final Project will be one that meets the needs of their professional field of practice; we will look to school boards and school principals to assist in the co-design of suitable projects. The choice of a "Final Project", rather than a thesis, will allow teaching-stream professors to serve as doctoral supervisors, thus minimizing the supervisory load on research-stream faculty. The Ed.D degree, rather than the Ph.D, will become the natural follow-up degree for MT students.

Once the Ed.D degree is established, we will be in a position where we can significantly redesign the MTRP, since it will no longer need to prepare students for entry into an
academic stream Ph.D.

Our initial targets for the Ed.D. are modest: 5 students for 2017-18, 5 students for 2018-19, and 10 students for 2019-20. These numbers, together with the increases in MT and M.Ed enrolments, will more than offset the decreases in Flex-mode Ph.D enrolments.

Note: The Ed.D degree is still in its early planning stages.

5. **Hire more faculty:** As these plans unfold, we expect the Dean’s Office to support our revenue-generating initiatives through faculty renewal. We need to further strengthen our CSTD and LLE programs. It will not be sufficient to simply replace retiring faculty; we also need to increase our numbers so that:
   (1) our core CTL programs can become stronger and more cohesive;
   (2) we can offer deeper and more responsive supervision to our current and future PhD students, and;
   (3) we can begin to build the next generation of professors in CTL. Six faculty members are already on retirement phase out, two others are well past retirement age (and could retire at any time) and many others will be eligible for phase out in the next five years.

Additionally, in the MT program, we need to replace sessional instructors with seconded instructors and tenure-stream faculty. This is critical if we want the MT to be viewed as a top-tier initial teacher education program.

**Financial justification for our plans:**
For the sake of simplicity, we assume that a government BIU is worth approximately $5000 and they are awarded to our department on the following basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>BIU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD Regular &amp; Flex Full-time</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Flex Part-time</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdD Full-time</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdD Part-time</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Full-time</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Part-time</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd Full-time</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We also assume that a student brings approximately $8,000 in tuition revenue to the Institute (this figure is a little low).

Under these assumptions, the loss of 5 flex-time Ph.D students will cost CTL the following: 5 x ($8,000 + 6 x $5000) = $190,000 per year (loss).

The increase in MT intake from 319 students this year to 360 students next year will add the following revenue annually:
41 x ($8000 + 4 x $5000) = $1,148,000 per year (gain).

The increase in M.Ed. intake from 95 students this year to 135 students next year, assuming 60% (81) full-time and 40% (54) part-time:
Full-time: 81 x ($8,000 + 3 x $5000) = $1,863,000 (gain)
Part-time: 54 x ($8,000 + 0.9 x $5000) = $675,000 (gain)

On top of these increases, this year’s Year 2 MT cohort (consisting of 212 students) will be replaced next year by the current Year 1 MT cohort (consisting of 342 students). This represents an increase in income of:
(342-212) x ($8,000 + 4 x $5000) = $3,640,000 (gain).

These figures suggest that we can decrease our flex-time targets without harming the bottom line. Even after the UT Tax, OISE should have sufficient funds for reducing the deficit and financing significant faculty renewal in the department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning.