Abstract
This article analyzes the history of Ontario’s secondary school teacher education by focusing on its development at the University of Toronto. It argues that the tensions associated with teaching, research and professional certification that arise when teacher education is placed within a university setting, have roots embedded in the nineteenth century. The article uses a variety of sources, including the Report of the Minister’s Committee on the Training of Secondary School Teachers 1962, to construct its arguments. The development of secondary school teacher education is traced through four historical periods: 1871–1907, the early history and development of the Ontario Normal College; 1907–1920, the establishment of the Faculty of Education at the University of Toronto and its first two decades of operation; 1920–1966, the transformation of the Faculty of Education into the Ontario College of Education; 1962–1996 the re-creation of the College (later Faculty) of Education and its merger with Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

The lofty goal, to be the centre of professional training in education, was set before the President of the University of Toronto by four members of the Faculty of Education in 1920. Their purpose was two fold: to advocate for increased status and to secure increased financial remuneration for themselves and their faculty (Cornish, 1920:5). Some forty years later, the institution they foresaw as enhancing Canadian teacher education to such an extent that Canada’s educational prowess would “outstrip the United States” was being vilified, not glorified. A prominent Ontario politician viewed it as:

The last refuge of the undecided ...[with] a high school atmosphere characterized by regimentation. The building is a study in depression ...It
is bleak, overcrowded ... cramped ... desolate ... student teachers are expected to be non critical ... non analytical ... It breeds an anti intellectual atmosphere. (Lewis, 1964:255)

How did the Ontario College of Education (OCE), the provincial school of education for secondary school teachers located on the campus of the University of Toronto, come to warrant such a diatribe? While some of these criticisms were well founded, others were reflective of the emotion that discussion of secondary school teacher education evokes among the population at large, teachers themselves and researchers in the field of education. The building that housed the OCE was in poor shape. Its “bleak, overcrowded, cramped and desolate” features were indicative of the neglect it received at the hands of both the Ontario Ministry of Education and the University of Toronto. Did it breed anti intellectualism? Were its students expected to be non critical and non analytical? To answer these charges is a more challenging task.

Like the other professional schools that form part of the University of Toronto, the Faculty of Education has a history that is largely determined by the fact that it served multiple masters. As a professional school, it sits at that most challenging position in the academy: the intersection of theory and practice. Like the histories of other schools of education throughout the world, the history of the Faculty of Education at the University of Toronto (and Ontario teacher education in general) is largely uncharted (Harris, 1967; Fleming, 1971; Phillips, 1977 Lang & Gelman, 1994; Booth & Stiegelbauer, 1996; Eastman, 2002). In contrast to other faculties within the university (Friedland, 2002), the Faculty of Education lacks a comprehensive history of its teachers, students and curriculum. This may be due in part to the nature of the teaching profession, for as Kennedy (2001) observes:

Most professions develop licensing policies that distinguish members from non-members and most members make career-long commitments to their professions .... Both these aspects of professionalism have eluded education. A substantial fraction of the population consists of former teachers or people who were certified but never taught [or] ... practicing educators [who] entered the field through alternative routes ... The boundaries of educational expertise are further blurred by a presumption of expertise in the population at large for, as Carl Kaestle has noted, everyone has been to the fourth grade, and that makes everyone an expert on educational matters. (17)
Kaestle’s point is worth bearing in mind while reading comments such as those that open this piece.

This article analyzes the history of Ontario’s secondary school teacher education by focusing on its development at the University of Toronto. It argues that the tensions associated with teaching, research and professional certification which arise when teacher education is placed within a university setting have roots embedded in the nineteenth century. The article uses a variety of sources, including The Report of the Minister’s Committee on the Training of Secondary School Teachers 1962 (The Patten Report), to construct its arguments. The development of secondary school teacher education is traced through four historical periods: 1871–1907: the early history and the development of the Ontario Normal College; 1907–1920: the establishment and termination of the Faculty of Education at the University of Toronto; 1920–1966: the Ontario College of Education, the Faculty of Education’s successor; 1962–1996: the re-creation of the College (later Faculty) of Education and its merger with Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

**Ontario’s secondary school teacher education: 1871–1907**

In 1867, the British North American Act established the country of Canada. Because of the linguistic, regional and religious conflicts among the founding peoples, a decentralized approach to education was taken. No national office of education was created. The administration of elementary and secondary education was placed in the hands of the provincial government. Ontario is the most populous of Canada’s ten provinces and three territories. Ontario’s provisions for teacher education have, at various points in their history, both led and followed the trends emerging in the rest of the country. From Toronto, the province’s capital, the Ontario Ministry of Education controlled schools and teacher education.

In the early period of its history, demand for teacher certification in Ontario remained a background issue – inadequate supply of teachers was a more pressing problem. Teacher education was by apprenticeship and for some, after 1847, attendance at the Toronto Normal Schools. With the restructuring of the provincial education system and the passage of the High Schools Act of 1871, the increase in number of students attending high schools signaled the need for more teachers. How-
ever, the Act listed no specific requirements for training. A university degree was deemed sufficient for teaching in the province’s high schools. In 1885, the specific pedagogical preparation of high school teachers was first addressed when a provisional agreement was drafted between the Ontario Minister of Education and collegiate institutes (those high schools that prepared students for university entrance examinations). Principals and their staffs were empowered to provide a 14 week training program for new teachers. This apprenticeship model had little appeal to those seeking to teach. Thus, by 1891, the School of Pedagogy educating teacher candidates for secondary schools was housed within the same building as the elementary-school oriented Toronto Normal School. Almost from its foundation, there were questions concerning the nature of the type of training the School delivered.

The growing interest in establishing a university-based teacher education program was apparent from the 1892 Report of the [Ontario] Minister of Education. In that volume, a Special Report of the Principal and Mathematics Master of the Normal School, Ottawa, On A Visit to Certain Normal Schools and Other Training Institutes in the US was reprinted. MacCabe and William (1892) described the curriculum and degree programs at the New York College for the Training of Teachers, a branch of the University of the State of New York:

This is the first time in the history of education that University has formally established a School of Pedagogy as a professional school and given pedagogical degrees ... Its work is first to make its students thoroughly familiar with the history and science of education, methodology, systems of schools, school law, practical administration and the educational literature of the ages. Second, by seminary method to give that incitement to the highest order of work, which comes from the contact of many highly trained minds, intent on success in the same professional ends. (187)

It appears that the University of Toronto was not particularly interested in moving in this direction – a fact that contributed to the 1896 establishment of the Ontario Normal College (ONC) in Hamilton, an industrial town located some 60 kilometers from Toronto. ONC was founded by a 10 year agreement between the Hamilton Board of Education and the Ontario Ministry of Education. The Ministry agreed to pay for staff time and for space while the Board of Education agreed that its teachers would work with the students in the “critic” capacity. ONC’s mandate included education of teachers for both elementary and secondary
It should be the centre...

panels. Just under 22% of ONC students possessed university degrees, the essential credential for preparation as a secondary school teacher (Ontario Normal College, 1907).

ONC contributed actively to the social and intellectual life of the city of Hamilton. With 26 members listed as its 1906–7 staff and 229 students enrolled, 155 women (21.9% with degrees) and 74 men (21.6% with degrees), the staff and students engaged in a variety of extra-curricular and co-curricular activities. The May 1900 issue of the Ontario Normal College Monthly gives a flavour of the matters on the minds of the staff and students. The student-written editorial observed that “The field of educational research is unlimited and will claim our most careful study” (Editorial, 1900: 82). It complained about poorly qualified teachers who possessed minimal high school credentials and no teacher education. They wrote, “the profession is swarmed with ‘third class’ teachers many of whom will accept ridiculously low salaries, just for the sake of getting a start... Thus those who are in the profession as a life-work are made to suffer by those who use the position as a mere stepping stone or in order to attain a certain degree of independence by supplying themselves with pin-money” (Editorial, 1900: 81). The agreement between the Hamilton Board of Education and the Ontario Normal College terminated in 1907. R.A. Thompson, the last principal of the College, concluded that its closure was largely the result of political whims and the changing opinions of the university (Guillet, 1960).

The faculty of education, University of Toronto: 1907–1920

That the University of Toronto had changed its mind with regard to its involvement in teacher education was directly related to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the University of Toronto. On 3 October 1905, the seven Commissioners were charged with the task of recommending the future development of the University of Toronto: its management, finances, and its relationships with professional schools. Six months later, the Commissioners delivered their relatively brief (60 page) report. They recommended the establishment or affiliation of a number of professional schools, including a Faculty of Education. They wrote:

The time has come in our opinion for the creation of a department of pedagogy. A course in the history principles and practice of education should form part of the curriculum. The University examines for the degree of Bachelor of Pedagogy and Doctor of Pedagogy but has hitherto
done no teaching. Departments of Education have been established in many universities ... The work is best performed where the theory and the practice can be made to supplement each other and it appears to us that the Provincial University should conduct the department on these lines ... The duty of the University in connection with the teaching body of our primary and secondary schools is one that ought to be recognized. ... We do not suggest the exact means by which such an arrangement can be effected. We believe that the question can best be dealt with by the new governing board and that financial provisions for the creations of a pedagogical course should be made. (Flavelle, 1906: iv)

Thus began the history of one of the most complex professional schools within the University of Toronto: the Faculty of Education. The Commissioners correctly foreshadowed the tensions that would emerge in determining the place of the professional education for teachers within a university that was increasingly shaped by the norms of science. They clearly identified the debates between the theory and practice of education. They pointed out the obvious: that the interplay among the university that taught those wishing to become teachers, the provincial government who licensed them as practitioners and the local school boards who employed them as teachers would require constant negotiation.

They identified the need for a clinical setting in which new student teachers could apply and practice their new knowledge and skills and thus recommended the establishment of the University of Toronto Schools.

While it may appear that the Faculty of Education was created to solve the issue of providing adequate professional education for secondary school teachers, once it was established, it did not restrict its admission to students who held first degrees. As Figure 1, the composite portrait of the graduating class of 1909–10, illustrates, the majority of students who enrolled in teacher education at the University of Toronto was young (by regulation, at least 18 years of age), female, preparing to teach in the elementary schools and lacking a university degree. The presence of so many young women students caused university officials great consternation. The University lacked facilities and personnel to adequately house and supervise them, the Dean of Education, W. Pakenham, explained. In the year that female enrollment in the Faculty of Education reached 259, Dean Pakenham wrote,

The great majority of these women were under 21 years of age ... Scarcely any were over 23 years of age. About two-thirds of them came from homes
outside the city and two-thirds of them did not remain in the city longer than one session. All of these women became teachers ... and shape the morals and manners of the young men and women of Ontario. And yet there is no residence for women at the Faculty of Education, no woman superintendent, counsellor or teacher. The condition calls for anxious consideration. (President’s Report 1914–15: 17)

The presence on the University of Toronto campus of such large numbers of young women preparing for careers as elementary school teachers was short lived. When the Faculty of Education was recast (albeit with the same staff, administration and physical location) as the Ontario College of Education, it required a university degree for admission. Its targeted population was those students wishing to teach in the provincial high schools. If a student was interested in elementary education, certification could be acquired only if they took elementary education as one of their two teaching subjects. Relatively few students chose this option.

As was indicated in the Commissioners’ 1906 Report, even before it began to prepare students for teacher certification, the University of Toronto was granting graduate degrees in education. Approved before Senate in 1894, the Doctor of Pedagogy was one of the first doctoral degrees the University offered. Targetted at those wishing to be principals or inspectors, the University provided a list of recommended readings and set the examinations, but offered no course work. Candidates were not required to prepare a dissertation (Harris, 1976: 310). With the creation of the Faculty of Education, its faculty assumed responsibility for the degree and changed the requirements to include coursework, examinations, and a dissertation. The Dean annually reported that the rising interest in doctoral studies was hampered by the lack of resources to deliver them:

The registration calls attention to the rapidly growing demand in Canada for courses in education, the demand is so varied and so strong that
the University cannot afford longer to neglect its organization of the teaching staff and course of instruction in the faculty of education. It must act immediately or American universities will train the education experts of Canada.

(President’s Report 1919–20: 18)

Graduate teaching and research were viewed as interdependent and dissemination of results was viewed as critical, especially in light of the pronouncement of the President in his Annual Report that

the spirit of investigation has been greatly strengthened and younger men are to be found in most departments who, either on their own account or under the direction of others who have already much to their credit, recognized that scientific research not only heightens their own interest but is becoming an essential qualification in a member of the staff of a modern university.

(President’s Report 1920–21:9)

While the impact of the research culture on faculty work life would not reach its zenith until the late twentieth century, it is noteworthy that its roots can be seen in reports such as these. Although it was not until 1934/35 that a Directorship and Department of Educational Research were established, national dissemination of educational research had long been an expectation of members of the Faculty of Education. As Dean Pakenham reported:

In September of 1912, the staff of the Faculty of Education issued the first number of “the School” ... It is the function of “The School” to help transfer to the teachers of Canada the results of the more recent discoveries and experiments in education, and this to renew or prolong their interest in educational problems. (President’s Report 1912–1913: 22)

In its initial phase of existence, the Faculty of Education at the University of Toronto educated teachers for both the elementary and secondary school panels. It did not require a degree for admission. Its student population was dominated by young women. It used the University of Toronto Schools (UTS), a school for boys (the second school – a school for girls – was never built) located in one wing of the Faculty of Education building, as one of its sites for practice teaching and as a source of methods instructors. Faculty members were encouraged to pursue a number of scholarly directions, which included engaging in graduate studies and research and contributing to the professional development of teachers in the province through the writing of articles and texts and the delivery of professional development courses.
The Ontario College of Education (OCE); 1920–1966

The experiment of educating non-dreged elementary and secondary school teacher candidates together within a university setting lasted less than two decades. At the direction of the Ontario Ministry of Education, the Faculty of Education that had been established at Queen’s University, Kingston, in 1907 was closed in 1920. In that same year, the Faculty of Education at the University of Toronto became the Ontario College of Education (OCE). While it operated within the University of Toronto, with its chief operating officer a Dean, OCE was to be under the direction of both the Minister of Education and the University President.

OCE was to be primarily devoted to the preparation of teachers for secondary schools. The demographic profile of the student population was considerably altered as many of the women students, whose need of residential accommodation and supervision was so much in the mind of the President and the Dean, were no longer admitted as students. The President of the University of Toronto reported:

Though what was formerly the Faculty of Education is now the Ontario College of Education, the relationship of this department to the Board of Governors is happily unchanged and I have the pleasure in presenting as usual the report of Dean Pakenham. As a result of the new policy the numbers were greatly reduced, those in training for first-class certificates having been assigned to the Normal Schools. All the students in the College of Education in the regular classes were graduates in Arts. By reason of the smaller attendance of students ... graduate work has now been made possible to greater extent than formerly. (President’s Report 1920–21: 9)

The Dean predicted in the same year that with the elimination of the burden of teaching high numbers of students destined for employment in elementary schools, graduate studies in education would flourish. At the same time, he signalled that a more focussed approach to graduate education would be instituted.

The OCE faculty’s work in graduate education and research appeared in the Reports of the President of the University of Toronto. Included annually were notices of appointments to the College; report from the Dean; enrollment data and number of graduates (whose degrees were granted by the University of Toronto) and intermittent reports from the Principal of the University of Toronto Schools.
Both physically and intellectually, OCE was not at the heart of the university. Situated on the edge of the campus, it was a brisk 20 minute walk from the administrative centre of Simcoe Hall. OCE was populated by faculty whom one former dean described as “an array of individuals and characters reminiscent of a Robertson Davies novel. Some were Dickensian in breadth and spirit. They were all males of course except for the obligatory and quite exceptional women in home economics and women’s physical education, loyalist in temperament, politically conservative in matters of education and classroom practice” (Macdonald 1996:9). Yet, it is important to note that some faculty members were in fact curricular leaders, writing textbooks that gained provincial and national prominence.

In spite of its location on a university campus, and the fact that its head was a dean, most matters dealing with finance, appointment of staff and curriculum were overseen by the Ministry of Education. OCE’s deans have been described by one of their number in the following terms “none of them scholars in the conventional contemporary sense but all of them sharing the same virtue of having impeccable connections with the ministers of education of their times” (Macdonald 1996:9). This is not to say that some Presidents of the University of Toronto did not try to have more influence over OCE. When Dean A.C.Lewis (1944–58) tendered his resignation, University of Toronto acting President Moffat Woodside followed University policy and initiated the process of a striking a search committee to select a new Dean. The Ontario Minister of Education, W.J. Dunlop, wrote to the President: “Before you have too many meetings permit me to call to your mind an antiquated, colloquial but still very valid maxim ’He who pays the piper calls the tune.’” By Order in Council, that is, a cabinet directive and not a University search, B.C. Diltz was appointed Dean (Stamp, 1982: 201). With appointment procedures that did not follow university policies, and much of its research and publications oriented toward educational practice, OCE’s culture differed dramatically from the rest of the university. It is not difficult to understand why tension between OCE and the rest of the campus arose.

In the mid-1950s, there were important changes made in the OCE program. Technical Studies were inaugurated to prepare teachers to staff these new secondary school programs. Most of the candidates for this program were men who moved from industry into education, without acquiring a degree. Major changes also occur-
red in the delivery of graduate programs. The degree Bachelor of Pedagogy, which may be considered as standing halfway between a Bachelor of Education and a Master of Education, was eliminated. The Master of Education degree was instituted. The Doctor of Pedagogy, to which one could gain admission from a Bachelor of Pedagogy, was also eliminated. Admission to the new Doctor of Education (Ed D) degree was completion of a Masters degree. The Ed D program included coursework in research, a series of seminars and the writing of a dissertation. The history of the Ed D at the University of Toronto is a fascinating and turbulent one for it raises questions as to how to implement a fully professional doctoral degree within a research-oriented university. Its current decline may be more a result of the professionalization of the Doctor of Philosophy degree than disinterest on the part of students in acquiring a graduate degree with a professional focus (Smyth, Allen & Wahlstrom, 2001).

**Reintegration in the University of Toronto and new Mergers: 1962–1996**

For almost forty years, OCE held a monopoly on professional education of secondary school teachers in the province of Ontario. Over those decades, teacher education was studied by a number of provincial reviews and task forces as the teacher educators in the provincial Normal Schools (later Teachers’ Colleges), the Teachers’ Federations and the faculty of OCE themselves all sought to improve secondary school teacher education. An analysis of the 1962 Report of The Minister’s Committee on the Training of Secondary School Teachers (*The Patten Report*) provides insights into the critical issues within teacher education. The committee who formulated *The Patten Report* was charged with making recommendations "on all matters pertaining to the preparation of secondary school teachers, including the possible establishment of additional training institutions in the province.” Among its six specific tasks was to explore “The relationship of the colleges to the universities to the Department of Education in matters both academic and non-academic” and “the relationship of the academic and professional education of teachers in both time and arrangement” (*The Patten Report* 1962: 5). Curiously, none of the 12 Commissioners were drawn from OCE.
The Patten Report listed 148 recommendations that addressed virtually all aspects of the life of a teacher education institution: the staff, students, curriculum, practice teaching, physical location, financial issues and governance. The Committee identified a number of roles for a college of education. While the training of teachers was its primary objective, the Committee believed that a key leadership role for the colleges lay in the domain of educational change:

Through its direct contact with the secondary schools and with the Department of Education the college should be a prime mover in education change ... Significant writings and studies on education, advances and findings of other departments of the universities and the results of its own research projects are a part of this process ... Teachers must be trained not only in the changing aspects of secondary schools but also in the fact of change itself. (The Patten Report 1962: 10)

The Committee concluded that the best arrangement under which professional education can occur is one in which the responsibility is shared among the Ontario Ministry of Education and the University. It set about to recommend an improved and enhanced OCE. It recommended that “new colleges of education should follow this pattern if a graduate school in close relationship to a university” yet stated that “it does not follow that every university should have an attached college of education ... the ability of the surrounding area to provide adequate facilities for practical work must have an important bearing on the placement of new colleges.” Staff should “hold university rank and appointment” yet “there must be consultation between the two authorities over the nomination and conditions of appointment of suitable persons to carry out the functions for which the college is established” (The Patten Report 1962: 50–53). How the committee visualized ‘scholarship’ was reflective of the dominance of members who were school-based or department based. The description of the Dean revealed much:

The dean should be a person whose breadth of scholarship and respect for scholarship are generally recognized by the minister, by the universities and by secondary school teachers ... Such scholarship is not necessarily identifiable with a multiplicity of degrees and should outweigh any proof of administrative ability. (The Patten Report 1962: 68)

Three recommendations in The Patten Report deserve special attention: the creation of a new
degree: the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT); the role of the college and faculty in research and the physical location of a school of teacher education.

Early in the report, the Committee members voiced their support for the MAT as a means of achieving “further personal development to the students and provision of even more intellectual challenge to the special group of students which can accept it without danger to the training aspects of the course. It should also help to forge a closer link between the college and the university” (The Patten Report 1962: 26). Students would divide their time between coursework in academic departments across the university and the Faculty of Education.

In the domain of research, the Committee’s writings indicate a very practice-oriented view. They wrote that “staff experimentation and research” in areas of teaching practice and curriculum should “supplement the work being done by any research department or graduate school within the College.” However, they advised against the establishment of a Department of Research (which was in existence at OCE), concluding that “it need not be considered an essential feature” for its role should be “subsidiary to the main function of the college which is to train teachers rather than research workers.” To ensure the operations of an effective research department which would explore “problems related chiefly to secondary education and to research having practical application .... Avoid[ing] the danger of straying too far afield in its investigations”, the committee advised that it be “controlled by the college and not allowed to develop into an isolate and semi-independent body” (The Patten Report 1962: 171). The committee advised that the colleges should not establish lab schools (and recommended that UTS be eliminated) but that research work be carried on, as should practice teaching, in schools reflecting the diversity of the secondary school population.

Finally, the committee dedicated a considerable amount of space to space. It recommended that new buildings, located “on a university campus or in proximity to a university” built to accommodate 600 students “should be planned to resemble a good secondary school” with specialist classrooms. The OCE building should be the subject of a study by structural experts with a view to demolition or complete renovation. Space in the newly constructed facilities should include “office space for the local officials of the Ministry of Education” (The Patten Report 1962: 228). This latter recommendation indicates the
Committee’s views that teacher education to be more aligned with the Ministry of Education. Shortly after the presentation of this Report, another commission, The Minister’s Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers, produced The MacLeod Report (1966). The committee recommended the transfer of teacher education from Ministry of Education administered Teachers’ Colleges into Faculties of Education that would be located on university campuses and governed by university procedures. This policy was initiated in the 1960s and completed the closure of the last Ontario Teacher Education College in 1979.

As with many commissioned works, little action was taken a result of The Patten Report. Yet, a few developments are worth noting. Two new colleges of education to qualify students for teaching in secondary schools were created at Queen’s University, Kingston, and at the University of Western Ontario, London. The Ministry divested itself of some control over OCE. To reflect this change, OCE was renamed the College of Education of the University of Toronto (CEUT) in 1966 and in 1972, the Faculty of Education of the University of Toronto (FEUT).

Two events dramatically influenced CEUT’s development: the foundation of OISE and a change in teacher qualifications. In 1965, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) was established independent of the University of Toronto but affiliated to it for degree granting purposes. OISE took over OCE’s responsibility for graduate teaching and research. What had been OCE’s Department of Educational Research became the core of OISE. The new OISE was well-funded. Its founding director recruited faculty internationally. Very rapidly, OISE became Canada’s premier institute of educational research. It attracted students and scholars from around the province, across the country and around the world. Its innovative and responsive approach to graduate education resulted in a large enrollment in its part-time Master and Doctor of Education degrees. As enrollment grew, many women teachers were drawn to part time study that enabled them to combine graduate work with full time employment. Through its network of field centres scattered throughout Ontario, OISE engaged in the delivery of graduate programs in education, in wide ranging research and in collaborative field development activities. In the absence of its own large and resource-rich graduate department, the new CEUT began striking alliances with a number of university departments, including English, Mathematics, Physics, Geography and Library Science (Macdonald, 1996:19) imple-
menting the degree of Master of Arts/Master of Science in Teaching (MAT) – the degrees that *The Patten Report* had recommended.

The second change was the result of the 1974 decision of the Ministry of Education to change teacher qualifications. Previously, students at OCE/CEUT could prepare for both elementary and secondary schools by selecting “the elementary option” in addition to one of their subject-based high school courses. Few students selected this path. As of 1974 students could select qualifications to teach students at the following levels: primary/junior (Kindergarten-Grade 6), junior/intermediate (Grades 4–10) or intermediate/senior (Grades 7 to school leaving). The outcome of this choice was that FEUT students could choose to pursue a program of studies with an elementary school orientation. Declining enrollment in the province’s school system caused great problems in faculty recruitment. One former dean described the problem thus “between 1974 and 1989, there virtually no new appointments made at FEUT ...the penalty paid by the Faculty for too rapid expansion in the late sixties was keenly felt by its inability to benefit from the advantages of orderly renewal throughout much of the eighties” (Macdonald, 1996: 15). The Deans of Education decided to keep enrollment in the elementary options small as they had to retool their secondary school oriented staff to teach students whose pedagogical interests differed from theirs.

The Provostial Review of the Faculty of Education 1986–87 pointed a new direction at FEUT. In addition to encouraging further linkages with OISE, and with the two laboratory schools, the Institute for Child Studies (ICS) and UTS, the Review recommended resources for new faculty appointments and a greater research focus. A period of reform under the leadership of newly appointed Dean Michael Fullan lasted from 1988 to 1996.
The Present

Perhaps the most significant change which has occurred in the faculty’s history is that which heralded the present phase: the 1996 merger of FEUT and OISE into the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). Previous attempts to join the two institutions, most notably an attempt by the University of Toronto based on the recommendation of the Marsden Task Force and one by the Liberal Government of Ontario made by an announcement in the 1985 provincial budget by Treasurer Robert Nixon (Lang & Eastman 2002: 77), had failed. Yet, under the leadership of FEUT Dean Michael Fullan, OISE Director Angela Hildyard and University of Toronto President Rob Pritchard, OISE/UT was created on 1 July 1996. Headed by Dean Michael Fullan, this new institution’s self declared mandate was:

Canada’s leading educational institution dedicated to the establishment of a learning society, through immersing itself in the world of applied problem solving and expanding the knowledge and capacities of individuals to lead productive lives. (OISE/UT, 2002)

OISE/UT continues the almost century-old tradition of delivering a one year consecutive program in teacher education to students who already have earned at least one academic degree. Additionally, it offers two graduate programs that combine a graduate degree with teacher qualification: a Master of Arts in Human Development and a Master of Teaching. Four other graduate degrees are offered by OISE/UT’s five graduate departments: Master of Arts, Master of Education, Doctor of Education and Doctor of Philosophy.

OISE/UT is still attempting to actualize the vision for professional teacher education within the University of Toronto that was identified in the 1906 Royal Commission Report. The tensions and challenges identified by the Commissioners are still in the foreground as the increasing demands from arms-length regulatory bodies, such as the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies and the Ontario College of Teachers, have reshaped elements of teacher education. Significant new pressures have emerged as well. In response to the structures put in place by the Ontario Ministry of Education to increase the accountability for teachers’ initial and ongoing professional certification, the relationship between the faculties of education and Ontario’s teacher unions has become strained. As well, the demands for accountability within the university-research culture has placed pressure on
faculty to meet ever escalating standards of excellence in both teaching and research.

As OISE/UT moves into the twenty-first century, and awaits the impact of a new dean, faculty are grappling with three questions. How can a professional faculty delivering both initial teacher education and graduate education achieve excellence in both teaching and research? What is the role of a professional faculty of education in a contemporary research university? In what ways can faculty excellence be enhanced within an environment which addresses the realities of professional education with its demands for the education and supervision of teacher candidates; responsiveness to the schools systems, graduate instruction and, supervision; scholarship and research? The answers to these questions may reveal the shape of tomorrow’s teacher education.
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