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Abstract
This research responds to the problem of minority teacher under-representation within North America’s increasingly diverse urban school systems. It weaves together what is known about educational equity, teacher education admission policy, and policy implementation to explore the research question, “How did equity-based admission policy shape candidate diversification in an urban Canadian teacher education program?” The conceptual framework grounds this study within organizational culture and describes how culture both shapes and is shaped by interactions between structure and agency. The conceptual question asks, “How did institutional norms and individual will work to support or constrain equitable candidate diversification?”

Data collection occurred during private interviews with members of three organizational groups: Policymakers, policy implementers, and policy beneficiaries. Policymakers were senior administrators with several years’ experience in their respective positions. Policy implementers were admission personnel, ad hoc faculty, and field-based educators. The policy beneficiaries were candidates who self-identified as future French and Physics teachers, and as members of Aboriginal, Disabled, Gendered/Invisible, and
Racialized/Visible minorities. Data analysis was an iterative process of applying demographic, thematic, and editorial coding to the interview transcripts. Discussion highlighted several themes that shaped the admission process: External admission policy context, Faculty of Education Equity Policy, admission policy instrumentation, qualification precedence and weighting, academic qualifications, non-academic identity-based and experience-based qualifications, admission policy gaps, and last-minute Policy disclosure. It also addressed admission personnel recruitment, training, and performance during candidate personal information form assessment.

Significant findings emerged in the areas of preservice program partnerships, candidate support services, qualification transparency, labeling of identity-based candidate characteristics, and admission personnel training. Research applicability extends to consecutive and concurrent teacher education programs, other tertiary professional licensing programs, and multi-site qualitative research projects. Recommendations for policy and practice target teacher education admission, policy implementation, and equity policy development.
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Chapter 1

1 The Problem of Minority Teacher Under-Representation in North America’s Public Schools

1.1 Introduction

This study examines how equity-based admission policy shaped teacher candidate diversification in an urban Canadian teacher education program. It begins with the problem of an elitist teacher workforce within North America’s public school systems. The teacher population consists of mostly white, heterosexual, closeted homosexual, middle-class, able-bodied women who work in the country in which they were born. Yet student diversity within urban school populations is rising exponentially, characterized, for example, by unprecedented variation in students’ physical appearance, family structure, religion, ethnicity, language, nationality, and migration history. Yet how can a teacher workforce that embodies so little diversity begin to meet the needs of these students? The solution depends first on applying principles of educational equity to identify the learning barriers that so much teacher sameness creates, and second, on diversifying North America’s teacher population through teacher education reform.

In this single site case study, the research question asks, “How did equity-based admission policy shape candidate diversification in an urban Canadian teacher education program?” Literature on educational equity, teacher education admission, and policy implementation informed the project design and added depth to the conceptual model. The chapter concludes with a thesis summary that describes how original interview data from administrators, admission personnel, and successful minority candidates provide insight into the way that institutional structure and agency interact to both support and constrain teacher candidate diversification.

1.2 An Elitist Teacher Workforce

Generations of North American public school students have attended classes taught by white, Christian women with middle-class backgrounds and little experience of social difference.
Since the early 20th century, accelerating trends in worldwide emigration have created North American schools populated by growing numbers of foreign-born students whose families do not speak or read English. However, for schools to succeed in meeting the needs of all students, research suggests that the teacher workforce needs to reflect the physical and ethnocultural demographics of their students. For example, Ryan, Pollock, and Antonelli (2009) point out that this is clearly not the case in Canada. Table 1 shows the under-representation of visible minority teachers and guidance counselors in three Canadian provinces and cities. Teacher-only data was not available.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visible Minority Populations (%)</th>
<th>General Public</th>
<th>Teachers &amp; Guidance Counselors</th>
<th>Teacher &amp; Guidance Counselor Under-Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Québec</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montréal</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.1 Learning Barriers that Undermine Diverse Urban School Populations

In the majority, the teacher workforce contributes to the re/production of the kinds of inequities that minority students have traditionally experienced. For example, most teachers support or fail to resist the exclusive entitlement of a few privileged groups such as whites, males, heterosexuals, Christians, and able members of the middle and upper classes (Lyons, Barraza, & Thomas, 2005; Portelli, Shields, & Vibert, 2007; Portelli & Solomon, 2001; Sleeter, 1995; Solomon, 2000; Wallberg, Reynolds, & Wang, 2004). As well, many teachers re/produce social tensions through their tacit or even open support for traditional status
inequities within multiethnic populations (Rasheed, 2004; Ryan, 1998, 1999, 2003a, 2003b, 2009; Zeichner, 1991). For example, McCaskell (2005) points out that a typical school is more likely to impose more serious consequences on students who smoke than on students who make racist remarks.

Brosio (1998) advocates regulatory reform to eliminate “anti-reproductive schooling” (see also Darling-Hammond, 1995; Darling-Hammond & Goodwin, 1993; Oakes, 1995), whereas J. A. Banks (2004), Bell (2002), Feiman-Nemser (2008), and Ladson-Billings (1995, 1999) make clear the importance of positive student/teacher relationships and describe how educational policy must be shaped to provide all students with teachers who they can trust and with whom they feel comfortable. In other examples, researchers advocate building a teacher workforce that reflects the sociocultural demographics of today’s student populations (C. A. M. Banks, 2006; J. A. Banks, 2006; Bell, 2002; Grant, 1993; hooks, 1994; Irvine, 2003, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Stead, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c; Wiggins & Follo, 1999). In particular, two dilemmas demand a response. First, growing numbers of students find themselves confronted by teachers who are not “responsive to their cultural orientations and learning styles” (Gay, 2004, p. 231). Second, many teacher education candidates find themselves graduating without sensitivity to multiethnic diversity or without being able to establish transformative relationships with all of their students (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), 2004; Anyon, 1995; J. A. Banks, 1994; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Ryan, 1999; Santiago, 2002; Torres, Howard-Hamilton, & Cooper, 2003).

A short-term solution to these two dilemmas may lie in a strategic diversification of the teacher pool that reduces physical and ethnocultural differences between students and teachers.

Today’s school populations include the descendants of North American colonizers, Aboriginal and indigenous peoples, refugees, first-generation immigrants, LGBT\(^1\) students, and ethnoculturally and linguistically diverse children who may be dependent on their schools to become fluent in English or French. Furthermore, many of these students may have yet to experience a school community where they “feel secure because the likelihood is

---

\(^1\) LGBT stands for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered. It is an abbreviation of the longer term, LGBTTQQA in which the last five letters stand for Two Spirited, Queer, Questioning, Ally, and Asking.
that people will understand and support them”, and comfortable enough “simply to be . . . themselves” (Abbott, 2008, p. 3). For example, Ryan et al. (2009) cite the disproportionately low number of teachers of colour in Canada’s three largest cities, where most students of colour are denied access to teachers who would be ethnic and cultural role models.

Ryan (2009) makes a strong case for diversifying the teacher workforce. First, he cites ethics and the expectations of representational democracy as justification for the fact that “people of colour have a legitimate right to gain employment in the teaching profession” (p. 18). Second, he names proportional representation of non-white teachers and administrators as essential to ensuring the motivation of non-white and white students alike. Third, Ryan points out the importance of non-white teachers and administrators as role models, successful adults who may have overcome hardship in their own families and community environments. Fourth, he states that shared appearance may be a reliable indicator of shared experience and provide a foundation for relationships with students of colour. Fifth, Ryan describes the value of non-white teachers in adapting their teaching styles to embrace “culturally relevant pedagogy that makes use of subject content that is related to the life, experience, and cultures of their students” (p. 18). Finally, he emphasizes the political role that teachers of colour may exercise in teaching their students to understand how society marginalizes coloured people, and in knowing what it takes to become active “cultural brokers” who intervene in the face of injustice.

Powerful social hierarchies structured by exclusionary norms such as racism, homophobia, classism, ethnocentrism, and xenophobia prevent some groups from accessing the quality of education to which they are entitled, even though the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (Government of Canada, 1982) and the US Constitution (United States of America, 1787) warrant all citizens and legal residents a free public school education. In schools, social hierarchies relegate minority students to the margins and re/force rigid social stratification (Brosio, 1998; Cochran-Smith, 2000; Connell, 1996; Diamond, 1999; Feiman-Nemser, 1990a; Ginsburg & Clift, 1990; Habermas, 1987; Liston & Zeichner, 1991; Poole & Issacs, 1993). As well, governments’ increasing reliance on standardized testing (AACTE, 2004; Ontario College of Teachers, 2006) continually reduces perceptions and valuations of student difference. It also raises systemic questions about how program administrators and instructors might oversimplify the personal, social, and cognitive needs of
diverse student populations (Anyon, 1997; Bascia, 1996; Bascia & Thiessen, 2000; Sleeter, 1992). For example, J. A. Banks (1994) points out that “Teachers must not only understand how the dominant paradigms and canon help keep victimized groups powerless but also must be committed to social change and action if they are to become agents of liberation and empowerment” (p. 160). Until the teacher workforce becomes sensitive to and supportive of the diverse abilities and needs of all school learners, minority schoolchildren are likely to keep on experiencing blanket marginalization and exhibiting disproportionately high levels of failure. These patterns of personal degradation and low achievement also perpetuate community stagnation through the low productivity of an inadequately educated workforce (Chou, 2005; Stead, 2005a, 2005c).

1.2.2 Equity-Based Trends in North American Teacher Education
Many stakeholder groups such as school board personnel, active duty principals, teachers, university faculty, staff, and students are pressuring teacher education programs to increase admissions from marginalized groups (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Noguera, 2008; Oakes & Rogers, 2006). Many teacher education programs are beginning to implement equity initiatives, despite vestigial layers of marginalizing legislation within and beyond their own faculties of education. Initiatives may include innovative and inclusive approaches to program budgeting, program hiring, admission policy, pedagogical practice, and institutional culture. Yet within the literature on teacher education reform, even research about school diversity and student identity (McCarthy & Krichlow, 1993; Slaughter-Defoe, 2005) says little about how social minorities experience the teacher education admission process (Marshall, 2004). Furthermore, it does not describe the experiences of the administrators, faculty, and staff who work within teacher education admission programs. However, it does show that admission policy reform in some programs is beginning to reflect a commitment to teacher diversification (Schmidt, 2006, p. 1). This trend may influence how teachers are recruited, and in that way improve admission opportunities for traditionally marginalized populations.

The recruitment and admission of a diversified group of teacher candidates would also immerse all candidates in a cultural environment that more closely resembles the school cultures where they will intern and teach. As well, a diversified candidate pool could provide
opportunities to model equitable pedagogical skills and broader, more inclusionary curriculum. A substantial body of work suggests that teachers do practice what they learn in teacher education programs (Bell, Adelman, & Bonilla-Silva, 2004a; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Montecinos, 1995), and that students do learn from competent teachers regardless of their physical or ethnocultural differences (Goldhaber & Brewer, 1996).

However, there is new evidence that teacher education research tends to overlook the dynamics of ethnoculturalism within diverse school populations, and to disregard how teacher candidates’ ethnocultural sensitivities influence candidates’ experiences in their qualifying programs (Darling-Hammond, French, & García-López, 2002; Moses, 2004). These sensitivities make it possible for teachers to respond to students’ needs for signs of welcome and cultural continuity, for nuanced and familiar forms of communication, and for a variety of role models and mentoring relationships (French & Maconachie, 2004; Gomez, 1996; Traudt, 2002). Ruiz de Velasco and Fix’s (2002) articulation of students’ need to learn con conciencia (through shared consciousness) alerts us to the subtle and complex ways in which teacher education programs might respond to student needs for a diverse teaching population (Nevin, 2006; Simmons, III, 2006; Stead, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c).

1.3 Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks

To conduct an inquiry at the doctoral level, it is important to present theoretical and conceptual frameworks that illuminate how the researcher understands the research problem. In this study, the theoretical frame describes the researcher’s experiences as an English and French Immersion teacher (all Grades K-OAC), as well as her collaborative roles within university governance and international professional organizations. The conceptual framework refines the project design and provides a foundation for the conceptual model by combining literature on educational equity, teacher education admission, and policy implementation.

---

2 OAC refers to the former Ontario Academic Credit for high school students who completed courses at the Grade 13 level. The OAC was discontinued at the end of the 2000-2001 school year.
1.3.1 Theoretical Framework

Why do educational equity, teacher education, and teacher education admission policy underpin this research? My interest in diversifying the teacher pool evolved over several years, beginning with early teaching experiences in English and French in an Ontario French Immersion program. There I encountered several ways in which female, Aboriginal, LGBT, visible minority, and foreign-born students were being marginalized within public school populations. My desire to stop this equitable practice was not shared by most local system or school administrators, so I became a union activist in hopes of recruiting other equity-minded teacher leaders. There were no takers.

I decided to pursue principal’s qualifications in order to principles of equity in what would hopefully become my new position as an exemplary school leader. Yet no sooner had I begun principal’s training than I realized that the school principals who were leading my courses were modeling the very inequities that I wanted to eliminate. This led to my interest in becoming a principal qualifications’ course instructor, and so I began a Master’s Degree in Educational Administration (1996-1998). Early in my Master’s studies, it became frustratingly clear that problems of inequity were being re/produced at the foundational level of teacher preparation, and so my goal evolved further into developing a career in preservice teacher education. My Grade 12 students at the time strongly encouraged me to become a preservice instructor. This required a doctoral degree that I began through a distance cohort Ed.D. Program in Educational Administration at the University of Toronto’s Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). I later relocated to Toronto to have closer contact with my advisor, to collaborate on the selection of my research committee, and to take advantage of the dazzling array of on-campus faculty, libraries, and computer resources.

An unexpected influence on my research focus was the timely opportunity to collaborate on OISE’s Faculty Council Ad Hoc Committee on Equity Policy Development (OISE, 2005). The principles that were brought forward for consideration closely paralleled my own professional beliefs, and resulted in the Equity Policy that underpinned the ethics review for my study. It states in part that all institutional researchers should acknowledge the implications of their work for social justice and adopt the following professional goals:
(1) Conduct a significant proportion of research to explore the issues of equity in the diverse educational contexts that we study. (2) Give back (knowledge, skills, and resources) to the communities who have participated in our research. (3) Provide institutional support for faculty, staff, and students to help them become better informed about existing resources for conducting and disseminating research which reflects our principles of equity and diversity. (4) Acknowledge the implications and limitations of research for diverse contexts and groups. (OISE, 2005, p. 2)

The research focus for this study also took shape from my experiences as Chair of OISE’s Graduate Education Standing Committee (2006-2008). In this role, I was challenged to learn about complex issues of research scale and scope, researcher complementarity, procedural standards, policy language, protections for researchers and subjects, and questions of finance and resource allocation. In a later role, I collaborated on OISE’s 2006 Research Centre Review Committee, yet the conditions in place for continued funding did not reflect several official policies, including the Equity Policy. This misalignment led to heated debate among faculty and staff who I knew, from personal experience, usually worked well together in calm deliberation. I was shocked, though instructed, by the intensity of the conflict that policy misalignment could engender at such high levels of administration, and became interested in researching effective models of policy implementation. Professional collaboration beyond my home universities has also informed my academic mindset. Since 1996, I have held executive positions within the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and the Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE) that afforded profound opportunities for professional development and reciprocal mentorship. As well, the privileges of being an OISE doctoral student have led me to a theoretical framework grounded in human rights and equity, a position shared by many educational researchers who explore issues such as social justice, democracy, race, gender (sex and sexual orientation), and ethnicity.

education; and by Solomon and Allen (2001) on struggles for equity diversity and social justice in teacher education have all shaped my thinking about equity activism. Table 2 identifies some of the research that explores institutional marginalization and exclusionary cultural norms.

Table 2. Marginalizing Cultural Norms and Sources of Institutional Bias

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginalizing Practices</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>classism</td>
<td>Green, 2009; Lyons, 2004; Orfield, 2004; Orfield &amp; Lee, 2005; Portelli, Shields, &amp; Vibert, 2007; Quartz, Barraza-Lyons, &amp; Thomas, 2005; Skrla, Scheurich, Garcia, &amp; Nolly, 2004; Sleeter, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disabiliphobia</td>
<td>Kozleski &amp; Smith, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnocentrism</td>
<td>Brathwaite, 2003; Lund, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heterophobia</td>
<td>Patai, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heterosexism</td>
<td>Blumenfeld, 2010; Dickson, 1994; Gee, 2005; Luhmann, 1998; McCaskell, 2005; Pinar, 1998; Rodriguez &amp; Pinar, 2007; Rofes, 2005; Sedgwick, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homophobia</td>
<td>Callaghan, 2008; Dickson, 1994; Goldstein, 2005; Hermann-Wilmarth, 2008; Mackinnon, 2005; Rich, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamophobia</td>
<td>Kincheloe, Steinberg, &amp; Stonebanks, 2010; Zine, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theism</td>
<td>Fibiger, 2009; Geertz &amp; Markússon, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xenophobia</td>
<td>Behdad, 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Works on race- and gender-based marginalization in post-secondary education have also shaped my thinking in fundamental ways. These include Bell’s (2002) “outing” of white teacher privilege, Ladson-Billings’ (1998) critical race theory in education, Noguera’s (2008) study of the black boy experience, and Traudt’s (2002) examination of the challenges facing white teachers who teach students of colour. Engagement with Nettles’ ETS symposia (1996-2010) on closing minority group achievement gaps has strengthened my critical thinking and determination as an educational activist. As well, Single and Muller’s (2001) insights into email as a mentoring medium, and Rasheed’s (2004) work on mentoring members of racialized and gendered communities has stretched my perspectives on human dignity and professional responsibility. In other examples of gender-based marginalization, Sadker and Sadker’s (1994) work on how schools cheat girls and Klein’s (1985, 2007) edited handbooks on sex equity, further informed me about society’s oppression of girls and women. I also learned much from Callaghan’s (2008) work on homophobia in Canadian Catholic schools, from Dickson’s (1994) anti-homophobic work on safety in school classrooms, from McCaskell’s (2005) work on institutionalized racism and homophobia in Ontario’s largest school board, and from Sedgwick’s (1991) work on LGBT experiences of closeted lives. Their insights alerted me to the harm that heterosexist policy and curriculum perpetuate in public school systems, and strengthened my commitment to combat this influence through my own teaching, mentoring, research, and administrative work.

Studies of ethnic and cultural diversity have also enhanced my equity sensitivity. Prominent among these are Irvine’s (2003) work about educating teachers to see with a cultural eye, Lund’s (1998) work that names preservice education programs as fertile ground for developing ethnocultural equity, and Portelli, Shields, and Vibert’s (2007) work about how ethnocultural inequity causes poverty, social dislocation, and other forms of marginalization. These authors often position their research within educational institutions in a way that supports inclusive curriculum and inclusive practice across the academy.

With this theoretical perspective, I became chose doctoral research that would explore teacher candidate diversification at the intersection of educational equity, teacher education admission, and teacher education policy implementation. This focus has been deeply enriching and I hope that it will contribute to more equitable access across the academy.
1.3.2 Research Questions

Policy governing teacher diversification may exist at many levels within a university system. It also may be couched in policies that advance equitable admission and human rights protection. This study examines how teacher education admission policy supported candidate diversification through the collection and analysis of original interview data from administrators, admission personnel, and successful minority candidates. The principal research question asks, “How did equity-based admission policy shape candidate diversification in an urban Canadian teacher education program?” The following sub-questions are embedded in the research question and help to refine the focus of inquiry:

1) How did the admission policy context (for example, the Faculty of Education Equity Policy) shape admission policy structure, agency, and procedures?
2) How did institutional structure (for example, the Candidate Handbook) shape equitable candidate diversification?
3) How did institutional agency (for example, admission personnel) shape equitable candidate diversification?
4) How did admission procedures (for example, Candidate Information Form assessment) shape equitable candidate diversification?

1.3.3 Conceptual Model

The conceptual model draws from the theoretical literature on educational equity, teacher education admission, and policy implementation to interrogate how admission policy context, structure, and agency work to shape an admission policy outcome. Educational equity theory addresses issues such as equity’s role in the global education market, discourses of equity within educational policy, and equity’s role in teacher education (Cochran-Smith, 1999; Darling-Hammond, 2010). It also examines teacher diversification from the perspectives of policy jurisdiction, teacher candidate recruitment, and preservice program structure (Crocker & Dibbon, 2008; Jordan, 2010; Ryan et al., 2009).

Teacher education admission theory explores issues such as how admission policy instrumentation, qualifications for program admission, and procedures for candidate evaluation may influence candidate selection (J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks, 1995; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Falkenberg, 2010; Feiman-Nemser, 1990; Kosnik, Brown & Beck,
It describes policy instrumentation in terms of audience, language, and transparency, and classifies program qualifications into academic and non-academic qualifications that take into account candidate identity and experience. Research on candidate evaluation examines bureaucratic performance, strategies for reducing admission personnel bias, and eligibility for assessing non-academic qualifications.

Policy implementation theory illuminates how policy structure and agency in ways that achieve intended and unintended policy outcomes (see McLaughlin, 1986). It situates structure and agency within both the cyclical dimension of policy implementation and the cultural dimension of complex organizational norms (Laswell, 1956, deLeon & deLeon, 2002; Matland, 1995; Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1989; McLaughlin, 1987). In this study, the admission policy context includes external factors, such as the needs of diverse school populations, and internal factors, such as the Faculty of Education Equity Policy. As well, salient policy structures consist of policy documents, program qualifications, and admission procedures; institutional agency is represented by administrators, admission personnel, and minority candidates; and the policy outcome is equitable candidate diversification. Figure 1 illustrates the relationships among admission policy context, institutional structure and agency, organizational culture, and teacher candidate diversification.

![Conceptual model](image)

*Figure 1. Conceptual model.*
1.4 Thesis Summary

This summary provides a synopsis of the following seven chapters. Chapter Two presents a critical review of the theoretical literature on educational equity, teacher education admission, and policy implementation. Research in educational equity addresses equity’s role in the global education market, the educational policy context, and growing ties between teacher education and candidate diversification. It also examines the needs of diverse school populations, the nuances of successful candidate recruitment programs, and ways in which equitable resource allocation contributes to policy development. Teacher education admission theory considers admission policy instrumentation, primary and secondary program qualifications, and procedures for teacher candidate evaluation. It also addresses the sometimes-unofficial question of candidates’ identity-based qualifications as well as the structural limitations to candidate evaluation that may arise within swollen bureaucracies. Policy implementation research focuses on policy development and policy implementation, characteristics of complex organizations, and visible and invisible factors that shape policy outcomes. Together these three research fields provide a broad-based and informative theoretical foundation.

Chapter Three presents the research methodology. It describes the principal actors, the single case study context, and the research proposal, as well as the procedures for departmental and university ethics review. Data collection is consistent with qualitative research practice for site selection, permission for access to institutional documents, construction of representative interview samples that draw from each of three respondent groups, and the conduct of confidential interviews. Data analysis is an iterative process in which demographic, thematic, and editorial coding facilitate the layering of emergent themes as well as the frequent rearrangement of researcher narrative and transcript excerpts. Data elaboration interweaves research findings with lessons from the literature in a way that illuminates new insight into teacher education admission policy implementation. The researcher intends to direct data dissemination toward multiple audiences in teacher education, other professional degree programs, and higher education admission through conference presentations, print and videotaped Internet products, conference proceedings, articles in refereed journals, and practitioner handbooks. Translation will depend on demand and funding availability.
Chapter Four is the first of three data chapters in which administrators, admission personnel, and minority candidates discuss their perceptions of the admission process during private, confidential interviews. Beginning with the admission policy context, they identify the external factors as international competition, the needs of diverse public school populations, and university policies on human rights and admission. Within the Faculty of Education, the internal policy context consists of the newly enacted Equity Policy, program partnerships with field practitioners, and candidate support services. Most influential among these factors is the Equity Policy because of its mandate for equitable teacher candidate diversification and influence on admission policy reform in response to the needs of diverse public school populations.

Chapter Five presents widely divergent perspectives on preservice admission policy that address policy instrumentation, program qualifications, and policy articulation. In the absence of a published admission policy, the Candidate Handbook and Candidate Information Form are the de facto policy documents, though they contain policy gaps that lead to confusion among both candidates and admission personnel. There is general support for the academic qualifications, but institutional resistance to some equity-based, non-academic qualifications such as the preferential admission of special groups of minority candidates. These groups are labeled according to subject specializations and candidate identity, yet they underrepresent the diversity that characterizes contemporary urban school populations. Limitations in the labeling of special group categories prompt allegations of elitism, homophobia, and racism from admission personnel and minority candidates. Impressions of inequity arise from the requirement that candidates disclose minority status, as well as from the absence of information about special group admission precedence and quotas. Other concerns consist of confusing and contradictory instructions for the Candidate Information Form, and finally, the marginalizing impact of last minute policy publication.

Chapter Six focuses on the preservice admission procedures that were targets of reform in response to the Equity Policy mandate for teacher candidate diversification. They consist of candidate recruitment, admission personnel recruitment and training, and the assessment of candidates’ non-academic qualifications. However, some procedures underwent only token restructuring and others are fraught with confusing and conflicting instructions. Candidate
recruitment focuses on visible minorities to the detriment of other marginalized groups, and admission personnel recruitment experiences little change even though it is targeted for a diversifying strategy. Personnel training focuses on Equity Policy implementation but suffers from leadership incapacity and personnel resistance rooted in fears about how equity-based admission will weaken the program’s international reputation for academic excellence. The process for assessing Candidate Information Forms experiences setbacks due to a disproportionately small reader pool, reader friction, and a confusing assessment rubric. All of these factors cause interference with procedures that were intended to increase candidate diversity.

Chapter Seven discusses how the policy context shaped teacher education admission policy reform and illuminates how institutional structure and individual will influence teacher candidate diversification. Within the three groups of institutional agents, the policymakers (administrators), many policy implementers (readers), and even a few policy beneficiaries (minority candidates) exercise individual will in a way that re/produces the primacy of academic excellence as well as institutional elitism, homophobia, and racism. Conflicting policy instructions and confusing policy instrumentation interrupt several stages of the admission process. As well, problematic Equity Policy training for admission personnel contributes to low levels of inter-rater reliability. Ultimately, the interactions between institutional structure and individual will weaken the effectiveness of an admission process that is intended to support equitable candidate diversification.

Chapter Eight summarizes the thesis, describes the project’s research significance and limitations, and presents recommendations for policy and practice. Findings in new areas of research embody issues of equity within teacher education program partnerships and candidate support services, as well as the nuanced use of labels to distinguish visible and invisible forms of candidate identity. Findings in existing areas of research could add to the literature on secondary qualifications for admission, the collection of sensitive personal information about potential candidates, and admission personnel training. Thesis limitations are the responsibility of the researcher and typical of single case studies in which there are no checks for content validity, and data replication is impossible.
Recommendations for research, policy, and practice reflect the complications inherent in equity-based admission policy implementation. They address the context of educational equity policy, equity literacy, and ways of supporting candidate diversification through the equitable collection and assessment of sensitive personal information. There are also insights into the importance of transparent policy articulation and policy implementer training. Suggestions for practice integrate educational equity and teacher education admission policy in support of equitable candidate diversification. Practitioners are advised to attend to transparent and comprehensive policy articulation, as well as respectful and accurate labeling for visible and invisible minorities. Finally, care must be taken to protect the confidentiality of individuals who disclose minority status, and to ensure close alignment between policy training for admission personnel and procedures for candidate assessment.

1.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter described the problem of minority teacher under-representation within North America’s diverse urban school systems, identified many of the learning barriers that flourish within so much teacher sameness, and introduced the researcher’s theoretical framework and conceptual model. Solutions to the problem of teacher homogeneity may lie in equity-based policies within those teacher education programs that support teacher candidate diversification. Examples of these policies include minority candidate recruitment, special support services for minority groups, non-academic qualifications that value marginalized candidate identity and experience, and equitable assessment training for admission personnel.

The researcher’s theoretical framework presented her experiences teaching English and French Immersion (all Ontario Grades K-OAC), chairing a large school-based Social Studies department, and collaborating in senior governance within OISE, CSSE, and AERA. The researcher’s awareness of social injustice combined with her activist proclivities to prompt the research question, “How did equity-based admission policy shape candidate diversification in an urban Canadian teacher education program?” The conceptual model evolved from a review of the theoretical literature in educational equity, teacher education admission, and policy implementation, creating an atypical yet insightful perspective on the admission process. The chapter concluded with a summary of the thesis.
Chapter 2

2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

Three areas of theoretical research inform this study: Educational equity, teacher education admission, and policy implementation. Educational equity literature discusses the global education market, teacher education programs, and teacher diversification. Research in teacher education admission addresses admission policy instrumentation, qualifications for admission, and teacher candidate evaluation. Implementation literature consists of three generations of policy implementation research that examines stages and selected procedures within policy implementation, as well as the characteristics of complex organizations. Together, these theoretical domains create an original and informative foundation for the exploration of teacher candidate diversification through equity-based admission policy.

2.2 Educational Equity Theory

The call for educational equity is a response to conditions of oppression in which dominant group hegemony enforces hardship through the activities of social, political, cultural, and economic organizations (Chomsky, 2003; Foucault, 1977). This hardship may be re/produced within educational institutions in the absence of enforceable equity policies that regulate minoritizing cultural influences. For example, Akom (2008) states that social constructs such as “class, gender, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, immigration status, surname, phenotype, accent, and special needs” become distorted into inequitable cultural characteristics that “interlock creating a system of oppression” (p. 257). Educational equity theory explores ways of unlocking oppressive systems within public education and of stemming rising tides of intercultural conflict in increasingly co-dependent, multicultural societies (J. A. Banks, 2004). This review presents equity research about the global education market, teacher education programs, and teacher candidate diversification.

2.2.1 Equity Policy in the Global Education Market

In today’s global society, three of the top growth areas within educational research are digital education which is based on Internet technology (IT) (Shade, 1995; Voithofer & Foley, 2007;
Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010), sustainability education that advances ways to counter manufactured climate change (Commonwealth of Australia, 2005; Nolet, 2009; Sterling, 2004), and educational equity that challenges marginalizing norms within increasingly multicultural societies (Anyon, 2009; Bell, Thomas, Shoho, & Pizzolato, 2004b; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Klein, 2007; McCaskell, 2005; Noguera, 2008; Sadker, Sadker, & Hicks, 1980; Skrla, McKenzie, & Scheurich, 2009; Solomon & Allen, 2001; Tierney, 1997). For example, the Common Application (2010) lists equity as a goal of its holistic selection process for admission to American colleges and universities.  

This review presents equity theory from the following perspectives: Trends in educational equity research, definitions and measures of equity, threats from educational privatization and marketization, influences of Internet technology (IT), high stakes testing and standardized teaching, characteristics of diverse urban school populations, and equity policy advocacy and enactment.

### 2.2.1.1 Trends in Educational Equity Research

Equity research first gained recognition in the 1970s in school finance policy, financial planning at the local, state, and federal levels (Berke, Goettel, & Andrew, 1972; Berke & Moskowitz, 1976; Berne & Stiefel, 1979; Windham, 1972), and higher education debate over the rising cost of tuition (Johnson & Leslie, 1976; Windham, 1972). By the 1980s, equity research had diversified to include, for example, sex equity in schools and higher education (Bogart, Wells, & Spencer, 1985; Bornstein, 1985; Foxley, 1982; Jones & Dindia, 2004; Klein, 1985; Mertens, 1984; Nicholson, 1987; Sadker et al., 1980), racial equity (Bell & Morsink, 1986; Strike, 1985; Thomas, 1980), competency testing (Smith, 1984), information technology (Shavelson & Salomon, 1985), bilingual education (Biscotti, 1987), adult education (Cameron, 1987), and social action research (Fergus & Wilson, 1988).

By the 1990s, equity theory permeated many areas of educational research such as administrative leadership (Powell, 1991), faculty compensation (Krallman, 1994), teachers’ salaries (Lee & Smith, 1990), teachers’ beliefs (Pohan, 1996), safe schools (Dickson, 1994), school finance (Benson, 1991), program equity in low-income schools (Clune, 1993; Trent, 1993).

---

3 The Common Application is a not-for-profit membership organization that, since its founding over 35 years ago, has been committed to providing reliable services that promote equity, access, and integrity in the college application process. It can be accessed at www.commonapp.org.

In the 21st century, equity theory generates epistemological debate (Lucas & Beresford, 2010; Luke, Green, & Kelly, 2010) and shapes educational discourses of global education (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Wiliam, 2010), multiculturalism and sociocultural diversity (J. A. Banks et al., 2007; Gorski, 2009; Irvine, 2003; Joshee & Winton, 2007; Nieto, 2004; Ryan, 2009; Ryan et al., 2009; Stead 2005d), student access to good schools and post-secondary programs (Allen, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 1995; Harklau, 1998; Mahrouse, 2001; Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010; Williams, 2009), and contexts of public education (Little & Bartlett, 2010).

Equity theory is also increasingly prominent in research that challenges racial marginalization (Akom, 2008; Dei, 2003; Jordan, 2010; Noguera, 2001; Tator & Henry, 2010), sexism (Jones & Dindia, 2004; Sadker & Sadker, 1994; Vaccaro, 2010), classism (Orfield, 2005; Portelli, Shields, & Vibert, 2007; Quartz, Barraza-Lyons, & Thomas, 2005), heterosexism/homophobia (Callahan, 2008; Goldstein, 2005; McCaskell, 2005; Rofes, 2005), and ablism (Kozleski & Smith, 2009; Titchkosky, 2003, 2007; Titchkosky & Michalko, 2009). As well, equity plays a role in establishing standards of accountability (Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2010; Harbour & Jaquette, 2007; Luke et al., 2010; Pignatelli, 2002), in labeling minority group identity (Nettles & Millett, 2005; Xuemeni, 2003), in designing assessment instruments (Jordan, 2010; Kang & Hong, 2008; Skrla et al., 2009; Wiliam, 2010), and in framing questions about Internet accessibility and educational applications (Gorski, 2009; Voithofer & Foley, 2007; Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010).
2.2.1.2 Definitions and Measures of Equity

In the first of several citations from the work of Ladd, Chalk, and Hansen (1999), Clune (2001, para. 5) defines equity as an umbrella term meaning “fairness in the distribution of funds for public education”. He also describes the following financial equity subsets: (1) “Horizontal equity” refers to the allocation of identical monies or other resources for students who are “similarly situated”; (2) “Vertical equity” describes potentially unequal yet sufficient expenditures or allocations for students whose needs vary; (3) “Ex ante equity” denotes fairness in the planned distribution of monies and resources, though there is no mention of supervision or enforcement; (4) “Ex post equity” consists of fairness in spending patterns at the local level, patterns that include monies and other resources, as well as the allocation of resources toward programs such as intensive ESL student coaching, or the subject-based assessment of student performance.

To enable equitable funding, it is necessary to establish standards of equity measurement. Clune (2001) states that equity is a “comparatively new legal paradigm of educational adequacy . . . [that] now serves as the foundation for many current court cases and deliberations” (Introduction, citing Ladd, Chalk, & Hansen, 1999, pp. 1-2) that adjudicate equity assessment. He also describes adequacy as a best measure of equity because of its “focus on educational and social opportunity rather than on dollars and tax resources” (Findings, Ch. 6) which do not indicate whether spending supplements are sufficient to meet student needs. As well, Clune (2001) identifies three ways of measuring adequacy: “Funding necessary to produce minimum outcomes, funding necessary to meet drastic backlogs of capital needs, and funding needed to staff complete academic programs in sparsely settled areas” (“Conclusion”). An example of producing a minimum outcome might be to invest in a training program that would empower all school employees to confront verbally incidents of racial harassment and discrimination. An example of eliminating a backlog of capital needs might be to make all school washrooms and water fountains fully operational, and an example of complete academic staffing might be to hire enough full-time licensed teachers to provide full day Kindergarten within a rural school system.
In other definitions of equity, Skrla, Scheurich, Garcia, and Nolly (2004) define a state of “consciousness” that informs all notions of evidence and adequacy, and that is based on four central beliefs:

1. All children (except only a very small percentage, e.g., those with profound disabilities) are capable of high levels of academic success.
2. All children means all, regardless of a child’s race, social class, gender, sexual orientation, learning differences, culture, language, religion, and so on.
3. The adults in schools are primarily responsible for student learning.
4. Traditional school practices may work for some students but are not working for all children. Therefore, if we are going to eliminate the achievement gap, it requires a change in our practices. (pp. 82-83)

In another example, Gielis (2009) defines equity as an “aspect of social justice which pertains to the recognition and redressing of discrimination” in the face of “unequal power relations and obstacles to the advancement of marginalized groups” (p. 11). As well, Jordan (2010) states that equity “denotes fairness and respect for humanity” and that it “should be co-constructed by all respondents of public education, incorporating a wide variety of voices, particularly with the aid of poor families and families of color” (p. 151). Luke, Green, and Kelly (2010) define equity in terms of “equitable access to traditional print-based skills and knowledge” (pp. ii-xiii).

Together these authors present notions of educational equity that focus on fairness in public spending, a state of consciousness among school leaders that sustains learning for all students, co-constructed educational spaces that normalize respect for all people, and universal student access to successful literacy instruction.

### 2.2.1.3 Threats from Privatization and Marketization

Proponents of educational equity in the early 21st century find themselves in a flat world (Darling-Hammond, 2010) where privatization and marketization are replacing a shrinking public purse as sources of public education revenue. This activity puts constant pressure on public school systems, colleges, and universities to align their missions with for-profit business activity (Harbour & Jacquette, 2007; Pignatelli, 2002). For example, Oromaner’s (2010) review of Woodhouse (2009) describes the troubling cases of three Canadian research universities (Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Toronto) in which “administrators have sold out the university system which values the advancement and dissemination of shared knowledge.
to the corporate-market program which values the maximization of private monetary profits” (para. 1).

Another seemingly intractable threat from marketization is the framing of research that names teacher inadequacy as the sole cause of student failure. Little and Bartlett (2010) state that policy literature approaches teacher capacity from an “individualistic frame of reference” (p. 286) which tends to obscure the equity implications of the institutional structures in which teachers work. Luke et al. (2010) also champion teacher capacity as a cornerstone of equitable education, but recognize the need for “systematic evidence on teachers’ work and career pathways, teacher education, changing workforce demographics, and variable school/community contexts” (p. xiii) to create equitable learning environments. Pignatelli (2002) states that market forces also exert “mounting pressure . . . upon centralized school systems . . . to maintain . . . the appearance of control of the educational agenda and to demonstrate systemic progress” (p. 157), increasingly through improved student performance in standardized tests (see 2.2.1.5).

Yet despite the odds, there has been some progress. Pignatelli (2002) gives examples of systemic and equitable improvements in alternative schooling models, such as charter schools, “small schools of choice built upon a distinct thematic focus, theme, or philosophy of education” (p. 158). In another example, Harbour and Jaquette (2007) cite England’s voucher system that has “reduced inequities across racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic lines” (p. 200). As well, Clune (2001) raises the possibility of reversing the uninformed public perception that “monies will be redistributed from middle class, white, and suburban areas to urban areas predominantly populated by the poor and minorities”. To undervalue the power of public opinion would be to overlook the role of democracy in shaping equitable public education.

2.2.1.4 Internet Technology’s Expanding Influence

Warschauer and Matuchniak (2010) state that “The development and diffusion of information and communication technologies [ICT] are having a profound effect on modern life . . . [as they] bridge the interactive features of speech and the archival characteristics of writing” (p. 179). Their invention bypasses the limitations of time and space enabling group-to-group collaboration, information gathering, and “content production and distribution in
both writing and multimedia on a scale previously unimaginable” (p. 180; see also Jewitt, 2008; Warschauer, 1999). Warschauer and Matuchniak (2010) further explain that “Computer-mediated communication can be considered a new mode of information (Poster, 1990), or a fourth revolution in the means of production of knowledge (Harnad, 1991), following the three prior revolutions of language, writing, and print” (p. 179). Castells (1998) calls ICT “the critical factor in generating and accessing wealth, power, and knowledge in our time” (p. 92), and Warschauer and Matuchniak conclude that “It is widely believed that effective deployment and use of technology in schools can help compensate for unequal access to technologies in the home environment and thus help bridge educational and social gaps” (2010, p. 181). Such powerful possibility suggests the need for wide-ranging and immediate changes in public school infrastructure, resourcing, and hours of operation.

2.2.1.5 High Stakes Testing and Standardized Teaching

This section examines another cultural force that threatens to dismantle much of what represents best practice in public education. Among the first to name the systemic erosion of democracy in education, Portelli and Vibert (2001) warn that “The general tendency of common standards and standardized testing movements is . . . towards the production and reproduction of a mechanistic, technocratic vision of curriculum” (p. 77) and a system of public education that reflects totalitarianism rather than democratic ideals (see also Portelli & Solomon, 2001). Gunzenhauser (2008) states that tolerance of the “normalizing tendencies of high stakes accountability policy” (Conclusion, para. 3) threatens to weaken the development of non-majority students by excluding their life experiences from the common curriculum of high stakes testing. A stultifying corollary to high stakes testing is high stakes teaching in which classroom curriculum and pedagogy focus exclusively on test preparation. Jordan (2010) counts high stakes teaching among the unwelcome “consequences of high stakes testing, which are nonobvious and perhaps unintended, [and] have not helped advance the nation toward equitable schooling” (p. 174). He identifies the persistence of concentrated poverty as one of these troubling outcomes.

Equity policies might achieve greater influence sometime soon were it not for the proliferation of standardized testing as the preferred method of program accreditation, teacher licensing, and advanced teacher certification. Pignatelli (2002) states that
standardized testing homogenizes the groups that it assesses and limits the freedom of educational leaders.

Regrettably, matters of curriculum, school organization and culture, and professional development as collaborative responses to the school community’s collective needs and aspirations are being buried under a blanket of surveillance, shrouded in a haze of frightfully crude and narrowly defined performance indicators. (Pignatelli, p. 171)

Fenstermacher and Richardson (2010) also acknowledge the hardship that high-stakes testing imposes on school administrators who must organize their schools to support high stakes teaching. As well, Pignatelli (2002) points out the dangers inherent in “the proliferation of one-dimensional, technicist-driven efforts which narrowly calculate and assess student learning, teacher work, [and] school effectiveness, and which offer anaemic, foreclosed readings of a possible future” (p. 157). Another drawback to standardized testing is its failure to take into account program culture, that profoundly influential force that embodies “the configuration of persistent and shared meanings, acquired by affiliation to a group, by which members of that group interpret the environment and themselves according to jointly valued representations and behaviours” (Aguado, Ballesteros, & Malik, 2003, p. 52).

Gunzenhauser (2008) describes standardized testing as a damaging process of “burying matters of curriculum, school organization and culture, and professional development as collaborative responses to the school community’s collective needs and aspirations . . . under a blanket of surveillance, shrouded in a haze of frightfully crude and narrowly defined performance indicators” (p. 171). As well, Fenstermacher and Richardson (2010) describe classroom-level harm that arises from “the all-consuming attention to high stakes accountability” that makes it “so very difficult to treat the classroom as a setting where moral virtue, aesthetic sensibility, and democratic character are intentionally nurtured by teachers” (para. 7).

Schools that subjugate themselves to high-stakes testing do so to the detriment of pedagogy, grade-level expectations, and student compliance. Limited are the opportunities to create interculturalism, the only form of school culture “that can guarantee a real equality of opportunities in education . . . [and through these opportunities] “the achievement of goals considered desirable in compulsory education” (Aguado et al., 2003, p. 50). Shrinking learning opportunities trigger an even stronger focus on grade level expectations and standardized performance. Notions of “how children develop, how they respond to certain
types of learning experiences, which learning material is appropriate at certain ages, and what counts as an acceptable range of responses to particular questions” (Pignatelli, 2002) (Gunzenhauser, 2008, “What Do We Mean by”, para. 11) are subject to intense, increasingly standardized scrutiny that devalues population diversity.

Experienced educators agree that high stakes testing tends to perpetuate, if not accentuate, power imbalances within individual classrooms, creating heightened tensions, conflicts, and the need for more frequent disciplinary interventions. Gunzenhauser (2008) states, “High stakes accountability policy generates new institutional practices and social arrangements that in turn enable exercises of power wherein individuals eventually discipline themselves in private spaces” (“What Do We Mean by”, para. 7), a practice that increases the likelihood of inappropriate disciplinary actions. Zero tolerance for certain behaviours on school property, tighter suspension policies, and the localization of discipline within vice-principals’ portfolios (see Armstrong, 2006) all reflect these trends and their inevitably heavier toll on minority populations.

Yet, Wiliam (2010) asks whether student testing would become redundant if a high positive correlation could be established between “what students learned” and “the instructional practices of teachers” (p. 254), placing the assessment burden on teachers instead of students. As well, Jordan (2010) envisions an equitable education system “where opportunities to learn and the ability to reach high standards are uncorrelated to race, ethnicity, and class” (p. 145). Finally, though in defense of standardized testing, Darling-Hammond (2000a, 2010) argues that teachers and teacher educators must meet consistent standards in order to achieve professional social standing and thereby provide equitable education for all students. Although the attainment of professional standing might represent a valuable transformation for many teachers, it would not end the need to identify and resolve equity gaps within teacher preparation.

2.2.1.6 Characteristics of Diverse Urban School Populations

Chief among the global forces that mediate classroom experiences are the “ongoing demographic shifts resulting from immigration, expansion and contraction of cities, internal geographic mobility, and general population growth” (Jordan, 2010, p. 145). As early as 1961, Mead points out how crossing a cultural barrier often undermines communication
between teachers and children, teachers and parents, and among school classmates. Maxine Greene (1984) states that in her vision:

> Daily life practice in classrooms . . . we need . . . spaces for expression, spaces for freedom, yes, and a public space . . . where living persons can come together in speech and action, each one free to articulate a distinctive perspective . . . a space of dialogue, a space where a web of relationships can be woven, and where a common world can be brought into being and continually renewed. (pp. 295-296)

Luke et al. (2010) share her concern for positive learning spaces, stating that “Teachers and learners do not work in universal, neutral, and generalizable cultural and social environments”, but in contextualized spaces subject to “the impacts of the shaping, structuring, and organization of ‘schools’ and ‘classrooms’ on learning and cultural identity” (p. xiv; see also Erickan & Roth, 2008). Jordan (2010) defines the learning process as “complex, dynamic, linked to human development, and embedded within a specific cultural context” (p. 148), illuminating how important it is to consider both learning and identity when creating equitable learning opportunities in multicultural classrooms.

Just as immigration contributes to classroom diversity, international political thinking infuses classroom culture. Fenstermacher & Richardson (2010) show that in the United States, there are persistent legacies from the April 20, 1999 Columbine massacre and the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in New York and Washington, D.C. These legacies are powerful enough to cause ongoing disruptions even within coherent teaching communities “where teacher-student and student-student relationships are fostered in ways that promote mutual regard, reciprocity of interests, and a shared pursuit of goals believed to be for the common good” (para. 4 from end). Yet, as Jordan states, “Equity is not about providing the same education to all students regardless of race, social class, or gender”, but about “providing knowledge, skills, and worldviews which would enable social mobility . . . and harmony” (p. 148).

Aguado, Ballesteros, and Malik (2003) distinguish among the need to comply with systemic curriculum guidelines, the importance of contextualizing regulations at the community level, and the benefit of modifying “the basic curriculum to include characteristics from different cultures” (p. 52). In fact, the absence of familiar and supportive cultural elements at school is a disorienting, even frightening cause of marginalization for minority students as well as an invisible contributor to academic achievement gaps. For example, Orfield and Lee (2005)
state that ethnically segregated schools experience “conditions of concentrated disadvantage, including less experienced or unqualified teachers, fewer demanding precollegiate courses and more remedial courses, and higher teacher turnover” (p. 4). Racism, especially when it is directed at black boys, is one of the most egregious characteristics of diverse urban school culture. Wells and Crain (1997) attribute its prevalence to a society “in which whites had written the rules and constructed the meaning of ‘merit’ on their own terms” (p. 2). As well, they point out the enduring drawbacks of civil rights-based policies in which “blacks were suddenly unshackled and then expected to compete in a contest in which whites had a 200-year head start” (Wells & Crain, 1997, p. 2). To eliminate these injustices, new legislation, education policy, and school practice must work hard to remove the complex root systems that continue to limit academic success among black students.

Noguera (2008) recognizes the complexity of racialization in social discourses and the reproduction of racism in the classroom. He also challenges “educators, parents, policymakers, and activists . . . to find ways not merely to save black boys and others who are at risk but to create conditions so that saving is no longer necessary” (pp. xxvii-xxviii). So how did we get to a place where “saving” schoolchildren from state-sanctioned, indeed state-administered public schools, takes on the urgency of rescuing them from a house fire? St. Denis and Hampton (2002) conclude that racism is rampant throughout public and post-secondary educational institutions. Hesch (2010) attests that everyday racism assumes forms such as:

Verbal and psychological abuse, low expectations of teachers and administrators, marginalization and isolation within the school community, a denial of professional support and attention, the unfair and discriminatory application of rules and procedures, and the denial of Aboriginal experience, human rights, and history. (p. 258)

Tator and Henry (2010) lambaste white hegemony within the academy, championing ways in which “racialized and Indigenous academics and students” are striving to create “a learning environment in which they can individually and collectively articulate their opposition to traditional practices that have either consciously or inadvertently ignored or omitted their knowledge, their voices and their contributions” (p. 369).

Although racism often dominates discourses about cultural marginalization, invisible hegemonic norms also perpetuate hierarchies of privilege within public school systems. Most
pervasive among those norms are ablism and homophobia. Ablism creates widespread marginalization among those with physical and mental disabilities (Kozleski & Smith, 2009; Shapiro & Derrington, 2004; Titchkosky, 2003, 2007; Titchkosky & Michalko, 2009).

Gender-based marginalization manifests as sexism (Connell, 1996; Dickson, 1994; Klein, 2007; Marshall, 2000; Noguera, 2008; Ng, 1993; Sadker & Sadker, 1994; Vaccaro, 2010), heterosexism, and homophobia (Callaghan, 2008; Goldstein, 2005; Mackinnon, 2005; McCaskell, 2005; Rice & Russell, 2004; Sedgwick, 1991; Smith, Wright, Cole, & Esposito, 2008). Gender-based discrimination even goes so far as to prescribe and proscribe female and male behaviours that include hair and clothing styles, enunciation and other forms of verbal expression, education and career choices, hobbies, and opportunities for social mobility.

2.2.1.7 Equity Advocacy and Equity Policy Enactment

As early as 1900, Dewey stated, “What the best and wisest parent wants for his [her] child . . . the community [must] want for all of its children. Any other ideal for our schools . . . destroys our democracy” (1974, p. 6). The United States Supreme Court’s 1954 decision to desegregate America’s schools in Brown v. Board of Education is often taken as a benchmark in the struggle for equitable educational access, though Harbour and Jaquette (2007) state, “Student access no longer suffices as an adequate strategy to achieve greater equity in society” (p. 197). Luke et al. (2010) state that citizens depend on government to provide “grids of specification, classificatory schemes, as well as taxonomies for the definition, categorization, and surveillance of human subjects” (p. xii). They also point to the absence of any equity “policy handbook or checklist” that determines “how to translate court-based evidence into complex narrative scenarios that might enable or discern more equitable, just, and democratic education” (p. xvi). This lack of regulatory standardization restricts rulings about what constitutes valid evidence of equitable practice and about how to apply that evidence to reform historically exclusionary dependence on “the system’s normative goals underlying the use of evidence” (Luke et al., 2010, p. xvi).

McLaren & Kincheloe (2007) state that classificatory schemes lack transparency in their linguistic or discursive power. The constant transformation of language makes it impossible for labels to retain their salience or to detect meaning in the absence of context. Because most classificatory schemes do not locate their terminology in time, space, or culture, they
tend toward systems of regulation that preserve the status quo. Bascia (2001) states that “The improvement of education for immigrant students is not about advocating for a single solution but rather . . . [establishing] a range of opportunities at both policy and practical levels” (p. 264). Luke et al. (2010) declare that it is the responsibility of school systems and state administrations to create policies that eliminate “the differential between general population norms and the performance of identified equity groups . . . such as African Americans, Latinos, migrants, second language speakers, and students from low socioeconomic backgrounds” (p. 9). To create equitable learning conditions, Ryan (2009) recommends diversification of the educator workforce so that students of colour can benefit from the representation, role modeling, relationships, and familiar pedagogy of professionally trained non-white administrators and teachers.

These kinds of interventions are essential to the creation of equitable education systems, especially given the market’s disinterest in equitable educational opportunity and the justice system’s limited role as a means to the development of equitable and effective plans (Clune, 2001). This concludes the review of equity theory and the global education market. Discussion now shifts to equity theory and teacher education.

2.2.2 Equity Policy in Teacher Education

Principles of equity are gaining ground within the contextual forces that shape teacher education. These forces include the language and intentions of state legislation and funding partnerships, as well as the structure of degree programs, research funding programs, and collaborative partnerships among universities, schools, and neighbourhood communities. Equity theory is also making inroads into the visioning and structuring of institutional culture, curriculum design, program pedagogies, teaching resource allocation, policies for hiring/promotion/tenure, and objectives for representational diversity within faculty, staff, and student populations. For example, in a Canadian study of 27 teacher education programs, Crocker and Dibbon (2008) identify commitment to “equity/social justice” as the second most frequent principle within program philosophies and mission statements (p. 26). The literature review continues with research perspectives in the following areas: State level support for equity in teacher education, equity issues within teacher education programs, equitable allocation of learning resources, inclusive curriculum, inclusive pedagogy, and
systemic barriers to equity policy development. Curriculum and pedagogy are included because they play a role in the admission process during equity-based assessment training for admission personnel.

2.2.2.1 State Level Support for Equity in Teacher Education

Questions about the quality of teacher preparation began to attract state-level attention in the mid-1960s. In 1966, the US Department of Health, Education and Welfare commissioned the first Coleman Report to examine the impact of poverty on America’s schools and a “continuing regeneration of inequality in the recruitment and training of future teachers” (Coleman, 1966, p. 335). In the same year, Ontario Minister of Education William Davis commissioned Canada’s first report on the training of elementary school teachers (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1966). The Coleman and Davis studies both reflected concern for greater accountability within state-run education programs, and they laid a foundation for more complex programs of legal oversight that would extend from public school systems to colleges of education.

In 1986, the Holmes Group (Michigan State University) released *Tomorrow’s Teachers*, a trilogy of reports that recommended modernizing teacher qualifications in keeping with social transition from an industrial to a knowledge-based economy (Holmes Group, 1986). As well, in *A Nation Prepared*, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (Carnegie) (1986) pointed out the urgent need to make American educational policy competitive within an increasingly global economy. It also raised questions about the quality of teacher education candidates, the importance of high standards in teacher training, classroom teachers’ ongoing need for professional development, and the functionality of schools as workplaces (Carnegie, 1986). Attention to these trends in American teacher education programs prompted more stringent entry requirements and higher administrative costs for research on improved program delivery, all at a time when funding for teacher education research was being cut back (Lieberman & Kirk, 2004; Marshall, 2004).

During the 1990s, several state-level policy shifts changed the structure of public education and created new challenges for teacher education reform. These shifts included the redefinition of teacher unions (Bascia, 1992, 1994, 1998), the redistribution of local power
from school board trustees to site-based parent councils (Bégan & Caplan, 1994; Stead, 1998a, 1998b), and the introduction of teacher licensing agencies such as the Ontario College of Teachers (2006). Public policy and research funding began to address the critical shortage of certified teachers in urban school districts across Canada and the United States and governments and professional organizations commissioned projects that examined learning conditions for students from all walks of life (Anyon, 1995, 1997; Armstrong, 2006; Bouie, 2007; Brotherton 2009; Cammarota, 2004; Chou, 2005; De Luca, Takano, Hinshaw, & Raisch, 2009; Gold, 2007; Guin, 2004; Kozleski & Smith, 2009; Lewis, 2006; Noguera, 2008; Quartz, 2003; Rury & Mirel, 1997; Tillman & Cochran, 2000; Zhou, 2003). Groundbreaking research was soon to follow.

2.2.2.2 Equity Issues Within Teacher Education Programs


Some of the early research on equity in higher education also focused on teacher education. In several examples, Sadker, Sadker, and Hicks (1980) researched sex equity between boys and girls, Bell and Morsink (1986) examined racism and equity in the context of black teacher preparation, and Dickson (1994) explored the harmful effects of the hidden heterosexist curriculum. Beadie (1996) listed equity among the foundational topics in teacher education and named it as a cornerstone of “the moral, civic, and social dimensions of education as a human enterprise, and of schooling as an institution” (p. 3). The range of issues that found their way into this early research highlights the wide ambit of marginalizing
practice and identifies the large number of minority populations who have yet to experience their constitutional entitlement to a good public education.

Research that is more recent recommends how to reduce achievement gaps across racialized, gendered, and other minority groups within teacher education cohorts, and it provides growing evidence of discriminatory language within admission instrumentation. In her work with graduates from UCLA’s Center X, Quartz (2003) challenged the value of teacher assessment using standardized written tests, recommending instead that it be based on “displayed performance” in actual teaching environments. In another example, Xuemeni (2003) investigated how discriminatory language in higher education raises invisible barriers in ways such as ignoring “the diversity of beliefs in the English Second Language (ESL) context” (p. 39). As well, at the Educational Testing Service (ETS), Nettles & Millett (2005) advocated reducing the discriminatory language and cultural bias that disadvantages minority groups within standardized assessment instruments such as the ACT and SAT 1.

Research about equity and teacher education persists into the new millennium. Darling-Hammond (2006) examined how colleges of education prepared teacher candidates, and debunked popular myths such as, “Good teachers are born and not made . . . [good curriculum must be] teacher proof . . . some students are incapable of learning” (p. v). She provides evidence that within well-structured programs, teacher candidates can learn how to teach in response to “students’ individual intelligences, talents, cultural and linguistic backgrounds . . . [and to demonstrate] in-depth learning . . . powerful thinking and flexible, proficient performances” (Darling-Hammond, 2006, p. vi). Justice-oriented educators such as J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (2003a, 2003b), J. A. Banks (2004), and Oakes (1995) argue that multicultural societies require teacher education programs that focus on:

Recognition and appreciation of the personal, socio-cultural and linguistic diversity of the children . . . offering an equitable, respectful treatment to the girls and boys, and offering a high-quality attention to indigenous children and teenagers, to the children of migrant families, to those who live in rural and marginalized urban areas, and to those who show special educational needs whether or not they are linked to some disability. (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), 2001, Preamble)

Nieto (2000) wrote that “Teacher education programs need to take a stand on social justice and diversity, make social justice ubiquitous in teacher education, and promote teaching as a life-long journey of transformation” (p. 180). Darling-Hammond (2000b) advocates using
professional standards for teacher preparation programs in the belief that high standards are essential in “protecting especially the least advantaged clientele from incompetent practitioners” (“The Argument for Professional Teaching”, para. 2). In other examples, Bascia (2001) called for greater attention to the ESL needs of immigrant students (pp. 273-274), Solomon and Allen (2001) launched a far-reaching campaign in “the struggle for equity, diversity, and social justice in teacher education” (p. 217), and Dei (2002, 2003) invoked more equitable policy in his work against racism in education. As well, McCaskell (2005) called for changes to the structure of urban teacher preparation that include: Revising provincial policies on foreign teacher accreditation, developing curriculum materials that address sexual orientation and homophobia, establishing “teacher training courses in African heritage” (p. 167), and “training principals to screen for racial bias in employment interviews” (p. 20).

Notwithstanding standardized testing and marginalizing cultural mediation, there is a small but growing set of exemplary teacher education programs that provide strong preparation for teachers and where equity discourses continue to make inroads (Darling-Hammond, 2006). In particular, they practice inclusive curriculum and pedagogy as well as equitable resource allocation. For example, in 1999 the Stanford Teacher Education Program (STEP) launched a four-year vision focused on the learning needs of all students, the nuanced differences among pedagogical approaches, and a commitment to equitable practice. In another example, the Washington State Professional Educator Standards Board (2007) began requiring new teachers to be “responsible citizens for an environmentally sustainable, globally interconnected, and diverse society . . . in the context of social, political, environmental, and economic systems” (para. 1). Finally, and in a Canadian study of 27 teacher education programs, Crocker and Dibbon (2008) identified “equity, social justice, and diversity” as the second most frequent theme in teacher education mission statements.

2.2.2.3 Equitable Resource Allocation

During the early search for a teacher education model that would replace one-on-one classroom apprenticeship, Mead (1978) sought alternatives that would “conserve the insights of the past . . . [and empower future teachers] with a sense of discovery and personal creativity” (p. 705). These are fundamental characteristics of equitable teacher education
programs. More recently, Aguado (1996) advocated the careful allocation of “multicultural” (structural) and “intercultural” (climate-based) program components. McDonald (2007) stated that social justice teacher education programs are “critically important in a time of high stakes accountability when the pressure to resort to a technical view of teaching and teacher education underlies much of the day-to-day work of teacher educators” (p. 2077).

As well, and in anticipation of exponential increases in the cost of teacher education, Caskey, Peterson, and Temple (2001) cautioned admission policymakers against admitting more students than they could provide with sufficient mentoring relationships, advocacy, and “human interaction necessary to support growth of a competent professional” (p. 16).

Rodriguez, Chambers, Gonzalez, and Scheurich (2010) stated that equitable teacher preparation programs must begin with a social justice mission and build in program flexibility that could “differentiate content based on student strengths and previous experiences . . . to heighten the effects of a socially-just curriculum” (p. 149), and enable teacher candidates to apply their program learning later as classroom teachers. With such a mission focus, they also list program faculty as the most important critical element in social justice teacher education. Faculty are responsible for ongoing program implementation, as well as for building faculty consensus around equity issues, guiding appropriate professional development, sustaining a social justice program orientation, and being “vigilant about program improvements” (p. 150).

In other work that focuses on program infrastructure (Lenski, Crawford, Crumpler, & Stallworth, 2005; Gibson, 2004), researchers stress the need for equity infusion across multiple platforms. These include the design of cohort-based instruction, team teaching, Internet learning, field placements, summer residencies, and non-traditional field placements. By extending candidates’ study spaces to include “ethnographic work in diverse settings . . . [faculty are in a better position to] encourage preservice teachers to examine their own views about diversity education” (Lenski et al., 2005, p. 7). This approach to the learning environment also makes it more likely that faculty will identify their own personal biases and create the conditions necessary for transformational learning (Carroll, H. Featherstone, J. Featherstone, Feiman-Nemser, & Roosevelt, 2007; DePalma, 2008; Gadsen, Davis, & Artiles, 2009).
Field placements are most effective when they enable teacher candidates to interact with students outside of traditional instructional settings in “expanded venues that provide opportunities for collaboration and critical reflection in action over time” (Jennings & Smith, 2002, p. 456). For example, Solomon and Allen (2001) advocate placing teacher candidates into mixed-race dyads during field placements because, “Such collaboration would enrich the pedagogical process with different perspectives, traditions, resources, and experiences from which teacher candidates, associate teachers, and students would benefit” (p. 1).

Another advantage of those field placements that immerse teacher candidates in student communities is that they provide the candidates with opportunities to interact informally with “individuals and groups they may not have encountered during their own education” (Lund, 1998, “Shaping Innovative Practicum Experiences”, para. 1). Informal interaction in culturally unfamiliar settings may also provide candidates with some of the fundamental skills that they need to develop “intercultural competence” (Zeichner, 2003, “The Deregulation Agenda”, para. 7). These skills also rank highly among UNESCO’s 2008 goals and appear as the call to develop “inclusive education systems which explicitly identify, target, and respond flexibly to the needs and circumstances of the poorest and the most marginalized” (para. 1).

2.2.2.4 Inclusive Curriculum

Curriculum in the 21st century is heavily regulated and increasingly variable across dimensions such as time, space, content, culture, language, and student audience. Rebell (2009) points out that America’s state level courts often malfunction by failing to deliver remedies that uphold “the constitutional right to a sound basic education” (p. 55). Among his recommendations are remedial steps that “require the state to adopt “challenging academic content . . . determine the actual cost of providing all the students the opportunity for a sound basic education . . . [and guarantee that] adequate resources are provided to students in all schools” (Rebell, 2010, p. 55). In another example, in a recent ruling the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal gave the following order to the Toronto District School Board:

Within six months from the date of this Decision, the respondent board, through its Executive Officer of Student and Community Equity, shall develop materials drawn from the facts of this proceeding to illuminate the concepts of “othering”, “demonization”, and the more subtle forms of racial discrimination, and integrate such materials into education and training measures already being undertaken. Copies of
these materials and information about how they are being integrated into education and training measures are to be provided to the Commission and the complainant and filed with the Tribunal. (Hart, 2010, Section 31)

The impact of such legal decisions is far-reaching and tends to work as an incentive within and across similar jurisdictions for developments in kind.

Internet technology is an increasingly pervasive force within curriculum design and delivery. It often replaces face-to-face teaching in traditional labs and seminar rooms, making it possible for faculty and teacher candidates to work asynchronously, at their own convenience, and wherever Internet service is available. Many researchers advocate this as a way of infusing equity into curriculum design (Acker & Oatley, 1993; Gorski, 2009; Shavelson & Salomon, 1985; Voithofer & Foley, 2007; Volman & van Eck, 2001; Warschauer, Knobel, & Stone, 2004; Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010).

Curriculum is increasingly recognized as an essential part of equitable teacher education. For example, Aguado (1996) states that intercultural curriculum reflects program equity because it is “based on respect for and recognition of cultural diversity, aimed at every member of the society . . . [and] encompassing all dimensions of the educational process in order to achieve a real equality of opportunities/results, to promote intercultural communication and competency” (p. 54, cited in Aguado et al., 2003, pp. 52-53). Rodriguez et al. (2010) call for the inclusion of social justice “in all aspects of the curriculum, horizontally across all courses and vertically from undergraduate through graduate programs” (p. 147). So what does “all aspects of the curriculum” really mean? Darling-Hammond (2000b) defines curriculum as follows:

Subject matter knowledge as foundations; abilities to plan, organize, and implement complex tasks as additional factors; knowledge of teaching, learning, and children as critical for translating ideas into useful learning experiences, and experience as a basis for aggregating and applying knowledge in nonroutine situations. (“The Definition of Teacher Expertise”, para. 4)

Similarly, Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) separated essential curriculum content into three areas: Formal knowledge and theory which qualify a teacher candidate to instruct particular subjects at particular grade levels, practical knowledge which reflects teachers’ pedagogical skills, and contextual knowledge which highly competent teachers gather about individual student identities and life experiences in connection with “larger social, cultural, and political
issues” (p. 250). A fundamental but often elusive part of equitable curriculum involves debunking foolish assumptions that may attach to various groups of minority candidates. For example, “One cannot necessarily equate being a person of color with being an effective teacher, even of students of a similar background” (Zeichner, 2003, “The Social Justice Agenda”, para. 3 from end). Once the assumption is challenged, it becomes apparent that teacher education programs must differentiate among the learning needs of diverse candidate groups. These notions of curriculum content emphasize equity by locating individual student identities and experiences within courses of study that represent their sociopolitical and cultural communities.

Falkenberg (2010) states that beginning teachers need to have “the resilience, competencies, and skills to build professional learning communities and to actively shape the culture and practices in a school” (pp. 10-11). As well, Rodriguez et al. (2010) recommend that programs hold mandatory multicultural classes that empower candidates to deflate marginalizing cultural norms and lead inclusive discussion about “religion/spirituality, ability/disability, gender, sexual orientation, social class, and race and ethnicity [including white privilege] (p.147). Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) also advocate requiring students to write daily reflections about the changes that occur in their own assumptions, their professional understanding, and their conversations with classmates and members of the external community. Furthermore, the collaboration of instructors and candidates in the construction of some portion of the curriculum (Rodriguez, Chambers, Gonzalez, & Scherich, 2010, p. 149) has gained prominence as a way of increasing intercultural awareness (Haberman, 1991).

In classes with diverse cohorts, co-construction enables candidates to infuse their own life experiences and interests into their professional learning and to expand all students’ cultural capital. As well, curriculum co-construction has the added advantage of “establishing a cohesive classroom community . . . where students’ backgrounds and lives are harnessed as assets” (Johnson, 2007, p. 308). These assets are also valuable during shared decision-making with faculty, empowering students to carry forward “the power and vitality of the communities and organizations to which they belong into the arena of school decision making” (Beadie, 1996, p. 87). Perhaps the most striking lessons that emerge from inclusive
curriculum theory are the futility of teaching with highly standardized curricula and the awareness that most state and provincial legislation require precisely that.

2.2.2.5 Inclusive Pedagogy

Like curriculum, pedagogy has become subject to state scrutiny and regulation. For example, the Ontario College of Teachers (2006) lists pedagogy as a key component of professional knowledge, and the use of “appropriate pedagogy” as a fundamental aspect of professional practice. In one example, Santamaria (2009) says that the blending of differentiated instruction (DI) with culturally responsive teaching (CRT) is the most effective form of pedagogy to use in multicultural classrooms.

When pedagogy is grounded in principles of equity, it exemplifies inclusive language, leadership, and learning resources that show respect for multiple heritages, faiths, cultural histories, and ethnic ambitions (Artiles, Kozleski, Dorn, & Christensen, 2006; Dei, 2002; UNESCO, 2000). It also recognizes “those with varying levels of English language development (ELD) . . . [as well as] “academic, cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity . . . in particular classrooms in particular locales” (Santamaria, 2009, p. 242, 244). Equitable pedagogy infiltrates “robust learning communities . . . [that] mediate learning or assist learning in a variety of ways . . . [and] employ heterogeneity and hybridity as organizing principles of instruction, including hybrid language practices” (Gutiérrez, Asato, Santos, & Gotanda, 2002, p. 338). Equitable pedagogy also contrasts favourably with “backlash pedagogy” that embraces “reductive notions of learning and literacy . . . [and] prohibits the use of students’ complete linguistic, sociocultural, and academic repertoire in the service of learning” (Guitérrez, Asato, Santos, & Gotanda, 2002, p. 338).

Ball (2000) advocates equitable pedagogy in response to the covert messages that often accompany support for the status quo, messages that encourage minority students, as victims, “to develop higher levels of consciousness and the skills needed to take control of and perhaps even transform their existing life experiences” (para. 1). Features of Ball’s pedagogy include instruction in several communicative styles such as “standard academic English, AAVE [African American Vernacular English], and technical language, as mediums for transmitting information in ways that would be accessible to the students” (“Playing Multiple Roles”, para. 3). As well, Ball recommends using “descriptive language to convey new
information, praise, and encouragement, and transactional language intended to invoke topics known to the students and to build upon shared knowledge and shared experiences” (“Playing Multiple Roles”, para. 3).

In an endorsement of Freire’s (1998) Pedagogy of Freedom, McLaren (2008) advocates a critical pedagogy that supports student empowerment through “participatory democracy” (p. 479) in the struggle for universal human rights and worldwide economic justice. Similarly, Bell’s (2002) vision of participation articulates instruction that prepares all candidates “to understand, analyze, and challenge . . . in the larger society . . . [how] school practices and procedures . . . differentially impact poor children, children of color, and children from diverse linguistic and cultural groups” (p. 236). Bell also stresses the importance of equitable pedagogy’s potential benefits for LGBT students, and contrasts them with the devastating effects of heterosexist pedagogy on queer children and youth (Dei & Simmons, 2010; Luhmann, 1998; Pinar, 1998; Rodriguez & Pinar, 2007).

The ideal of equitable pedagogy is well understood even though strategies for its implementation are somewhat limited. For example, even though faculty may be equity-minded, well intentioned, and even have K-12 teaching experience, these characteristics do not substitute for the kinds of learning that one gains by working in high-poverty schools (Zeichner, 2003) and contribute to the re/production of unresponsive pedagogy that often prevents teacher candidates from acquiring “cultural competence” (Cushner & McMahon, 2009, p. 304). Finally, Brooks (2010) offers three rules that could usefully inform the construction of equitable instructional policy:

(1) Don’t promulgate a policy that will destroy social bonds. (2) Try to establish basic security. If the government can establish a basic level of economic and physical security, people may create a culture of achievement. (3) Try to use policy to strengthen relationships. (p. A31)

Brooks’ rules also implicate some of the systemic barriers that impede equity policy development.

2.2.2.6 Systemic Barriers to Equity Policy Development

Although the relationship between equity and teacher education programs continues to grow, there are persistent barriers to equity policy development. For example, Rodriguez et al. (2010) caution that “Sometimes the merging of programs leaves remnants of the old program
that do not coincide with new program objectives . . . [such as] coursework focused only on race and culture, thus, leaving out gender, disability, and sexual orientation (p. 144).

McKenzie and Scheurich (2004) attribute equity policy’s slow progress to “equity traps . . . conscious and unconscious thinking patterns and behaviours . . . [namely,] the deficit view, racial erasure, employment, and avoidance of the gaze and paralogic beliefs and behaviours” (p. 601).

Equity policy may also be uniquely vulnerable to systemic implementation barriers that create a gulf between policy-maker intentions and policy outcomes. Johnson and Joshee (2007) state that policy creation often occurs “in the context of a web of interrelated, ongoing policies . . . [that are] generally embedded in states and organizations with histories of racism and exclusion” (p. 6). These histories may themselves be purveyors of structural barriers, social taboos, and economic disincentives to change. In another example, Juker (2002) attributes the gulf between intentions and outcomes to structural barriers such as work schedules and transportation infrastructure that make commuting by public transit an impossible goal.

Like all educational reform, equity policy infusion is subject to limits of scalability and requires fully scaffolded political support in order to create “centrally mandated reform that expects to make a difference” for all public school populations (Luke et al., 2010, p. xv). Such sweeping policy may include characteristics that, although overlooked by standardized testing, stand out as essential features of equitable teacher education programs. Ultimately, the realization of equitable teacher education policy will depend primarily on a critical mass of equitable administrators, faculty and program instructors who have experience in diverse instructional settings and commitment to equity-based curriculum and pedagogy. To achieve fully equitable teacher education policy, it may even become necessary to limit program space to pro-equity teacher candidates (see McKenzie, Christman, Hernandez, Fierro, Capper, Dantley, et al., 2008).

Complicating the process of equitable teacher preparation, jurisdictional conflicts have become increasingly prevalent among federal, state, and provincial arbiters such as colleges of education, school boards, teacher unions, and school-based parent groups (Fullan, Connelly, & Watson, 1990; Leithwood et al., 2004; Stead, 1998a, 1998b, 2005b). For equity
to thrive it must rank high among teacher education reform agendas that include “program approval and accreditation, requirements for initial licensure, the induction of new teachers, [and] the structure of teaching careers” (Zeichner, 2003, “The Social Justice Agency”, para. 11).

Teacher education programs across North America also continue to fight for funding within a hierarchy of public services that places military preparedness at the top, relegates public schooling close to the bottom, and has yet to embrace universal day care. These programs are besieged by reform legislation and softer internal policy guidelines that focus on making all students perform well on standardized tests. Of ongoing concern are the often polarizing tensions arising from rigid and stringent funding for special interest student groups (Bell et al., 2004b), the rising costs of teacher training programs (Cammarota, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Feagin, 2002), and the problem of a predominantly middle class teaching force that is not sensitized to the learning characteristics of increasingly diverse student populations (AACTE, 2004; Grant, 1993; Irvine, 2003; Jackson, 2003). This concludes the review of equity in teacher education and backgrounds research on equity and teacher candidate diversification.

2.2.3 Equity Policy and Teacher Candidate Diversification

The application of equitable principles to teacher diversification did not gain momentum until the 21st century, but early initiatives within activist-driven professional organizations have now evolved into multi-level jurisdictional support and teacher education policy for diverse candidate recruitment. The collaborative efforts of many North American education organizations have ultimately begun to replace white, middle-class teacher hegemony with opportunities for teacher candidate diversification.

2.2.3.1 Early Initiatives in Teacher Diversification

In the early 2000s, regulatory turf wars among public and private funding agencies prevented many would-be activists from conducting research that would challenge the status quo in areas such as the needs of children from impoverished neighbourhoods (Ladson-Billings, 1999), growing diversity within school aged populations (Cochran-Smith, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c; Lee, 2004), and the deepening demographic contrast between teachers and students (Lieberman, 2004; UNESCO, 2000). However, equity activists were persistent, and by 2004
the National Collaborative on Diversity in the Teaching Force (NCDTF) emerged as an alliance comprised of the following education policy groups: AACTE, the American Council on Education (ACE), the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE), the Community Teachers Institute, the National Education Association (NEA), and the Initiative for Recruiting New Teachers. NCDTF endorsed an ambitious platform of diversifying the pool of highly qualified teachers, of eliminating obstacles faced by minority teachers in passing college of education entry tests, and of developing programs that supported teachers of color and other minorities, both during their preparation years and later in the classroom (AACTE, 2004).

Support for teacher diversification had finally reached a tipping point that unleashed research funding across North America. For example, in Canada, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) (2004) funded a project aimed at expanding cultural, ethnic, racial, and religious diversity within Canada’s post-secondary research institutions. As well, America’s Spencer Foundation financed projects to “enhance educational opportunities for all people” (Spencer Foundation, 2010, para. 3) and to redress the inequities of “law and government, markets and property rights, practices and patterns of racial and gender inequality, and . . . deep inequalities in family circumstances and social environments” (para. 4). In another example, the Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE) also recommitted to research “reflective of the sociocultural diversity of Canada” within all of its internal organizations and external partnerships (2005, “Mission”). Furthermore, the American Educational Research Association (AERA) launched a doctoral fellowship program for minority students that directly targeted African Americans, American Indians, Alaskan Eskimo and Aleut, Native Pacific Islanders, Filipino Americans, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans (2005, p. 40).

These funding initiatives were timely and marked the beginning of a groundswell in the campaign against barriers to minority teacher representation. For example, Ryan et al. (2009) stated that the current teacher-student imbalance may be the result of two structural barriers, “inequitable school practices that limit the number of students willing and able to enter the teaching force . . . [and] discriminatory licensing and hiring practices that exclude those who have already completed their teacher education programs” (p. 609). In another example, Vaccaro (2010) attributes the teacher imbalance to cultural barriers such as “institutional sexism, racism, male hostility toward equity initiatives, and liberal bias” (p. 202). Together,
these authors make the case for targeting minority group members who would like to pursue a career in teaching and for giving them the early support needed to guarantee access to teacher preparation programs.

2.2.3.2 Institutional Support for Teacher Diversification

In many of the developed nation-states that make up the post-colonial western world, most levels of government have a legislative stake in the regulation of public education (Anyon, 1997; Sleeter & McLaren, 1995). These stakes are usually matched by jurisdictional controls at the state or provincial level, within teacher organizations, and within teacher education programs. State-level support jumped to the public’s attention in 2004 when the NEA proposed revisions to The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) (Department of Education, United States of America 2001) that named diversity as a critical element in:

1. Developing a ‘highly-qualified’ teacher workforce, (2) identifying and eliminating obstacles that minority teachers encounter on entry tests, and (3) creating programs that support teachers of colour, both in teacher education programs and in school classrooms. In support of equitable school staffing, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2004) reported that “some state legislatures have developed . . . programs to recruit minority teachers. (“Mission”, paras. 1-4)

Yet despite ongoing revisions, NCLB continues to receive widespread criticism for failing to establish an equitable restructuring of educational resources.

Teacher support for teacher diversification now appears in the literature and examines equitable possibilities for candidate recruitment, access, preparation, curriculum, pedagogies, teaching materials, and internship (AACTE, 2004; American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2004; Feiman-Nemser, 1990b; Fullan et al., 1990; Fullan, Galluzzo, Morris, & Watson, 1998; Holmes Group, 1990, 1995; Kosnik et al., 2003; Wenglinsky, 2004). Others describe teacher diversity as a valuable resource (Coleman, 1966; Gomez, 1996; Shaw, 1997), and teacher hybridity as the DNA for new and better pedagogy (Gutiérrez & Baquedano-López, 1999; Pritchard, Annamma, Boele, & Klingner, 2010).

Support for teacher diversification within teacher education programs has emerged within several North American teacher preparation programs that articulate a clear commitment to meeting the needs of diverse school populations in their admission policies, curriculum, and procedures for candidate selection (Beckum, 1992; Darling-Hammond, 1995). In particular,
teacher diversification is understood to be at the heart of meeting the needs of students who identify as poor, non-white, female, and queer (J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks, 1995; Brosio, 1998; Dickson, 1994; Kezar, 1999; Klein, 1985; Klein, 2007; Marshall, 2004; McMurtry, 1991; Ovando, 2004; Pinar, 1998; Sadker & Sadker, 1994). As well, Lenski, Crawford, Crumpler, and Stallworth (2005) describe an ideal candidate pool as “a classroom of different genders, race, religions, cultures, and all kinds of different people” (p. 5). In New York City, Bank Street College encourages applications from those who “demonstrate sensitivity to others, flexibility, self-awareness . . . a willingness and capacity to engage in self-reflection . . . view their work against the backdrop of world events and conditions” (Feiman-Nemser, 1990a, pp. 3-6), and who take seriously their professional responsibility to be community leaders. The commitment to diversity at Teachers College, Columbia University, is evident in its diverse pool of teacher candidates where “13 percent . . . are international students, 12 percent are African-American, 11 percent are Asian American, and 7 percent are Latino/a” (Teachers College, Columbia University, 2005, “Diversity & Community”, para. 1).

In other American examples, the Faculty of Education at Carnegie Mellon University (CMU) told prospective candidates in its Statement of Assurance that it would not “discriminate in admission . . . on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex or handicap [or] on the basis of religion, creed, ancestry, belief, age, veteran status, or sexual orientation” (2005a, “Vision & Mission”, para. 3). As well, the CMU Relations Commission took a public stand against the US Department of Defense for its practice of excluding openly gay, lesbian, and bisexual college students from receiving Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) scholarships through its policy of, “Don’t ask, don’t tell, don’t pursue” (CMU, 2005b, “News”, para. 5). Other exemplary colleges of education in the United States include the University of California, Los Angeles’ Center X, the Teacher Education Program at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the College of Education at Iowa State University. For more examples of American teacher preparation programs that are building equity into their educational policies, see Darling-Hammond (2006, Appendix C, p. 363).

In examples from Canada, the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia listed a commitment to increasing student diversity among its development goals (2005, p. 2), and the Faculty of Education at York University (2004) mission statement included the promotion of “pedagogical practices, curriculum materials and school structures that address
issues relating to race, gender, ethnicity, social class, sexual orientation and disability” (“Mission Statement”, para. 1). OISE’s Student Guide stated that “OISE is strongly committed to social justice in everything it does” (2006a, p. 4). Yet, to support teacher candidate diversification, there must be opportunities for all candidates to gain program admission, but also to access all of the professional benefits that teacher education programs have to offer. These benefits include “access to quality teaching, acquisition of knowledge and belonging to a social community” (Arnesen, Allan, & Simonsen, 2009, p. 44).

To achieve successful candidate diversification, program administrators must resist the practical appeal of simply adding stand-alone equity courses for students, or stand-alone equity training for faculty and staff. A better solution is to identify existing and inherently inequitable program structures, and then to engage in a gradual process of transformation that results in diversity-sensitive program culture. Taken to scale, diversity-sensitivity creates “engaged pluralism . . . an active attitude towards valuing diversity . . . [and] a special concern for the disadvantaged or marginalized and those who are most at risk of failure, exclusion and powerlessness in education and society” (Arnesen et al., 2009, p. 46).

Admission policies that make teacher education accessible to minority candidates are an urgent priority if we are to meet the needs of diverse urban school populations. Park and Egan (2011) state that applicants who seek early admission tend to be white, affluent, and to have benefitted from contact with college recruiters. Perhaps early admission practices could offer clues about how to support the admission of minority candidates. Johnson (2007) links teacher education program access to social organization such as “the interplay among individuals’ racial, class, cultural, gender, and language backgrounds” (p. 304). She also advocates, “Commitment toward reconstructing society so that opportunities and resources are distributed more equitably” (p. 304), and public education’s fight for social justice would have widespread support.

2.2.3.3 Diverse Candidate Recruitment
Among those who support teacher candidate diversification, several advocate minority candidate recruitment. For example, Beadie (1996) states that diversifying the pool of incoming candidate assets may strengthen all candidates’ effectiveness as cultural ambassadors during their teacher education program and as positive role models inside their
own classrooms. Falkenberg’s (2010) recruitment plan calls for pre-selecting interested candidates from diverse and traditionally marginalized groups, and then for giving them whatever support they need to meet academic admission criteria. Candidate selection and support could begin during their undergraduate studies, or even as early as high school. In another example, Rodriguez et al. (2010) suggest recruiting individuals who have already “demonstrated social justice in their current practice . . . [and] who would not only benefit from participation in the program, but . . . make significant contributions to faculty and other students” (p. 148). The emphasis here is that these candidates, by virtue of their inclusion in the program, would greatly enhance overall program quality for all candidates.

However, this recruitment strategy comes with the caveat that while remaining open to everyone, admission priority should be given to candidates who represent, “those whom schools have not been very successful with, i.e., students of color, LGBT students, students with disabilities, students whose home language and cultures is [sic] different than that of the mainstream, students who came from low SES homes” (Rodriguez et al., 2010, p. 151).

Although there is merit in Rodriguez et al.’s targeted approach that extends to anyone inside or outside of school/college/university communities, Falkenberg’s position may be more equitable because it reaches out to candidates who may not have had the privilege of distinguishing themselves as social leaders.

Although equitable recruitment policies hold promise, they face multiple contextual barriers. For example, the literature on higher education programs describes resistance to policies that are seen as “challenging the norms . . . even in ‘diversity friendly’ environments” (Sleeter, 2009, p. xiii). Hidden resistance to equity initiatives comes packaged in stock stories (Bell, 2007) that justify and reproduce the status quo. Nevertheless, these stories can be challenged through the telling of “oppositional stories or counterstories . . . [that illuminate exclusionary practices, reveal how daily routine is invoked to] enforce boundaries . . . [and expose] benefits that accrue to dominant groups when the rules are taken as normal” (Sleeter, 2009, p. xii; see also Bell, 1987). Popkewitz (2006) stated that resistance to change is reinforced by the power of social rules to define what is normal. These rules preserve the status quo through embodied fears that may date back to early 20th century teacher traditions “in which values and beliefs were tied to ethnicity and radical socialist ideas brought from Europe” (p. 127). These fears find expression in public attitudes and organizational infrastructure, often
manifesting in cultural norms such as racism, classism, sexism, heterosexism, and ablism. These norms pose an invisible and at times invincible threat to the recruitment of minority teacher education candidates.

This concludes the presentation of equity research in the global education market, in teacher education programs, and in teacher candidate diversification. It also introduces many of the issues that underpin teacher education admission theory.

2.3 Teacher Education Admission Theory
Research on teacher education admission theory has been scant compared to research in other fields of teacher education. It began with Linton’s (1927) study about “educational principles as a basis for policies governing the admission of students to professional work in education” (p. 165). Contemporary teacher education researchers typically focus on candidate recruitment, preparation, and retention, but do not specifically investigate admission policy (Darling-Hammond, 2006, 2007, 2010; Newton, Jang, Nunes, & Stone, 2010). For example, teacher education meta-reviews by Cochran-Smith, Feiman-Nemser, and McIntyre (2008), Cochran-Smith and Zeichner (2005), and Sykes, Schneider, and Plank (2009) only touch peripherally on admission policy. However, there is some literature in three areas of admission policy that have a direct influence on teacher candidate diversification: Admission policy instrumentation, qualifications for program admission, and candidate evaluation.

2.3.1 Admission Policy Instrumentation
Admission policy instruments transmit policy regulations and procedures to a range of institutional audiences that includes senior administration, program recruiters, admission personnel, financial officers, and potential candidates. To support the policy that they describe, these instruments must be accessible, consistent, clearly articulated, and sufficiently detailed to satisfy every audience. The literature frames these issues under the headings of admission policy guidelines and admission policy instruments for candidate evaluation.

Teacher education programs vary in their admission policy guidelines, but most employ a combination of print and web-based documents, backed up by admission personnel who are available in person, by phone, by e/mail, or through an anonymous website email contact. Admission policy guidelines instruct candidates how to complete their admission forms and
sometimes the instructions, or an abridged form of them, are printed on the admission forms themselves. But when instructions appear in more than one place they are often inconsistent, and as Caskey et al. (2001) point out, it is important to provide all audiences with information that describes the admission process in steps that are “coherent, revealing, and thoughtful staged explanations” (p. 19). Admission policy guidelines also differ in the degree of information that they provide. Cochran-Smith and Fries (2005) state, “We assumed that teacher education preparation programs and arrangements characterized by the same labels might or might not contain the same components” (p. 50), but this was not the case. For example, administrators may develop abridged policy guidelines to prevent junior administrators or ad hoc admission personnel from accessing potentially controversial policy issues.

Wikipedia (2010) describes academic transcripts as “a copy of a student’s permanent academic record which usually means all courses taken, all grades received, all honors received and degrees conferred to a student” (“Transcript (education), United States”, para. 1). Additional transcript information may convey class size, statistics on class and course average GPAs, or regulations about official procedure. Student demographics also appear on academic transcripts but to date there is no research on what form this information takes. Regulations governing the use of academic transcripts are almost exclusively site-specific, consisting of instructions for their purchase and secure transfer, as well as consequences for academic dishonesty.

Personal information forms, also called candidate profiles or candidate information forms, vary widely, but they usually contain questions about candidates’ contact information, personal demographics, teaching specializations, subject area concentrations, language fluencies, nationalities, motivation for becoming a teacher, and teaching-related experiences. Some of these questions are in survey format with checkboxes for answers, while others are in open-ended essay format. Essay topics vary from site to site and may assess “motivation related to student needs as opposed to self-interests, congruence with the program and mission of the institution as a major urban university, vision of need or quality in schools, and ability to express oneself in a compelling way” (Caskey, Peterson, & Temple, 2001, p. 12). Another frequent question asks candidates about their career goals.
Yet despite their widespread use, information forms raise some troubling issues. One problem arises from confusing or incomplete instructions about how to complete the forms (Chandler & McKnight, 2009; DiAngelo, 2006). Another issue is the use of demographic categories that limit how minority candidates can describe themselves. For example, some information forms ask minority candidates to disclose their identity using a set of checkboxes that specify minority status based on categories such as race, class, or ability (Caskey et al., 2001; Crocker & Dibbon, 2008; Smith, & Pratt, 1996). The process may be stressful for candidates who belong to more than one group on the list, especially if the instructions allow them only one checkmark. Moreover, what is the impact on candidates who identify with a minority group that is not on the list? How can they comply with the admission requirements? Some researchers suggest that the use of prescribed identity labels simply reproduces the status quo (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Mahrouse, 2001).

To disaggregate candidates’ personal demographics, some information forms use prejudicial labeling such as “race”, a fictitious term invented by slavers to distinguish slave owners from their human property (Herbes-Sommers, 2003; Schama, 2005), to classify candidates on the basis of their physical appearance. How demographic labels are understood also varies by region (Bell, 2007; Bell & Griffin, 2007; Dei, 2003; McCaskell, 2005) because labels are context-specific and culturally defined (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Fusarelli, 2004; Kezar, 1999; Morsy & Altbach, 1996). For example, consider whom one would think of as a gendered/invisible minority or a racialized/visible minority in New York, Attawapiskat, Mumbai, Murmansk, Toronto, Nairobi, or Buenos Aires. Alternatively, whom might one think of as marginalized in remedial education classes, prisons, psychiatric wards, or terrorist organizations? As these examples suggest, cultural context is possibly the strongest determinant of minority identity.

Policy instruments for candidate evaluation have evolved in response to new research about incoming candidate characteristics (Caskey et al., 2001; Hunter & Schmidt, 1989; Schmidt, Ones, & Hunter, 1992). McDonnell and Elmore (1987) state that it is helpful to know why policymakers prefer some instruments over others, “how these instruments actually operate in the policy arena, how they differ from one another in their expected effects, the costs and benefits they impose, their basic operating assumptions, and the likely consequences of their
use” (p. 134). The most widely used candidate evaluation instruments are academic transcripts, followed by personal information forms and letters of reference.

Other kinds of policy instruments for candidate evaluation may also play a role in teacher education admission such as standardized test results (Aguado, 1996; Darling-Hammond, 2010), letters of reference, interviews (Byrnes, Kiger, & Shechtman, 2000), and simulation performance activities (Caskey et al., 2001; Crocker & Dibbon, 2008). Letters of reference sometimes form part of a personal information form, and they are usually subject to restrictions. For example, immediate next of kin, employees, and faith leaders are usually excluded from the list of eligible referees, and preference often extends to former employers or supervisors who are familiar with candidates’ volunteer work. Caskey et al. (2001) point out that simulation exercises are good predictors of teaching success, unlike academic transcripts, personal information forms, letters of reference, and personal interviews (see also Roose, Mitchell, & Rudman, 1985; Shechtman, 1988, 1992). They also propose the following framework for assessing the value of simulations:

The time, monetary, and logistical demands of teacher candidate admission require deliberation and consideration. The need to compress simulations into a short period of time calls for advanced planning and commitments. The time and dollar costs should be balanced against the important needs to get a high-quality group of teacher candidates. The tasks and costs asked of candidates need to be considered. (Caskey et al., 2001, p. 70)

However, simulations have high per capita administrative costs. These costs may be absorbed by host institutions, but more often simulation costs are passed on to the candidates regardless of their financial means.

This completes the review of admission policy instrumentation which introduced how program qualifications may be accessed, what information they might contain, and how language shapes their interpretation by candidates and admission personnel.

2.3.2 Qualifications for Admission

Admission qualifications serve as important program signifiers that “influence the reputation of the institution with candidates, graduates, the public, and professionals” (Smith & Pratt, 1996, p. 43). They embody admission policy goals and typically consist of primary and secondary qualifications that guide the ranking and selection of successful candidates.
Primary qualifications measure candidates’ academic performance and secondary qualifications rank variables such as legal residency, financial solvency, language fluency, letters of recommendation, and prior experience working with children (Casey & Childs, 2007; Cochran-Smith, Feiman-Nemser, & McIntyre, 2008; Crocker & Dibbon, 2008; Smith & Pratt, 1996; Zeichner & Conklin, 2008).

Academic requirements have traditionally functioned as the first filter for incoming candidates, though research shows that high GPAs are not good predictors of teacher success (Smith & Pratt, 1996). However, some secondary qualifications have gained prominence as good indicators of candidate success (Crocker & Dibbon, 2008) and as reliable ways of identifying candidates who will respond well in diverse school populations (Nieto, 2000). Growing diversity within school populations has prompted some programs to waive one or more of their academic criteria on the understanding that promising teacher candidates might fail to meet one or more of the standard qualifications. For example, in their comparative study of exceptional admission and regular candidates, Demetrulias, Chiodo, and Diekman (1990) state that, “At program completion, the exceptional admission students, as a group, were as successful as the regular admission students in the completion of the credential requirements” (p. 71). Together primary and secondary qualifications enable admission personnel to rank candidates according to their “complete linguistic, sociocultural, and academic repertoire in the service of learning” (Gutiérrez et al., 2002, p. 338), and to use that ranking to allocate limited program spaces.

2.3.2.1 Primary Qualifications for Admission

Primary qualifications consist of minimum academic performance in at least one conferred degree, and may include prior completion of course prerequisites, minimum achievement on standardized tests, as well as other generic requirements such as restrictions against concurrent enrolment at another institution (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Prerequisite courses vary in content, number, minimum GPA, and year of study. Some programs align their course prerequisites with state licensure requirements or standardized tests that teacher candidates must take to qualify for graduation or employment. Other programs call for prerequisite courses related to candidates’ depth of knowledge in their teachable subjects or their breadth of knowledge across the liberal arts, humanities, and social sciences (Crocker &
Dibbon, 2008). Lucas and Grinberg (2008) state that candidates who apply to teach English Language Learners (ELLs) in “programs with minimal pre-requisites” may need to meet extra “qualifications related to linguistic skills” if their first language is not English (p. 621). Primary qualifications for admission also vary between concurrent and consecutive teacher preparation programs. Concurrent programs often feature staggered academic requirements that range from a high school diploma or internationally recognized baccalaureate, to one or more years of undergraduate study. Concurrent programs may also require admitted candidates to complete courses outside the teacher preparation program as a condition of graduation (Casey, 2005; Crocker & Dibbon, 2008; Falkenberg, 2010).

2.3.2.2 Secondary Qualifications for Admission

Secondary qualifications take into account candidates’ non-academic characteristics. These qualities have become the focus of increasing interest in light of growing classroom diversity. For example, Casey and Childs (2007) recommend guidelines for the selection of secondary qualifications: (1) a program’s vision of outgoing candidate capacity, (2) the teaching capital that candidates acquire during their preparation program, (3) incoming candidate identities, attitudes, knowledge, skills, and interests that indicate an affinity for teaching, and (4) candidate abilities that equip them well for navigating the program’s environment and expectations. In another example, Falkenberg (2010) states the importance of experience-based qualifications that reflect working conditions in schools and hiring criteria in catchment area school divisions. In their overview of teacher education in Canada, Crocker and Dibbon (2008) identify a surprisingly long list of typical secondary qualifications for teacher candidates: Sociocultural background, life history, identity, self-awareness, ethics, attitudes, work experience with children and youth, reasons for becoming a teacher, knowledge about the challenges that teachers face in the classroom, teaching skills, Internet literacy, language fluencies, and personal references.

Other examples stress the importance of candidates’ “practical knowledge” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999, p. 250), that candidates need to be aware of themselves as cultural beings, and that they need to be familiar with the relationship between “privilege and personal identity” in order to conceptualize cultural differences (Lenski et al., 2005, p. 4). McFalls & Cobb-Roberts (2001) point out how important is for teachers to feel comfortable with and to work
effectively within diverse populations, Nieto (2000) advocates the benefits of second language fluency and “personal and professional experiences with learners of diverse backgrounds” (p. 183; see also Brown, 2007), and Noddings (2006) states that candidates need self-knowledge in order to understand how they connect “to others and to the physical environment” (p. 289). Cultural sensitivity and awareness of the physical environment are among the core qualifications used to prepare teachers for work in Aboriginal and far northern communities, along with interest in working in remote communities, financial sponsorships, letters of support from senior public system administrators, and “experience as a paraprofessional in Aboriginal schools” (Crocker & Dibbon, 2008, p. 30).

Lenski et al. (2005) describe an ideal candidate pool as “a classroom of different genders, race, religions, cultures, and all kinds of different people; all the things that make people unique” (p. 5), while others herald candidate diversity as a valuable resource (Coleman, 1966) and hybridity as the DNA for new and better pedagogy (Gutiérrez & Baquedano-López, 1999; Pritchard et al., 2010). Like Zeichner (2003), Skrla et al. (2004) point out that the common mistake of conflating the equitable representation of diverse populations with equity-mindedness. Diverse representation consists of proportional grouping with regard to differences such as “race”, class, gender, ability, age, or other visible and invisible variables. Equity-mindedness, on the other hand is the expression of equitable principles and it may range from “none” to “limited” to “inauthentic” to “authentic” (Skrla et al., 2009, pp. 83-84). It is also fully independent of personal identity and is not an automatic characteristic associated with any type of “race”, class, gender, ability, age, or other demographic (Skrla et al., 2009; see also McCaskell, 2005).

While researching non-academic program qualifications, I was struck by similarities between the standardized assessment of academic performance and standardizing the qualifications for program admission. The need for greater efficiency (Stein, 2001) underpins assumptions about what is reasonable or appropriate in both processes, but when admission policy succumbs to this kind of pressure, non-academic program qualifications may reduce the complexity of candidate diversity. For example, identity-based qualifications are what Falkenberg (2010) describes as candidates’ socio-cultural and ethnic backgrounds, their “noneducatable qualities” that individual candidates must bring with them into their preparation programs. Zeichner and Conklin (2008) value these qualities at a group level
because they create “enrolment influences” (p. 274) that shape the experiences of all program candidates. Closely related to candidates’ cultural and ethnic backgrounds are the early experiences that result in their adult identities, attitudes, and core values (Johnson, 2007, p. 302). This concludes the review of program qualifications and establishes the role of primary and secondary requirements in teacher candidate evaluation.

2.3.3 Teacher Candidate Evaluation

Candidate evaluation is a complex process that requires tight orchestration. To ensure both compliance with admission policy goals and high levels of inter-rater reliability, admission personnel may receive professional training from time to time. The relationship between training procedures and candidate evaluation determines whether the assessment process reflects admission policy goals.

The assessment of candidate personal information forms is an annual event in the cycle of many teacher preparation programs and the literature describes structural limitations that may occur during the admission process. For example, Luke, Green, and Kelly (2010) attribute some policy misimplementation to limitations in “the actual technical and professional capacities of complex and often unwieldy bureaucracies to lead, resource, and implement reform” (p. xv). Some programs engage student assessors, a contested issue that dates back to work by Linton (1927). He stated that admission policy “should be executed by an admission official of academic rank who is conversant with the policies of the institution and who is privileged to sit in all conferences when such policies are under consideration” (p. 165). However, Caskey et al. (2001) open the door to the possibility of allowing candidates to judge each other (see also Schectman, 1991). They further point out the limitations of having “too few judges, limited time” (p. 18), and they recommend the use of a third judge in the case of ties between paired teams of assessors.

Admission personnel bias is another source of procedural disruption during teacher candidate evaluation. Johnson (2007) attributes interpreter differences in part to “the organization of society and the interplay among individuals’ racial, class, cultural, gender, and language backgrounds” (p. 13). Deviation from standard program practice occurs when admission personnel exercise their own preferences in ways that advantage some individuals and groups over others. Caskey et al. (2001) point out that many agents who resist policy reform are
fully aware of their non-compliance, whereas others may be exercising “unintended bias” (p. 18). Yet, bias of any kind lowers inter-rater reliability and may re/produce subjective institutional meanings that have little to do with candidates’ own identities or expectations (Brah & Phoenix, 2004; Pritchard et al., 2010). Students with disabilities may face bias against their physical or psychological conditions, as well as faculty resistance toward meeting their special needs with classroom and scheduling accommodations. These candidates may also encounter marginalization triggered by beliefs that they will lower institutional test scores or somehow harm their colleagues (Green, 2009).

Sexual orientation is another frequent victim of covert admission personnel bias. Blumenfeld (2010) points out the “overarching system of advantages bestowed on heterosexuals . . . [as a result of] the institutionalization of a heterosexual norm or standard which establishes and perpetuates the notion that all people are or should be heterosexuals” (para. 1). This oppression may occur through “neglect, omission, erasure, and distortion” (Blumenfeld, para. 3) toward members of LGBTTQQA communities (see also Callaghan, 2008; Dickson, 1994; Goldstein, 2005; Herek & Berrill, 1992; Hermann-Wilmarth, 2008; Mackinnon, 2005; Rich, 1980).

Cultural minorities are another group who may experience negative admission personnel bias from those who accept racist studies that attribute some cultural minorities with lower than average intelligence, inappropriate communication skills, and chronic poverty (Green, 2009). As well, recent immigrants may be discounted because they are unfamiliar with local teacher education practices and do not behave like “normal students” (Green, 2009, p. 18). These problems are compounded for immigrants from developing countries where there may have been no higher education institutions and little exposure to the cost of living associated with western urban residency. To cover these costs, many recent immigrants work at part- or full-time jobs that conflict with inflexible course schedules and assignment deadlines. As well, their sources of income may make them ineligible for bursaries or research grant funding.

Candidates who come from religious minorities often face the same kinds of bias as cultural minorities, in addition to finding their faiths either omitted from curriculum documents and institutional holiday calendars, or recognized with distain and fear. Sometimes their exclusion takes on the form of extreme persecution such as Islamophobia which many see as
a reaction to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States (Kinchele, Steinberg, & Stonebanks, 2010; Zine, 2003). Admission personnel bias may also devalue candidate desirability based on age, relationships with dependents, religious beliefs, employment history, academic specialization, or immigration or refugee status (Green, 2009). For example, both female and male students face expectations about what careers they should pursue and women may be discounted because they are associated with the care of dependents such as children, the chronically ill, and the elderly.

This concludes the review of teacher education admission theory. Together, the literature on admission policy instrumentation, qualifications for program admission, and candidate evaluation extends the theoretical background and sets the stage for review of the third research field, policy implementation theory.

### 2.4 Educational Policy Implementation Theory

Policy implementation literature consists of three generations of research that progressively examine the stages of educational policy implementation, selected procedures within each stage, as well as the characteristics of complex organizations. In combination with the literature on educational equity and teacher education admission, this body of knowledge underpins a nuanced and comprehensive conceptual model for the exploration of equity-driven candidate diversification within an urban Canadian teacher education program. During policy delivery, research illuminates issues of policy implementer training and post-training performance, as well as the expectations of policy beneficiaries. Characteristics of complex organizations are conceptualized in four domains, namely sociopolitical context, infrastructure, agency, and cultural mediation.

#### 2.4.1 Three Generations of Educational Policy Implementation Research

This section discusses three generations of educational policy implementation theorists whose theoretical work evolved from case study analysis, to top-down/bottom-up policy implementation, to contingency theory. The implementation process occurs during the following discrete, though sometimes overlapping stages: problem articulation, policy design, policy delivery, and policy evaluation. The section concludes with a review of the
following organizational characteristics: Sociopolitical context, infrastructure, agency, and cultural mediation.

The First Generation: Case Study Theory (1956-1975) began when Laswell (1956) coined the term “policy implementation” as a new research focus in public administration, intergovernmental relations, and public management. He also identified four stages in the policy implementation process: (1) problem definition, (2) policy development, (3) policy enactment, and (4) policy evaluation. Because case studies dominated the field of inquiry at that time, this first generation of implementation theory became known as case study analysis. It examined the roles of organizational leaders, their leadership styles and communication patterns, and policy structures (Appleby, 1949; Waldo, 1948).

The Second Generation: Top-Down / Bottom-Up Theory (1978-1983) was launched by researchers such as Elmore (1978, 1979), Majone and Wildavsky (1979), and Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981; see also Sabatier & Mazmanian, 1983). Top-down/bottom-up theory continued the focus on policy structures but also examined organizational procedures. For example, it distinguished among the levels of administration that were responsible for policy administration at different stages of the implementation process. The term “Second Generation” arose from a new line of research that studied outcome differences between executive (top-down) and grassroots (bottom-up) policy initiatives. However, this research generation was short-lived, giving way to the more complex theoretical approach known as contingency theory.

The Third and Present Generation: Contingency Theory (since 1987) emerged with work by McLaughlin (1987) that highlighted theoretical shortcomings, such a focus on policy transmission at the expense of policy reception, and failure to consider the power of individual and group motivation to shape policy outcomes. McLaughlin’s contribution to contingency theory widened the theoretical scope by increasing the number of independent policy variables that shape implementation outcomes, and by deepening the thinking about how they might interact with one another. Newly identified influences included organizational capacity, individual and group will, and recognition of the need for balance between administrative pressure and implementer support. As well, they consisted of sensitivity to the dynamic character of organizational culture and constantly changing
relationships among three distinct agency groups: Policymakers who operate at a systemic level, policy implementers who operate at lower levels throughout an organization, and policy beneficiaries who may be located inside or outside the policy-making institution (McLaughlin, 1987).

Fuhrman, Clune, and Elmore (1988) stated that “Policy ownership is possible without participation in the shaping of policy” (p. 242), though this situation may be a poor substitute for one in which there is well-informed ownership. In another development, Mazmanian and Sabatier (1989) stressed the importance of “bargaining and negotiating” that occur over time as policy implementers interact during several stages of the implementation process. As well, Goggin, Bowman, Lester, and O’Toole (1990) introduced the term “third generation” to refer the new and increasingly complex research about policy implementation. For example, Mazmanian and Sabatier stated that “The problem to be addressed stipulates the objective . . . and normally runs through a number of stages” (1989, pp. 20-21) that consist of policy enactment, interactions among implementing agency, beneficiary group compliance, and an evaluation process.

Contingency theory continues to expand, embracing not only an increasingly complex array of implementation processes, but also new areas of educational theory. For example, Clune, White, and Patterson (1989) examined the implementation of high school curriculum policy, Marcoulides and Heck (1990) highlighted the dynamics of balancing the policy goals, equity and excellence, within urban education reform, and McLaughlin, Talbert, and Bascia (1990) explored the role of the school as “policy mediator, policy critic, and policy constructor” (p. 256). In other work, Ball and Bowe (1992) examined implementation in the context of new national curriculum standards, and Clune (1993), working with the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (Rutgers), studied the role of the courts in shaping school finance reform. Adams (1994) also studied educational finance but from the broader perspective of implementing equity across all levels of program spending (see also Berne, 1994; Brathwaite, 2003; Clune, 1994; Datnow, Barman, & Stringfield, 2000; Datnow, Hubbard, & Conchas, 2001; deLeon & deLeon, 2002; Elson 2006; Fenwick, 2001; French & Maconachie, 2004; Grubb & Flessa, 2006; Hall & O’Toole, 2000; Honig, 2004; Leithwood, Steinback, & Jantzi, 2002; Lester & Goggin, 1998; Matland, 1995; Matsumura, Garnier, & Resnick, 2010; McKenzie & Scheurich, 2004; Mitchell & Romero, 2010; O’Toole, 1993; Single & Muller,

2.4.2 Selected Procedures During Policy Implementation

Policy implementation is a period of activity for policymakers who design policy, policy implementers who may be recruited or undergo training, and policy beneficiaries who interact with policy structures and agency to their maximum advantage. Within the stakeholder groups, individuals may differ from one another in terms of experience, values, perception, and learning (Elson, 2006). As well, their comfort levels with policy structures and procedures depend on multiple factors such as personal judgment and will (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1989), group incentives and learning needs (McLaughlin, 1987), individual and group beliefs, mindsets and expectations (deLeon & deLeon, 2002; Lipsky, 1980), group resources, group size, and, where applicable, the degree of change that policy reform imposes on them (Elson, 2006). The discussion deepens with research into policy implementer training, implementer post-training performance, and policy beneficiary compliance.

2.4.2.1 Policy Implementer Training

Familiarizing policy implementers with new policy goals and procedures is a nuanced process whose success depends on several factors. Matsumura, Garnier, & Resnick (2010) point out the importance of “the relationship between various contextual factors” such as “policies for determining who is qualified to serve . . . norms for . . . professional community . . . experience level . . . the influence of . . . social resources” (p. 250). In consideration of an organization’s readiness for change, Matsumura et al. (2010) also state the need to “gain unambiguous buy-in from respondents, ensure that organizational structures are in place to support the innovation, and clarify how an innovation fits within a community’s larger ‘agenda’ or priorities for change” (p. 268). As well, Mitchell and Romero (2010) show that the “links between institution characters . . . the type of the training model implemented . . . [and whether programs] build on traditional . . . training or seek to substantially alter the nature of credential training” (p. 363) have a direct effect on training outcomes.

In other work, Grubb and Flessa (2006) advise against implementing new policy “without any warning, without any staff input, and without worrying about the chemistry of the
leadership team” (p. 540). Early staff training helps to reduce friction during training applications (deLeon & deLeon, 2002), because training that is rushed or based on roughly-assembled instrumentation may result in protracted and incomplete staff preparation (deLeon & deLeon, 2002; McLaughlin, 1987). Matsumura et al. (2010) point out the benefits of “taking steps to ensure that the program is not ‘one more thing’ added to their schedules” (p. 268). As well, Zeldin, Camino, and Mook (2005) state that successful implementation depends on respondents’ having adequate time for shared organizational learning. Many expect their training to follow familiar institutional routines, including leadership within a well-respected chain of command. They may feel disoriented by procedural changes that occur outside of this pattern and become less willing to engage in consensual decision-making (Elson, 2006; Habermas, 1987; McLaughlin, 1987). As well, Matsumura et al. (2010) state the importance of “tailoring programs for teachers at different phases of their careers” (p. 268) in order to maximize teacher learning and program support.

Diverse personal values also influence the way in which new policy is interpreted (McLaughlin, 1987; Spillane, 1998). Some values may lead policy implementers to resist new organizational goals and objectives (Clune, 2001; Hall & O’Toole, 2000; Kosnik et al., 2003), and even create covert barriers to policy that appears to have general support (Wallin, 2001). Zeldin et al. (2005) state the benefits of creating “favourable narratives” in advance of introducing new policy, benefits that include “theories and stories of organizational change . . . affirmatively address issues of power . . . and institutionalize new roles” (p. 121). For example, these favourable narratives could join other characteristics of institutional culture to shape policymakers’ decisions about the selection of policy instrumentation (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). Yet, maintaining clear communications and congenial working conditions may put unexpected time demands on the implementing administration, potentially limiting implementer capacity (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1989; McLaughlin, 1987). To maximize implementer training, it is essential to ensure that “implementing decisions and actions be coordinated . . . in ways that promote goal alignment, capacity building, and direct support for change” (Adams, 1994, p. 518). O’Toole (1993) refers to this as meshing the structures employed for implementation with the policy objectives.

Implementation research also recommends aligning resource levels to personnel’s changing needs during the introduction of procedural changes, and adjusting expectations for
imp
lementer response time to allow adaptation to “necessary role changes” (Berne, 1994, p. 502). Another training issue is implementers’ need for different kinds of information at different stages of the implementation process (McLaughlin, 1987). For example, if the rules for decision-making are not available after training, confusion among some policy implementers may disrupt policy implementation mid-way through post-training performance and result in unwanted policy outcomes (deLeon & deLeon, 2002; Elson, 2006). As well, too much emphasis on efficiency may weaken implementer effectiveness (deLeon & deLeon, 2002; McLaughlin, 1987). According to Fuhrman et al. (1988) implementer “compliance clearly depends heavily on the extent to which the technical knowledge exists” (p. 252). However, a sense of competence does not guarantee that implementers will perform exclusively as intended, and many of the issues that present during implementer training reassert themselves during implementer post-training performance.

2.4.2.2 Implementer Post-Training Performance

Policy implementers are frequently required to apply their policy training very soon after the initial training period and McLaughlin (1987) postulated likely sources of difficulty at this juncture: “[Does] a program fall short because program policy provided insufficient training or because implementers made ineffective training choices?” (p. 175). In another example, Matland (1995) examined relationships between policy ambiguity and implementer conflict to understand their roles in policy implementation. Table 3 is an adaptation of Matland’s work and it shows relationships between low and high levels of conflict and ambiguity. The implementation of a single policy may reflect different processes and central principles at different points in time. For instance, changes in program structure such as the substitution of a new procedure for a long-standing one may create enough ambiguity to transform an administrative process into an experimental event. As well, persistently high ambiguity may trigger high implementer conflict and convert an experimental event into a symbolic one.

In another example, Fenwick (2001) pointed out the potential pitfalls of a delivery process in which individual performance is limited by excessive structural interventions:

Teachers and principals interviewed after 3 years of implementing this appeared to work within three basic contradictions related to the intersections of power and knowledge: (a) promoting teacher self-direction while increasing surveillance; (b) honoring individual teachers’ ways of knowing while narrowing teacher learning to a technicist model; and (c) focusing on teacher risk taking, creativity, and personally
Contradiction “(c)” resonates with Pignatelli’s (2002) observation that standardized testing homogenizes the groups that it approves, and limits the freedom of education leaders, thereby establishing a link between educational equity and policy implementation.

Table 3. *Implementer Conflict and Policy Ambiguity (after Matland, 1995, p.159)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementer Conflict</th>
<th>Policy Ambiguity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Process: Administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Principle: Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Process: Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Principle: Administrative Power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.2.3 Policy Beneficiary Compliance
The literature on policy beneficiary compliance is limited, but it does explore how policy language and procedures shape beneficiary interactions (McLaughlin, 1987). McDonnell and Elmore (1987) situate beneficiary compliance within “the political and organizational context in which policy beneficiaries must respond” (p. 134). Beneficiaries tend to respond in a variety of ways depending on their own judgment and will (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1989), as well as on their personal and group mindsets. Ambiguous policy guidelines frequently creates resistance (Elson, 2006), whereas beneficiary expectations of policy benefits (deLeon & deLeon, 2002), and the extent to which implementation procedures meet their needs (McLaughlin, 1987) determine levels of compliance. This concludes the theoretical review of policy implementer training, implementer performance, and beneficiary compliance.

2.4.3 Characteristics of Complex Organizations
Contingency theorists state that complex organizations are characterized by three elements: sociopolitical context, structure and agency, and cultural mediation (Honig, 2004;
Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1989; McDonnell & Elmore, 1987; McLaughlin, 1987). How these elements shape policy implementation is sometimes difficult to discern because they are complex, dynamic, and often invisible.

### 2.4.3.1 Sociopolitical Context

Sociopolitical context exists at multiple levels throughout the policy arena. For example, high level infrastructure consists of organizations, legislation, or operating capital such as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (United Nations, 2009), the NATO military alliance, creed-based liturgy governing public worship, an environmentalist organization’s fleet of ships, a website dedicated to human rights activism. Examples of medium level infrastructure include human rights statues, taxation policies, as well as regulations governing professional licensing, health care delivery, public education, national defense, and social services. Low-level infrastructure typically exists within individual communities and neighbourhoods (Clune, White, & Patterson, 1990; Spillane, 1998). It includes associations such as daycares, chambers of commerce, union locals, sports teams, volunteer fire departments, Neighbourhood Watch branches, school councils, faith-based children’s after-school programs, temporary housing, women’s shelters, and political organizations. Sociopolitical context shapes perceptions about problem tractability and the importance of policy goals (McLaughlin, 1987) as well as an organization’s overall capacity to control implementer proficiency and beneficiary compliance (Elson, 2006). Sociopolitical context permeates every aspect of organizational life, and exerts constant, often conflicting, pressures on organizational structure and agency. For example, some North American educators are actively lobbying for reform in the belief that there is an urgent need to supply qualified teachers to all public schools (Darling-Hammond, 2010). In another example, Canadian culture exerts conflicting pressures both to safeguard the hegemony of white, heterosexual, post-colonial British and French power brokers as well as to support the interests of diverse indigenous and multiethnic populations.

### 2.4.3.2 Organizational Structure and Agency

Structure and agency are so closely interwoven within complex organizations that it is impossible to ascribe power to one without considering the other. However, as essential elements, they can be separated and their meanings are discussed here. Bates (1980)
describes organizational structure as knowledge networks that maintain organizational control and accountability. Mitchell and Romero (2010) define structure as formal and informal policies and procedures that govern organizational activity and create organizational uniqueness. Formal organizational structures consist of policy instruments and “mechanisms that translate substantive policy goals into concrete actions” (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987, p. 133), as well as the procedures whereby policy “instruments operate in the policy arena, how they differ from one another in their expected effects, the costs and benefits they impose, their basic operating assumptions, and the likely consequences of their use” (p. 134). Changes to parts of an organization’s structure, or procedural reform, may inadvertently cause deviations from non-targeted policy goals (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1989). For example, Lipsky (1980) states that these deviations weaken administrative influence and may lead to further unexpected and unwanted activity (Lipsky, 1980). As well, Elson (2006), citing Adams (1994), states that procedural reform may create hierarchical misalignment which leads to policy gaps such as inconsistent rules for decision making and sub-standard organizational accountability.

Informal organizational structures, or norms, are the unofficial ways of doing things that underpin attitudes and decision-making within an organization. They consist of cultural norms that shape informal social groups and activities, as well as the day-to-day ways of interacting within the workplace (Mitchell & Romero, 2010). These norms are invisible forces that shape the “human/social relations’ paradigm” (Dei, 2003, p. 3), intangibles like public opinion and standards of acceptable conduct. They also regulate personal and professional relationships, dress codes, social courtesies, expectations for the use of public spaces, and beliefs about the proper distribution of power and privilege (Pritchard et al., 2010). They may include conflicting pressures to preserve the status quo or to initiate reform within a wide swath of policy domains.

Organizational agency consists of individuals and groups who engage in formal and informal organizational activity. Formal agency consists of how individuals and groups perform their official roles, whereas informal agency is the unofficial way that individuals and groups shape organizational norms. Individuals and groups have their own distinct identities, experiences, values, and goals (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987) which underpin communities of common discourse, self-selected social roles, and degrees of support for organizational
policies and procedures (McLaughlin, 1987). Organizational agency may lead to relationships such as like-minded commitments to social action or resistance to policy reform (Gee, 2005). For example, a like-minded group of faculty, staff, and students might work successfully toward eliminating the use of body fragrances or plastic bottles. In another example, senior administration might use their invisible power to undermine official reform.

How organizational agency responds to policy reform or procedural interventions may take the form of “resistance, compliance, [or] adaptation” (Fuhrman, Clune, & Elmore, 1988, p. 242). How agency interpret, evaluate, support, and engage in all stages of policy implementation depends on situated personal knowledges (Haraway, 1991), as well as intercultural knowledges and multiperspectivities (UNESCO, 1994). Intercultural complexity may also cause differences in how individuals interpret group tasks, their roles in task completion, and their understanding of the roles of their co-workers (Collard & Normore, 2009). So much complexity within the process of cultural mediation may lead to agency responses characterized by confusion and conflict (Baez, 2006). Agency responses may also vary according to nuances in the language of policy articulation (Prensky, 2009) or in keeping with individual beliefs about an organization’s potential to meet its goals (McLaren, 2008, McNeil, 1988). For example, responses to policy reform may generate conflict among senior faculty and newer hires who disagree over the benefits of a particular policy change. As well, responses may diverge according to perceptions of homophobia or racism in the language of policy instrumentation, language that may well characterize larger issues of marginalizing organizational culture. From these descriptions, it is possible to envision how structure and agency, working together, determine how procedures such as candidate recruitment, the candidate application process, and candidate assessment combine to determine admission policy outcomes.

2.4.3.3 Cultural Mediation

Cultural mediation denotes the dynamic influence of institutional culture on institutional norms and individual will at every level of an organization. It is context-specific, embodies all organizational structure and agency (McLaughlin, 1987), mediates the ways in which policies are envisioned, enabled, and enforced (Clune et al., 1990), and creates unique organizational environments within which policy implementation takes place (Conchas,
Whenever individuals or groups engage in institutional activity, they are simultaneously influenced by organizational culture and agents of its re/production (McLaughlin, 1987). For instance, Aguado et al. (2003) state that cultural mediation is a pervasive language of interpretation whose power over institutional agency influences three fundamental aspects of program equity: (1) the ways in which members of a teacher preparation program experience the environment; (2) the ways in which these individuals relate to themselves and to each other as a function of their experiences within the program environment; and (3) the ways in which individuals within the same culture may represent contrasting identities and values that make conflict inevitable and equity-mindedness difficult to achieve.

When members of the same group do not share a common level of commitment to their task, the group may not function well as a cooperative network and personal comfort levels within the group may vary (Seidman, 1991). High comfort levels tend to support consensual bargaining, transformative initiatives, and willingness to help co-workers with policy interpretation and delivery (McLaughlin, 1987). These influences determine how individuals and groups understand new procedural requirements, how willing they are to support new policy, and how well an organization can demonstrate capacity to implement new policy. Cultural mediation may also establish the extent to which an organization maintains the balance necessary among human and financial resources during critical periods of change (Fullan, 2001, 2003). For example, in a faculty of education, cultural mediation tends to circumscribe tolerance levels for language and dress codes, as well as determining whether all individuals and groups feel safe and supported within the community.

This concludes discussion about the characteristics of complex organizations, sociopolitical context, structure, agency, and cultural mediation. Sociopolitical context offers insight into the external forces that exert pressure on all aspects of organizational activity. Organizational structure, consisting of policies, procedures, and informal norms, defines roles and social customs performed by the individuals and groups who comprise organizational agency. Cultural mediation is the pervasive influence that creates a unique culture within every organization and permeates the processes of policy articulation and enforcement.
2.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented a critical review of the theoretical literature on educational equity, teacher education admission, and policy implementation. Educational equity research encompasses equity’s role in the global education market, discourses within the context of educational policy, and growing ties with teacher education programs and teacher candidate diversification. Teacher education admission theory considers admission policy instrumentation, primary and secondary program qualifications, as well as procedures for candidate evaluation. Policy implementation research focuses on three generations of policy development, implementer training and performance as well as beneficiary compliance during policy delivery, and the characteristics of complex organizations. In combination, these areas of research infuse this project with an analytical perspective that is original, practical, and informative.
Chapter 3

3 Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The choice of research design may well rival the research question in establishing the boundaries of inquiry and the ultimate success of a project. This methodology is a dynamic framework with which to explore the research question, “How did equity-based admission policy shape candidate diversification in an urban Canadian teacher education program?” To probe for nuanced meaning within the research data the following research sub-questions guided the processes of selection, collection, analysis, and presentation:

1) How did the admission policy context (for example, international competition) shape admission policy structure, agency, and procedures?
2) How did institutional structure (for example, the Candidate Handbook) shape equitable candidate diversification?
3) How did institutional agency (for example, admission personnel) shape equitable candidate diversification?
4) How did admission procedures (for example, Candidate Information Form assessment) shape equitable candidate diversification?

The project design evolved organically from conversations with the advisor and committee members, from readings in qualitative methodology, and from the proposal and ethics review processes. The research design changed to include refinements in the research question and conceptual model, as well as insights arising from the opportunities and limitations of the research site. This chapter describes the following key research elements: Principal actors, research methodology, procedures for proposal development and ethics review, as well as data collection, coding, analysis, presentation, and research dissemination.

3.2 Principal Actors

I was the primary and sole investigator on this project. Dr. Nina Bascia kindly moved from the role of departmental supervisor to dissertation advisor and chair of the research committee. Together we selected Drs. John P. Portelli and James Ryan to complete the committee. Additional internal examiners at the proposal hearing were Dr. Stephen Anderson
and Malcolm J. Richmon. Dr. Susan Padro was the departmental designate who guided the completion of the Ethics Review Package.

3.3 Case Study Context
One hallmark of a well-conceived research project is the extent to which the methodology enables the researcher to answer the research question. I began with broad reading in qualitative research methods to discover what method would fit best with the research question and the conceptual frame. Following are the rationale for choosing qualitative research, the case study strategy, and a single case study paradigm.

3.3.1 Qualitative Research
Even though conventional research into policy implementation and organizational complexity has tended to favour large scale, quantitative methods of inquiry, this approach did not fit well with the interest in deconstructing organizational dynamics to gain a deeper understanding of policy implementation. Instead, I was drawn to the social constructivist strand of qualitative inquiry and to its power to uncover patterns of experience and understanding that usually go unnoticed by quantitative researchers (Creswell, 2007, pp. 20-21). I also wanted to use a methodology that embodies “qualitative goodness”, an achievement that is possible when “the researcher purposefully avoids controlling the research conditions and concentrates on recording the complexity of situational contexts and interrelations as they occur naturally” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 204). A final reason for choosing a qualitative approach to inquiry was to take advantage of “emerging methods, open-ended questions”, and “analysis based on interview and document data” (Cresswell, 2007, p. 17). As a veteran interviewer, I knew the value of this process in teasing out nuanced impressions within a common experience, an essential step in gathering rich data.

3.3.2 Case Studies
The literature on qualitative research supports the case study as an ideal form of inquiry for projects that require fine-grained analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Creswell, 2007; Patton, 1990). For example, many of the issues that are central to an understanding of organizational complexity, issues such as structural design and control, and causal explanations for individual and group behaviour, are accessible within the parameters of a case study
(Lloyd-Jones, 2003; Maxwell, 2004). Maykut and Morehouse (1994) recommend the case study approach for uncovering the cultural norms within educational settings, and Seidman (1991) states that it is useful in gaining insight into the intricacies of interviewing within the field of education. Yin (2004) points out the value of case study methodology for conducting a comprehensive inquiry into the structures, actors, and cultural forces that mediate within specific yet complex organizational processes.

From a structural perspective, Merriam (1998) describes how to collect, code, and analyze large amounts of data, and Miles and Huberman (1994), Janesick (2004), and Yin (2004) point out the need for sensitivity to the idiosyncratic nature of individual cases. Together, these sources informed how I developed the case study framework that became the research design. Although I had quickly settled on a case study approach, I needed guidance from the committee to grasp that a multi-site inquiry was beyond the scope of this degree requirement and that a single-site inquiry would provide ample research opportunity.

3.3.3 Single Case Study Paradigm
Scaling this project as a single case study set the parameters for an inquiry in which the phenomena and context of a teacher preparation program were inseparable (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2004). I took care to choose a site where I could gain access to sources that would support the breadth and depth of the research question and sub-questions. For example, I made sure that I would be able to access important infrastructure such as formal and informal policy instrumentation at both program and university levels, and to get permission to interview the organizational agents responsible for policymaking and policy delivery, as well as a purposeful group of policy beneficiaries.

3.4 Research Proposal
Departmental permission to conduct this research depended on the successful completion of a research proposal and the defense of that proposal at a supervised, public hearing. The proposal outlined the problem statement, major theoretical areas of interest, the model, the research strategy, and the anticipated significance and limitations of the project.
3.5 Ethics Review

University permission to conduct this research was contingent on approval from the Ethics Review Board. To complete this requirement, it was necessary to complete an Ethics Review Protocol Form that reflected much of the information contained in the research proposal and illuminated many nuances within the research process.

3.6 Literature Review

Although some literature review had been necessary to inform the research proposal, most of it had occurred in conjunction with the course requirements for an Ed.D. in Educational Administration. There was now a review of research in the theoretical fields of educational equity, teacher education admission, and policy implementation. EndNote 3 and later EndNote 4 bibliographical software facilitated the process of organizing and referencing these sources.

3.7 Data Collection

Data collection occurred during policy delivery and focused on three areas of admission policy: (1) program qualifications, (2) Equity Policy training for Candidate Information Form readers, and (3) Candidate Information Form assessment. Description of the collection process consists of the research site, policy instrumentation, and interviews with administrators, Information Form readers, and candidates.

3.7.1 Research Site

The research site was an urban Canadian consecutive teacher education program with an Equity Policy mandate for teacher candidate diversification. To gain access to this site, my advisor and I co-signed letters to the Dean of Education (Appendix F) requesting permission to conduct my research, and to the Assistant Dean, Teacher Education (Appendix F) requesting access to Information Form reader training materials and asking for approval in theory for access to additional sources that might be suggested during interviews with administrators, readers, and minority candidates. The Deans approved both requests on condition of site confidentiality.
3.7.2 Policy Documents

It bears repeating that this Teacher Education Program did not publish a written admission policy. By default, several public and private policy documents served as sources of information about the Program’s admission policy and procedures. Public documents consisted of University Policies on Equity and Admission (Appendix G), the Faculty of Education Equity Policy (Appendix A), and the Candidate Handbook (Appendix B). These were supplemented by two private documents, the Candidate Information Form (Appendix C), and the Information Form Assessment Instrument (Appendix D). Although these documents informed selection of the interview samples and construction of the Interview Guides, they are not part of the research data. Completed Candidate Information Forms are also excluded from the data because most candidates emphasized that what they said in their interviews was far more detailed and transparent than the “official answers” that they wrote on the Information Form.

3.7.3 Interviews with Administrators, Admission Personnel, and Minority Candidates

To create a deep and fine-grained inquiry, I conducted private, face-to-face, interviews with administrators, readers, and candidates from the special groups identified for preferred admission. The interviews were audio-recorded using focused Interview Guides, and later transcribed for review and feedback from the respondents.

3.7.3.1 Respondent Group Selection and Sample Construction

Sample construction began by identifying three respondent groups who were closely engaged with the admission process and whose perspectives would represent those of policymakers, policy implementers, and policy beneficiaries. This process led to three respondent samples which represented senior administrators, admission personnel, and minority candidates. To embed diversity and breadth of experience within each of the respondent groups, sampling began with two broad and ten narrow criteria. The two broad criteria were personal and policy role. The eleven narrow criteria consisted of five personal characteristics: Race, sex, languages, ethnicity, and sexual orientation, and six policy role selection procedures: Central, critical, opportunistic, stratified/purposeful, confirming/disconfirming, and snowball/chain. Table 4 illustrates these criteria.
Table 4. *Optimal Criteria for Interview Group Sampling*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broad</strong></td>
<td><strong>Narrow</strong></td>
<td><strong>Descriptions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Appearance/“Race”</td>
<td></td>
<td>The term “race” is in quotation marks because “race” is an illusion based on comparison to a white, northern European standard of physical appearance (Herbes-Sommers, 2003), not a human characteristic. I use it reluctantly to represent ethnic origin and all of the stigmatized characteristics of skin and eye colour; eye, face, hair, and body shape; and cultural identification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex and sexual identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother tongue and other acquired languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural identification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sexual Orientation |  | Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, two-spirited, queer, questioning, ally, asking (LGBT)

| **Policy Role** |  |  |
| Central |  | Involves information-rich cases that represent the phenomenon |
| Critical |  | Permits logical generalization and maximum application of information to other cases |
| Opportunistic |  | Follows new leads, takes advantage of the unexpected |
| Stratified/Purposeful |  | Engages subgroups, facilitates comparison |
| Confirming/Disconfirming |  | Elaborates initial analysis, seeks exceptions, looks for variation |
| Snowball/Chain |  | Identifies cases of interest from people who know people who know what cases are information rich |
Using these referents, it was my hope that each interview group would include all of the criteria, but the lack of institutional diversity and my own discomfort in asking faculty and staff about sexual orientation limited the range of criteria represented by the two institutional groups. As well, I was unable to vary the “race” of the administrators because they were all white. As well, the small number of Information Form readers who were available for interviews precluded my taking much advantage of opportunistic discoveries. In contrast, this sampling process was successful in targeting the small but highly diverse contingent of special group candidates within this year’s preservice program.

By applying these selection criteria, and with access to my advisor’s professional network, I was able to recruit senior administrators by sending them each a personal letter of invitation and informed consent that my advisor and I had co-signed (Appendix H). As well, I was able to recruit Candidate Information Form readers with a similarly worded and signed letter of invitation and informed consent (Appendix I). These letters guaranteed all participants complete confidentiality in forthcoming research reports as well as the option of receiving a summary of the research findings. Although I needed to be flexible with scheduling, filling these institutional samples went very smoothly.

The recruitment of special group candidates was a bit more complicated. The goal was to recruit a group of candidates from each of the six official special group categories listed on the Candidate Information Form. Table 5 shows the criteria used to construct the interview samples. Because the Candidate Information Forms were confidential, I needed help to recruit a representative sample of special group candidates. In response to a co-signed Letter to the Program Registrar (Appendix J), she sent a letter of invitation to participate in Admission Policy research to over 130 candidates who had indicated special group affiliation on their Information Forms (Appendix K). Enclosed with the Registrar’s letter were two other letters, one from the researcher that described the project and invited candidates to email me if they were interested in being interviewed (Appendix L), and one co-signed by the researcher and the Advisor that described the project’s ethical parameters and contained a statement of informed consent to be signed by candidates who wished to participate in the project (Appendix M).
Table 5. Selection Criteria for Interview Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Samples (3)</th>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators (3)</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Information Form Readers (13)</td>
<td>External (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Group Candidates (18)</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to candidate expressions of interest, and at the Registrar’s request, I enclosed the letter of invitation and informed consent (Appendix M), as well as another co-signed letter (Appendix N) asking for permission to access each candidate’s Information Form. This careful correspondence produced excellent results and many of the candidates who responded by email asked whether I would also be able to include friends of theirs in the project. Such high interest enabled me to take advantage of opportunistic, stratified purposeful, confirming, and snowball sampling effects. It also made it possible to include special group candidates who had not indicated special group status on their Information Forms.

As the samples grew, I kept careful track of how many respondents I already had in each group, and although it was difficult to turn people away when a category became full, the decision to hold out for the fullest possible representation was a good one. This process yielded the widest possible individual representation and resulted in at least one female and male candidate from each of the special group categories. It also led to an unexpected yet propitious turn of events. During the interviews, three Visible Minority candidates independently disclosed that their special group identity had more to do with sexual
orientation than with race, and that they would prefer to have special group status based on gendered difference. Their preference illuminated the absence of a gender classification in the special group categories on the Candidate Information Form (Appendix C), shown here in Figure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td>Surname, Given names, Application #, Street, City or Town, Province, Postal Code, Email address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Special Group Checkboxes</td>
<td>Aboriginals, Disabled Persons, Native French Speakers, Men in Grades K-6, Visible Minorities, Women in Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grade Levels &amp; Teaching Subjects</td>
<td>For Grades K-6 and 4-10, indicate one teaching subject. For Grades 7-12, indicate two teaching subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>International Status Checkbox</td>
<td>For internationally licensed teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>General Instructions</td>
<td>Submission deadline, formatting details, instructions for completion; full details available in the Candidate Handbook (strongly recommended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Personal Essays</td>
<td>Motivation, prior experience, knowledge of equity, other accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Signatures</td>
<td>Candidate and three verifiers who will confirm the answers to the second essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Office Use Only</td>
<td>Date received, coded boxes, other blank boxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Candidate Information Form: Main sections.

After candidate coaching on the nuances of special group labeling, and to strengthen the quality of the data analysis, I developed the new category of “Gendered/Invisible Persons” and used the label “Racialized/Visible Persons” instead of the Candidate Information Form’s category, “Visible Minorities”. These changes form the basis for candidate identification in the next section that introduces the interview respondents.

3.7.3.2 Interview Respondents

There were three groups of interview respondents, policymakers (3), policy implementers (13), and policy beneficiaries (18). Policymakers consisted of three senior administrators, one man and two women, who had held leadership roles during development of the Equity Policy
and were responsible for equity-driven reform implementation within the Teacher Education admission process.

Policy implementers consisted of internal and external Candidate Information Form readers, including some who had long-standing partnerships with the preservice program and others who were new to the process. The external group included active duty and retired school system superintendents, principals, and teachers, as well as local community leaders and civil servants. The internal group comprised faculty, instructors, Registrarial Staff, and students.

Policy beneficiaries were eighteen minority candidates who were carefully selected so they would represent all of the sexes, grade levels, and special groups that were listed on the Candidate Information Form (Appendix C), as well as a new category for Gendered/Invisible Persons in which some of the Visible Minority candidates asked to be grouped.

3.7.3.3 Demographic Coding

Demographic coding corresponds to respondent interview sample, sample subgroup, sex, and teaching level (where applicable), as shown in Table 6. This table makes clear the relationships between the general roles of policymaker, policy implementer, and policy beneficiary, and the specific roles of administrator, Candidate Information Form Reader, and special group candidate. As well, and in response to candidate requests, the information in this table digresses from the Candidate Information Form in three ways: (1) It includes an additional special group category for Gendered/Invisible Persons. (2) It refers to “Visible Minorities” as “Racialized/Visible Persons”, and (3) it reflects a distinction that almost all candidates made between special groups based on subject specialization and those based on personal identity.

Table 6 also reflects the use of “name codes” instead of aliases to help the reader identify whether a data source is an administrator, an Information Form reader, or a minority candidate. Administrator name codes begin with “AD” followed by a personal number. Reader name codes begin with “R” followed by a subgroup code: “E” for external, “I” for internal, and a personal number. Candidate name codes begin with “C”, followed by one of the special group codes: Aboriginals “A”, Disabled Persons “D”, Native French Speakers “F”, Men in Grades K-6 “M”, Gendered/Invisible Persons “G”, Racialized/Visible Persons “R”, Women in Physics “W”.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups (3)</th>
<th>Name Codes</th>
<th>Sexes</th>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policymakers / Administrators (3)</strong></td>
<td>AD1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Externals (4)</strong></td>
<td>RE1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Implementers / Information Form Readers (13)</strong></td>
<td>RI1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internals (9)</strong></td>
<td>CF1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CF2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CF3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Groups Based on Subject Specialization</strong></td>
<td>CM1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native French Speakers (3)</strong></td>
<td>CW1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men in Grades K-6 (2)</strong></td>
<td>CA1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women in Physics (1)</strong></td>
<td>CD1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Groups Based on Personal Identity</strong></td>
<td>CG1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CG2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CG3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gendered/Invisible Persons (3)</strong></td>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racialized/Visible Persons (6)</strong></td>
<td>CR6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7.3.4 Interview Guides

There were three Interview Guides (Appendices O-Q), one for each group in the interview sample. The Guides contained questions that had emerged from the literature as well as some that program leaders had suggested. Questions for administrators focused on leadership experiences, understanding of the role of equity in Admission Policy implementation, and perspectives on how the admission process might influence the acceptance of candidates from traditionally marginalized groups. Questions for Information Form readers dealt with candidate recruitment, the role of equity in the admission process, equity training for this year’s readers, and Information Form assessment. Questions for candidates addressed the appeal of the program, issues involving special group status, and ways in which the admission process had been accessible or difficult to navigate.

All three Interview Guides ended with a generic question that invited respondents to add any other salient information. My copies of the Guides had extra space after each question so that I could record observations, insert follow-up questions, and note places where I might need to clarify the contents of the audiotape. This space was especially useful after an electrician fell through the ceiling of the interview room, giving us both the giggles.

3.7.3.5 Interview Protocols

I conducted, private, audiotaped interviews (34) with the following members of each group: Administrators (3), Information Form readers (13), and minority candidates (18). Before the interviews, I provided an Interview Guide to anyone who requested one, although only a couple of external readers asked to see them in advance. Although I had prior experience on both ends of the interview process, to prepare for this stage of my research project, I read over the Interview Guides and did my best to answer the questions. This process was enriched by my own experiences as a preservice teacher candidate.

With one exception, the interviews took place in a single sitting and lasted from 45 to 90 minutes. They began with my welcoming the respondent, collecting the respondent’s signed Letter of Invitation and Informed Consent (Appendices H, I, or M), and providing both of us with our own copy of the Interview Guide (Appendix O, P, or Q). I recorded the name of the respondent, the date, the place, and the start and stop times. With respondent consent, I then turned on the tape recorder. Occasionally one of us would ask to stop the tape, usually to
blow our noses, rehydrate, take time out from the wash of emotion, check something on the Candidate Information Form, or make notes. In fact, several candidates told me that this interview process made them think about issues that they wanted to take up in their course work.

3.7.3.6 Audiotape Transcription and Respondent Feedback
A professional transcription service prepared written texts from the interview audiotapes. Before sharing these transcripts with the respondents, I reviewed each one twice and made editorial changes based on the notes in my interview guides and the recollections that came to mind during the second read. I then gave all subjects an opportunity to edit their interview transcripts and seven out of thirty-four provided feedback. In no case was I inclined to disagree with their clarifications or additions, and I was grateful for their additional support and insight.

3.7.4 Reflections on the Data Collection Process
By collecting data from three distinct interview groups, I met the standard for triangulation (Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994) and ended up with a richly diverse respondent population. This project has further sensitized me to the infinite array of marginalizing experience and may have contributed to the respondents’ receptivity to my follow up questions. As well, experiences on institutional committees established contextual references that deepened insights into the influences arising from institutional infrastructure, agency, and cultural mediation, influences such as policy structure, language, values, norms, and expectations.

3.8 Data Analysis
Data analysis took place through an evolving inductive process. A single data theme soon mushroomed into several hundred sets of information whose management required a complex system of thematic and editorial coding.

3.8.1 Thematic Coding
This form of coding made it possible to link individual chunks of data to the research and conceptual questions. The codes consisted of one word headings or groups of words in which
each new level was separated by a period. For example, one theme looked like this: Sources of candidate support. Candidate Information Form design. Affirmation of minority life experiences. The assignment of thematic or content codes took place during three consecutive and uninterrupted readings of each transcript. The first reading was a holistic analysis focused on identifying primary or broad themes as well as potential quotations. The second reading was an in depth examination to identify secondary or embedded themes within the broader issues and to continue the search for quotations (Creswell, 2007, p. 75). The third reading was an even more nuanced or fine-grained analysis of the primary and secondary themes in search of patterns that naturally separated into tertiary or fourth level subthemes (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, pp. 165-172). It embodied a further refinement of the selection of quotations and led to subtle changes in the codes themselves. For example, I divided the code “Candidate Information Form” into “Candidate Information Form Design” and “Information Form Evaluation”. It soon became necessary to code the transcript data using four heading levels: (1) broad themes, (2) embedded subthemes, (3) nuanced subthemes, and (4) very fine-grained subthemes.

3.8.2 Editorial Coding
Editorial coding was helpful in sorting the themed data into a meaningful narrative. The editorial codes changed frequently in an iterative process of engagement with the data. The scale of the changes expanded outwards in a spiral fashion as I allocated larger and larger blocks of data into chapter sections and eventually into individual chapters. Table 7 shows coded examples from two interview transcripts. Together, the demographic, thematic, and editorial coding provided a clear audit trail, immediate access to respondent identity, and convenient data resorting.

3.8.3 Reflections on the Data Analysis Process
Midway through the data analysis, the use of software such as NVivo gained acceptance as a preferred methodology. Dr. Bascia and I weighed the merits of reworking the raw data using the NVivo database but decided in favour of the manual data management process that I had developed. In hindsight, what began as a purely practical decision turned out to be an analytical opportunity. My process facilitated more comprehensive analysis than would have
emerged using NVivo because it was possible to recategorize chunks of data in response to the emergence of new, finely nuanced thematic distinctions.

Table 7. Sample Transcript Excerpts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Codes</th>
<th>Thematic Codes and Transcript Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic Levels: (1) Primary or Broad, (2) Secondary or Embedded, (3) Tertiary or Nuanced, and (4) Very Fine-Grained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A period “.” separates each thematic level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Sexes</th>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>Thematic Codes and Transcript Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Admission Policy.structure.internal.constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Ed. Program.outreach.reform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9 Data Presentation

In deciding how to present the research data, it was difficult to weave so much information into a compelling, yet rigorous and coherent narrative. The process required patience, perseverance, multiple revisions to the thematic and editorial codes, and constant reordering of the individual chunks of text. Initially I organized the data into separate chapters for each of the three respondent groups. However, this layout contained repetitive topic introductions and tended to interfere with inter-group comparisons. The data presentation now consists of chapters that each focus on separate topics and that highlight similarities and differences among the three respondent groups. This arrangement may also be helpful to the reader because it corresponds somewhat closely to the key elements and underlying dynamic in the conceptual model.
The chapters that have emerged attest to the range of salient experiences within and among the groups of administrators, Information Form readers, and special group candidates. In most cases, data sources are indicated using respondents’ name codes, but in the case of data that are particularly salient but also sensitive, respondents’ wishes for anonymity have been respected. The writing style complies with the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (5th and 6th Eds.)*, OISE’s Thesis Guide (2011), and the School of Graduate Studies Thesis Template at the University of Toronto (2011).4

3.10 Data Dissemination and Translation

My intention is that data dissemination will be directed toward multiple audiences, including equity and Admission Policy administrators in teacher education, other professional training programs, and higher education generally. There will be effort to channel the findings through conference presentations, conference proceedings, and articles in refereed journals, practitioner handbooks, and related media. I am also open to opportunities for translation depending on demand and funding availability.

3.11 Chapter Summary

Chapter Three described the underlying theory and structure of the research design. It presented the principal actors, and the research methodology which was a qualitative, single case study paradigm. This was followed by a description of the research proposal process, the requirements for ethics review, and information about the research site. Data collection identified the key program documents, the procedures for constructing interview group samples, and the use of demographic coding. Letters of informed consent and interview guides underpinned private conversations with administrators, readers, and special group candidates. The procedure for data analysis incorporated thematic and editorial coding into a series of iterative engagements with individual transcripts and thematic data sections. The chapter concluded with discussion of the formats for data presentation as well as research dissemination and translation.

4 http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/informationfor/students/finup/producingthesis/formatting.htm
Chapter 4

4 Teacher Education Admission Policy Context

4.1 Introduction
This is the first of three data chapters that present administrator, reader, and minority candidate perspectives on Teacher Education Admission Policy and its intended outcome of equitable teacher candidate diversification. Discussion focuses on the admission policy context (Chapter Four), admission policy documents and program qualifications (Chapter Five), and admission procedures (Chapter Six). Discussion shows a variety of perspectives among and between the administrator and reader groups. In Chapter Four, administrators, readers, and minority candidates describe the admission policy context as a dynamic synthesis of external and internal factors. Key elements within the external policy context consist of international competition for the best students, the needs of diverse public school populations, and university policies on human rights and admission. Within the Faculty of Education, the internal policy context is characterized by the Equity Policy, program partnerships with field practitioners, and candidate support services. Although these contextual factors do offer some support to minority candidates, they also shape the admission process in ways that constrain equitable candidate diversification.

4.2 External Admission Policy Context
International competition, the needs of diverse public school populations, and university policies on human rights and admission dominated this program’s external policy context. Administrators, readers, and candidates stated that it was important to maintain the program’s outstanding academic reputation given the high level of international competition among the world’s best universities. Administrators and readers also stated that the needs of increasingly diverse urban school populations were placing new demands on teacher education programs to diversify teacher candidate admission. However, administrators stated that whereas policy decisions were sometimes supported by university policies governing human rights and admission (Appendix G), in this case, the absence of a university level equity policy tended to inhibit equity-based admission policy reform.
4.2.1 International Competition

The growing power of international competition for the best students from domestic as well as foreign populations is forcing teacher education programs to become increasingly competitive. Administrators unanimously stated that their faculty’s distinguished international reputation gave it a sharp competitive edge, but that recent passage of the Equity Policy made preserving that reputation problematic. Many within the faculty opposed the Equity Policy because they perceived it as a form of affirmative action that gave enhanced personal identity and diminished academic performance as qualifications for admission.

Most readers stated that the Equity Policy did imply that academic excellence was no longer this faculty’s foremost qualification for admission, yet several candidates disagreed, stating that they had applied to this faculty in particular because of the value that it placed on both personal identity and academic excellence. For example, CA2 stated that she chose this program because of the university’s “international reputation for excellence”. As well, CD1 said that the program’s “international reputation and strong research base” underpinned her application. In other examples, CF2 stated that “The program’s reputation is one of the best in the world”, CF3 called it “strong”, and CG2 stated that the program had a “highly competitive reputation”. CR5 also said that her choice was based “first on reputation, then location (wanted to be close to home and friends), and then the equity mandate”.

4.2.2 Needs of Diverse Public School Populations

Family immigration from Africa, the Caribbean, Eastern Europe, India, China, and South Asia was placing increasingly heavy linguistic and cultural demands on urban school systems. The needs of immigrant children had to compete with those of indigenous groups such as Canada’s Aboriginal, Inuit, and Métis populations, as well as those of Canada’s official founding populations, the French and the British. The collective needs of so many diverse groups of students created unprecedented challenges for urban teachers, yet some administrators spoke positively about the program’s response to population complexity within the teacher workplace. For example, AD2 stated, “There have been huge changes in the city demographic over time, but certainly, this is a global city and the university prides itself on its global reach and the diversity that takes place within the institution”. However,
many readers expressed concern that the needs of diverse urban school populations should carry even more weight within the preservice program. For example, RI8 advocated candidate diversification from what he called “the practical perspective” of serving diverse school populations that ranged from the inner city to the suburbs. “We want to represent teachers of different cultures in the field because that is the reality of the student population. . . . We want teachers to be representative”. In another example, RI5 said that there were multiple forms of diversity and that the program needed to attract candidates who met students’ needs for both equity sensitivity and diverse representation. She stated, “We need candidates that have some beginning sense of what teaching and learning are about, what the very contexts are in which they will be taking up this professional practice”, and who represent “the diversity we find in our schools at the current time”.

The question of student representation suggests multiple domains such as physical appearance, sexual orientation, language fluency, cultural identification, and academic interests. The selection of a candidate pool that reflects these domains requires an inclusive and carefully drafted admission policy, one grounded in equity and comprehensively articulated in language that is clear to all audiences. As the data presentation continues, it will become clear that this Teacher Education Admission Policy did not fully meet the needs of diverse public school populations.

4.2.3 University Policies on Human Rights and Admission

Another prominent influence within the external policy environment was the set of university policies governing human rights and admission procedures (Appendix G). Administrator familiarity with university policies varied according to personal interest and rank, and seemed surprisingly vague. This group spoke generally about the opportunity to learn from related and comparable policies within the university community but did not refer to any specific documents. For example, AD1 stated, “I think we want to look at our admission processes and the broader university-wide admission processes”. In another example, AD2 pointed out that the university’s new strategic plan “was emphasizing more outreach and more of an equity focus”. As well, AD3 stated that:

The university had been worried about equity for quite some time. . . . There were policies around more equitable treatment of women, of ethnic minorities . . . but as
kind of a staff problem, a human resource problem, kind of responding in a pretty conventional way to issues of fairness.

Only a few readers mentioned the power of university regulations to shape admission policy, and they pointed out that the absence of a campus-wide equity policy made it difficult for pro-equity activists to gain support within the Faculty of Education. Yet this policy gap at the university level gave the Faculty more latitude in devising an equity-based teacher education admission policy.

4.3 Internal Admission Policy Context

Within the Faculty of Education, respondents identified three factors that exerted a powerful and pervasive influence on preservice admission policy: The Equity Policy, program partnerships with field practitioners, and candidate support services.

4.3.1 Faculty of Education Equity Policy

This was the first year in which the Faculty’s Equity Policy (Appendix A) underpinned teacher education admission policy reform. The Equity Policy contained principles of equitable representation and equity sensitivity as well as a mandate for teacher candidate diversification that was to shape “processes for student recruitment, selection, admission and subsequent support and accommodations” (Section D). Administrators stated that they had worked hard to incorporate the mandate into program structures such as admission policy documents, candidate support services, program qualifications, as well as into the procedures for candidate recruitment, reader recruitment, reader training, and candidate assessment. Several readers agreed, saying that equity-based reform manifested as better recruitment of traditionally marginalized candidates, improvements to candidate support services, more inclusive qualifications for program admission, and more equitable procedures for candidate evaluation. Candidates attributed the minority candidate recruitment program and the services for candidate support to the Equity Policy’s “overall influence”, and cited the Faculty’s Equity Policy, academic reputation, and central urban location as the main reasons why they applied to this teacher education program.

This year’s changes to the admission process were substantial, though somewhat expected, in light of several years’ discussion about equity issues. Administrators stated that the needs of
diverse urban school populations were the primary driver behind the Equity Policy initiative and that the principal focus was on increasing representational difference. Some readers disagreed, saying that admission policy focused on increasing the number of candidates who were visibly diverse and those who possessed equity sensitivity. For example, and with reference to one of the admission policy documents, RI9 stated:

The administration here expresses their support for the policy. In terms of the Information Form itself, they have actually put equity down as one of the major sections, and it looks like the biggest one where we want to know your attitudes. If you don’t have the right attitudes then don’t even bother to apply.

AD2 said that the Faculty had been concerned with “bringing people together and trying to make it [equitable practice] a little bit more coherent, trying to bring together research with teacher education and with graduate programs”. As well, AD1 stated that prior to the Equity Policy enactment, admission policy reform had assumed “an ongoing if disjointed role”, and that “there was no way of systematically building on the disparate questions year to year, or of building on the collective knowledge base”. This resulted in a series of what were later recognized as highly frustrating policy changes that tended to lack continuity and coherence, and a reader described this year’s round of reform as in some respects an untimely continuation of past practice:

It’s been changing so often that nobody really knows what’s happening and I do think that’s a problem. At some point we need a little bit more stability so that yeah, so that there’s more understanding throughout, particularly internally I think, about what we actually are doing. (RI8)

AD2 disagreed with this evaluation, stating that the admission process reflected consistency with the university position on equity, and that the Teacher Education Admission Policy provided the public with information that was clear and transparent.

Elaborating on Faculty norms, AD2 explained that equity-based admission policy reform was taking place despite institutional values and policies that were somewhat oppositional:

The overall directions of the Admission Policy, its connection to the rest of the university is certainly something that I end up mediating a lot and its connection to the school and the welfare of the school system externally is again something that I’m concerned about, how we’re seen externally, how we’re serving the system, what the system’s needs are.

Readers who opposed the Equity Policy asked not to be identified, but they disagreed with its “excessive focus” on diversity without regard to the ways in which “affirmative action” and
“unjustified candidate diversification” might damage the program’s reputation for high academic standards. On this very point, AD3 described an “awareness of the need for candidate diversification [that] had surfaced during a quasi-crisis” a few years earlier when evidence had emerged that “The admission process was perhaps unintentionally, but subtly shifting the focus in a way that would disadvantage minority teacher candidates”. In response to this evidence, a small, self-selected, and evolving group of leaders had taken on the responsibility of raising the faculty’s awareness of equity-mindedness. AD1 praised those who had worked behind the scenes to engage faculty support saying, “I think it has been the wonderful leadership of people like our [department] chairs who will go back and have those discussions in their departments” that has made the Equity Policy possible. AD3 agreed that the chairs had been instrumental in the policy’s development and that because of their involvement, “the policy actually calls for reflections of equity issues in research that faculty do”, thereby strengthening the admission process.

Some readers said that external advocacy was responsible for equitable policy reform. For example, RE2 stated, “I think there is a tremendous commitment on the part of this university to social justice and equity”. As well, administrators said that other early equity-minded developments had emerged in part from an iterative approach to reform within the Teacher Education Program that was intended to improve admission policy clarity and transparency. For example, AD2 stated that “When the research shows that nobody knows what’s happening over here . . . we try to get back, take a look at it, have some more discussions, and change it”. AD1 said that the Dean was largely responsible for supporting equity reform and that she offered personal encouragement, “by asking the right questions at the right time that helped me know that I’m being supported in taking those next steps, by providing good wisdom and advice and resources to help make that happen”.

The Dean’s authority seems to have been the lynchpin that enabled movement toward the formalization of the in-house Equity Policy, as were the findings of an internal research team “with a range of expertise in terms of measurement, evaluation, large-scale research methodology design . . . processes, procedures, and . . . issues of reliability” (AD1). This team pointed out the need to balance new initiatives with the identification and removal of pre-existing constraints. Some obstacles that were embedded deeply in the process of
structural change included navigating organizational complexity, balancing excellence and equity, and generating sufficient faculty support for “equity, diversity, and social justice”. Envisioning the years ahead, AD1 hoped that the Equity Policy would contribute to admission policy reform “by applying gentle persistence” to the deliberations about innovation, program priorities, and ways to “increase the acceptance of candidates from traditionally marginalized groups”. This change seemed to be taking place already, because several readers noted that the Equity Policy had prompted them to reconsider the program’s admission policy outcomes. For example, RI3 said:

> There have been criticisms for a long time about the lack of diversity of our teacher candidate pool. . . . I know school boards have blamed us and other faculties of education for failing to produce diverse teaching pools. There’s been an increasingly effective lobby by internationally educated professionals against institutional racism in the form of devaluing the non-Canadian experience.

As well, AD1 believed that growing teacher diversification would support the removal of traditional constraints that overlook “the context of our children and youth in schools in the greater urban area”. In contrast, AD3 expressed lingering reservations about the potential impact of admission policy reform in the absence of an institutional commitment “that would make Equity Policy training mandatory for all faculty and staff, and make equity classes mandatory for all candidates”. A few readers shared his reservations.

### 4.3.2 Program Partnerships with Field Practitioners

Administrators stated that the field practitioners were an influential group with involvement in multi-level decision-making throughout the preservice program. They included retired and practicing teachers, principals, and superintendents, as well as former faculty members, undergraduate instructors from various university departments, and provincial government employees. In describing the practitioner role AD1 stated, “Field partners are embedded in our program and the interaction with them is a conscious strategy”. In another example, AD3 said, “They work in schools with our program. We collaborate with school districts to provision our teacher education program”. The administrators agreed that this close association yielded many benefits, such as strengthening relationships among classroom-based associate teachers and teacher candidates, yet one also said that it tended to anchor the program in traditional ways of thinking and to slow the process of change. To further understand their perspectives, I reviewed the, albeit incomplete, record of practitioner
engagement and discovered that some school system employees had volunteered repeatedly as external readers. It was problematic that the convenience of established district employees exerted such a strong influence over the process for candidate admission, taking precedence over the needs of diverse school populations and the admission policy goal of equitable candidate diversification.

Most readers also acknowledged that field practitioners were a powerful voice within the admission process, though it bears noting that the external readers were themselves field practitioners. RE4 described her own experiences to illustrate their value:

I was at this faculty in the capacity of practicum coordinator and director of the school-university partners office as well as an instructor in the B.Ed. program from 2000 to 2003, and when I moved back to the provincial office, one of my portfolios was liaison to this faculty. So I’ve always had an interest in teacher education. I read Information Forms while I was at this faculty in an employment function and I continued that into my work at the provincial office.

As well, RE2 stated that practitioners brought an important perspective to the admission process, and that field-based learning was much more valuable than instruction at the Faculty of Education. Some internal readers agreed with this point of view. For example, RI9 said that field practitioners understand the needs of diverse students, enabling them to play an important role in supporting teacher candidate diversification:

The Faculty of Education recognizes that this province is a multicultural society and that there are people with diverse backgrounds in terms of race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, levels of ability, religion, creed, and all those areas. It is not a Eurocentric community and the school staff should reflect this to be so.

Yet other internal readers discounted the contributions from field practitioners. For example, RI2 said that readers who work within the Faculty “know so much more about what candidates need to learn”.

Of growing concern to administrators and some readers was the fact that many field practitioners did not support equitable candidate diversification, and this raised questions about their role in the admission process. As RI5 stated, the focus of program policy “has shifted recently from the relationship between theory and practice to . . . what effective field partners look like and the facets of effective partners”, yet external readers continued to exert a powerful influence over the admission process. Many of them opposed the mandate for
candidate diversification, expressing heterosexist and racist biases against Aboriginals, gendered/invisible, and racialized/visible candidates.

4.3.3 Candidate Support Services

Candidates identified three support services that encouraged them to apply to this program: A part-time Equity Officer, access to Registrarial Staff, and eligibility for financial assistance. The Equity Officer’s role was to assist with questions about the new, equity-based program initiatives. For example, AD1 said that the Equity Officer was “responsible for mentoring and supporting teacher candidates, instructors, and associate teachers in the area of equity”. The Equity Officer worked in the Department of Student Services, a logistical decision intended to offer relative anonymity to candidates who found themselves victimized by harassment and discrimination.

Several candidates said how valuable it was for them to have free access to an Equity Officer, and that the service was especially supportive for candidates who were non-white, first in their families to attend university, and members of gendered minorities. For example, CG2 described the Equity Officer’s availability as evidence of a commitment to advantaging candidates who were “under-represented in schools across Canada”. As well, CM1 said that the program’s decision to fund this position was a way of “trying to iron out some of the inequalities that exist in society”. However, not all candidates were well served by the Equity Office. For example, CG1 said, “It almost seems as though she’s token in many ways”, and CA2 stated that the Equity Officer’s role within the program needs to be clarified in the Candidate Handbook.

A few candidates described contact with the Registrarial Staff as another valuable support service. For example, CM2 said that their information session was an opportunity to learn what to expect on the Candidate Information Form, such as the emphasis on “what you’re going to bring to the table from a diversity standpoint rather than necessarily having X number of hours of volunteer experience in a classroom setting, which was a shift”. In another example, and as a Visible Minority, CR4 said she had taken advantage of a personal interview in the spring “to make myself more competitive”, and that “It was very helpful to be told, ‘Yes, we’re looking for this type of people. You need this’, and to actually get feedback on my kind of qualifications”. As well, CD1 stated that her disability was not “of a
typical nature”, that she had needed clarification about eligibility for disabled support, and that she had asked “whether I had to provide medical evidence, a medical letter, whatever, beforehand, and no, I did not. I was surprised by that and somewhat relieved”. However, another candidate said that she had consulted Registrarial Staff several times about the purpose of the special group categories, but to no avail.

Some readers also mentioned the value of supporting candidate contact with the Registrarial Staff, though the only one with information about the quality of service said that it fell short of candidate expectations. For example, RI3 stated that Registrarial Staff were in a position to “positively promote the program’s commitment to equity”, but that some candidates had been treated as if they “had a disability, or were one of those damaged types of people who is diverse, who is ethnic . . . and in need of diversity services, a kind of repair”. Yet Registrarial Staff played only a peripheral role during admission policy development and did not receive any Equity Policy training until after the preservice application deadline. Training prior to the preservice application period might have benefitted Registrarial Staff and the candidates that they served.

Administrators and candidates described candidate access to a Financial Assistance Fund as another important equity-based support service, though access to it was problematic. On the one hand AD1 stated, that financial assistance had long been a cornerstone of this teacher education program, and that “We give out, I think it’s about $1.2 million . . . in the form of bursaries and support for candidates, so from the socioeconomic end that would be an important message for students to receive”. On the other hand, she expressed concern that there was so little information about how to access the Fund that few minority candidates applied for support. Candidates pointed out that the Fund’s application deadline was a full year ahead of the program’s admission deadline. For example, CG3 said that this made it “very difficult for some kinds of minority candidates to take advantage of” and that even that early deadline made it “too late for some women of colour” because acceptance notifications were sent too late for them to access other sources of financial support. In another example, CG3 said that in order for candidates to benefit from the Fund:

There needed to be much more information about financial assistance in the Handbook and on the program website. . . . Eligibility for support was too closely tied to provincial regulations that discriminated on the basis of things like marital status.
Those systems are so intertwined that if you don’t cross that one hurdle then you’re not eligible for the next.

In an era of escalating tuition and rising incidental academic expenses, candidate difficulty in accessing financial assistance undermined the mandate for equitable candidate diversification.

4.4 Chapter Summary

Chapter Four presented administrator, reader, and minority candidate discussion of the Teacher Education Admission Policy context, identifying a dynamic relationship between external and internal contextual factors. These respondents focused on three key elements within the external policy context: International competition for the best students, the needs of diverse public school populations, and university policies on human rights and admission. Within the internal policy context, respondents stated that the following factors exerted a powerful influence over admission policy development and implementation: The Faculty of Education Equity Policy, program partnerships with field practitioners, and candidate support services. In combination, these contextual factors both supported and constrained equitable candidate diversification.
Chapter 5

5 Teacher Education Admission Policy

5.1 Introduction

This data chapter presents administrator, reader, and minority candidate perspectives on three areas of admission policy that linked most directly to the equity-based mandate for teacher candidate diversification: Admission policy instrumentation, program qualifications, and admission policy articulation. Administrators expressed only positive impressions of the admission policy, but readers and candidates diverged substantially in their responses to the policy structures. In relation to the use of special group categories to identify candidates for preferential admission, they raised issues of institutional elitism, homophobia, and racism. As well, candidates drew a sharp distinction between special groups based on subject specialization and those based on personal identity.

The use of personal essays to capture candidates’ learning and professional goals also met with mixed responses from readers and candidates. In particular, essay content and the instructions for essay completion were contested issues. Discussion about admission policy articulation focused on two sources of stress and inconvenience to minority candidates, admission policy gaps, and last-minute admission policy changes. There were policy gaps in the regulations for qualification precedence and weighting, minority status disclosure, and special group precedence and quotas. Last minute policy changes either altered existing policy or revealed new information in a way that left candidates feeling marginalized and disadvantaged.

5.2 Admission Policy Instrumentation

Admission policy instrumentation conveys essential program information to multiple audiences such as administrators, admission personnel, minority candidates, and the public at large. This Faculty of Education did not publish its admission policy, providing instead three separate instruments: The Candidate Handbook, the Candidate Information Form, and the Information Form Assessment Rubric. Perspectives on the Handbook and the Information Form is presented here as background to the discussion about program qualifications and policy articulation. Perspectives on the Assessment Rubric are included later in the
discussion about Information Form assessment. Although much of the information was consistent across all three documents, some instructions were contradictory, and some policy details were nowhere to be found.

5.2.1 Candidate Handbook and Candidate Information Form

The Candidate Handbook (Appendix B) provided much, though not all, of the information that candidates needed to know about the admission process. It was organized into sections (Figure 2), though information about topics such as candidate selection appeared in several places and was not always clear. The Candidate Information Form (Appendix C) recorded candidates’ non-academic qualifications for admission by tracking certain types of minority status and through four personal essays that asked candidates to describe their goals and accomplishments, as well as what they had learned about teaching from their previous experiences. Several readers pointed to the inclusive language in both admission documents as evidence of an equitable attitude toward traditionally marginalized candidates. For example, RI1 said:

This year as part of our push to be more transparent and consistent with other institutional practices, we’ve adopted the language and categories from StatsCan5 and we adopted the categories from StatsCan which mostly align themselves with some of these other categories to provide more specificity to individuals.

The move toward harmonization with Canada’s national database made the language of the Admission Policy more accessible to candidates from other regions of the country and created an institutional dialect that more closely resembled that found on immigration and other public service forms. In another example, RI9 said that the Handbook reached out to diverse communities with statements such as, “We’d like you among our teacher candidates because we need to have a diverse teaching population . . . in terms of race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, levels of ability, religion”.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) Degree Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Admission Requirements and the Selection of Candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>English Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Academic Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Background Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Selection Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Internationally Educated Teachers (IET) Admission Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Candidate Information Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Completing the Candidate Information Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Personal Information and Program Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sections of the Candidate Information Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Verification Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Final Notes About Your Candidate Information Form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Candidate Handbook: Main sections.

Most candidates also said that their “first impression” of the Handbook was encouraging because of the outreach to special, traditionally marginalized groups. For example, CG2 stated how the “surprisingly extensive volume of information” reassured minority candidates that they would feel at home, and be welcome members of this academic community. Similarly, CR1 stated that the Handbook descriptions of the Equity Policy and of how “special group categories and classifications would play out in the admissions process” were very supportive.

Yet the range of candidate diversity described in the Handbook did not carry forward into the special group categories on the Candidate Information Form. Figure 3 lists the Information Form’s main sections, and makes it clear that many minorities such as gender and religious minorities were excluded from the list of special groups (see Section 2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td>Surname, Given names, Application #, Street, City or Town, Province, Postal Code, Email address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Special Group Checkboxes</td>
<td>Aboriginals, Disabled Persons, Native French Speakers, Men in Grades K-6, Visible Minorities, Women in Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grade Levels &amp; Teaching Subjects</td>
<td>For Grades K-6 and 4-10, indicate one teaching subject. For Grades 7-12, indicate two teaching subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>International Status Checkbox</td>
<td>For internationally licensed teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>General Instructions</td>
<td>Submission deadline, formatting details, instructions for completion; full details available in the Candidate Handbook (strongly recommended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Personal Essays</td>
<td>Motivation, prior experience, knowledge of equity, other accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Signatures</td>
<td>Candidate and three verifiers who will confirm the answers to the second essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Office Use Only</td>
<td>Date received, coded boxes, other blank boxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3. Candidate Information Form: Main sections.*

Summing up the administrator perspective, AD2 stated that with the Equity Policy in mind, “We decided to take a look at our Candidate Information Form to make it more inclusive”. Several readers supported the way that it focused on candidates’ incoming knowledge and skills (see Section 6). For example, RI6 said that “Its most fundamental purpose was to try to get a sense of how an individual will interact with students”. In another example, RI4 stated:

> This Information Form does allow potential candidates to talk a little bit about their thinking about issues of equity and diversity that we didn’t have in the past. I think it also gives you a little bit of insight into their language around those particular issues, what experience they’ve had, if any, and . . . how they’re taking up that particular question in our current society.

In other examples, candidates described the close relationship between the *Handbook* and the Candidate Information Form. CA2 said how important the *Handbook* had been when it came to writing the essays on the Candidate Information Form because it showed “straightforward examples of suitable types of prior experiences”, and CA1 said that “If they didn’t give those examples, I think it would have been really, really difficult”. As well, CR5 stated that the
examples “had produced a better, sort of more succinct impression of what the program was offering, what was expected from candidates”, and that she had “used the wording in the Handbook to try to fit her answers in the essay questions”. In other examples, CR3 said “The program information was thorough and accessible. This was great because I was pressed for time and just wanted to focus on how to write”, and CR4 stated, “If you had your Information Form, you took the Handbook and they said this is what we’re looking for and this is the type of answers we need”. She also said the Handbook was so informative that “This was the only program that I ended up applying to”.

Yet not all candidates found the Handbook helpful. For example, CF1 said that it was disorganize, frustrating and “just made it hard” by setting such high expectations about how much information candidates could squeeze into the limited essay spaces on the Candidate Information Form. Her comments were among the first of many that emerged as most candidates found themselves struggling to find additional information about completing their applications.

5.2.2 The Internet’s Role in the Admission Process

This year the Internet played an essential role in the admission process, though in a way that both supported and disadvantaged minority candidates. The Candidate Handbook was published online as well as in print format, and candidates were required to complete their Information Forms in a single online session. Administrators and several readers described the Internet’s new role as a positive development. For example, AD1 said that the decision to create an electronic version of the Handbook was a great step forward: “Anybody can go to our website and read a bit about our Teacher Education Program . . . we have discussion groups for those interested in Islamic issues . . . and a discussion group for gay/lesbian/transgender/bisexual students”. In another example, RI9 said, “It shows that we are in fact committed to this Equity Policy . . . in terms of moving from a paper Information Form to a fully online Information Form.” As well, RI7 stated, “Now they’re able to do Internet access, which we hope will be easier for them at the submissions stage as well”.

A couple of candidates and readers said that they took advantage of the Handbook’s Internet format. For instance, CF2 said that while she and another candidate had been exploring the online Handbook, they discovered that special group affiliation would increase their chances
of acceptance and decided to apply to this program. As well, CR5 said that the admission statistics were helpful, “I looked at stats of the program. It said X people will apply, X people will be accepted”, and that without the online Handbook and Candidate Information Form it would have been impossible for her to apply in time from her home in South Asia.

However many readers and candidates perceived the requirement that candidates complete their Information Forms online as problematic. For example, RI2 said, “You have to have a computer. Otherwise you won’t be able to write or to submit anything”, yet neither the Handbook nor the Candidate Information Form described this technical requirement. Most candidates said that they had expected to be able to print out a blank Information Form, to complete it by hand or by using a typewriter, and that it came as a shock that this was not the case. As well, they experienced another setback by being unable to save their work and by having to complete their Information Forms in a single session. Furthermore, they said that it was very difficult to deal with the expense and inconvenience of spending so much time on the Internet. For example, CG3 attributed this situation to classist assumptions about candidates’ social capital and about the resources that they had access to in their neighbourhood schools. She stated:

How about people that come from really impoverished families . . . don’t have a computer? What are they going to do if they don’t know anyone with a computer in their communities? Their schools may not give access to a computer, or maybe they don’t let you print on a computer.

In other examples, CM1 objected to “the nuisance of having to complete the Form in a single Internet session”, and CR5 said that “Completing the application process for this program required more work than any other program on my target list”. As well CA1 stated:

It was Internet only and there was no “Save” function, creating inequities for candidates who do not have unlimited computer access. You couldn’t save it and so you had to do it all at once and then print it out. Otherwise you would have to start all over again to edit. . . . So I guess it makes some assumptions about your access to technology . . . and I think it would be great if they could find something where you could actually work on it progressively.

These examples illustrate how the Internet’s role in the admission process overlooked the fact that minority candidate often have lower incomes than their mainstream peers. For admission policy instrumentation to be truly equitable, the burden that it places on individual candidates must be commensurate with their personal resources.
5.3 Program Qualifications

This teacher education program required candidates to meet both academic and non-academic qualifications. The academic qualifications were a straightforward combination of GPA and, in some cases, undergraduate course prerequisites, but the non-academic qualifications took into account candidates’ identity as well as their incoming knowledge and skills. Non-academic qualifications were recorded on a Candidate Information Form which tracked candidates’ identity with set of special group checkboxes, and candidates’ knowledge and skills through four structured essays.

5.3.1 Academic Qualifications

In continuation of past practice, this year’s academic qualifications required candidates to achieve a floating academic cut-off point, or minimum GPA, that was determined by the ratio of applications to available positions. For example, AD1 stated that this year’s minimum GPA was a “C” average in the candidate’s most recent undergraduate or graduate degree. Many readers said that they favoured a mid-level GPA in order to advance a wider spectrum of candidates. For example, RE2 stated:

I don’t think that a high academic cut-off point should be the only determining factor in making you a good teacher…. Rather than raise the academic score cut off, I would rather keep it at 75% and attract [more] candidates than raise it to 85% and attract [fewer] candidates. I’m not saying that the [special] categories that we identify here would not be represented in a score . . . of 85%. I just think that we’ve got to look at a broader spectrum.

There were also undergraduate subject-based qualifications for candidates specializing in Grades 4-10 and 7-12, though the prerequisites were negotiable in some cases, and some readers questioned their relevance. For example, RI4 said that “They could be more helpful if there was more alignment with courses that are of value to what a teacher needs to know and be able to do in the classroom”. Another reader questioned the differences in the number of required prerequisites: None for Grades J/K to 6, one for Grades 4 to 10, and two for Grades 7-12, saying that there was a need for greater academic consistency.

5.3.2 Non-Academic Qualifications Based on Candidate Identity

Within the set list of special group categories on the Candidate Information Form (Figure 3) candidates identified three that were based on personal identity. Because there were no
external policies that prescribed which minorities should be singled out for preferential admission, program administration were at liberty to choose which special groups they would include on the Candidate Information Form. Some readers and candidates supported the list of special group categories; however others opposed its exclusionary structure and challenged it as evidence of institutional elitism, homophobia, and racism. Several candidates also perceived the list as indicative of institutional homophobia. Their discussion also offers new perspectives on the nuances of labeling identity. Finally, many candidates discussed disambiguation of the special group categories, distinguishing those based on subject specialization from those based on personal identity. Their insights show how policy that is intended to be inclusive and supportive actually undermines its targeted beneficiaries.

5.3.2.1 Support for Privileging Special Groups of Candidates

Those who supported preferential admission for minority groups perceived the list of special groups as a useful way of making the admission process more equitable and responsive to market demand. Administrators explained them as a response to system requirements for specific kinds of teachers. For example, AD2 stated:

It had to do with the needs of the system for more visible minority teachers . . . more French speaking teachers . . . and it tended to fluctuate to advantage candidates who would increase the diversity of the teacher candidate pool in a way that represents the needs of the system. . . . We're limited by what we can ask, so we have visible minorities, a category that we have monitored, gender . . . disabilities.

About half of the readers expressed support for privileging special groups and most said that they were satisfied with the special group categories. For instance, RI9 said that inviting minority candidates to declare special group status helped “to attract as many candidates in these areas as possible”. As well, RI7 stated that special group recognition sounded “a remarkable shift in tone”, and “worked like a beacon by telling the whole world out there that we are interested in having these individuals in the teaching profession”. In other examples, RI9 said that offering admission priority to the six special groups was clear proof of the Program’s commitment to admitting more minority candidates, and RI7 said that “Adding more categories would just slow readers down”.

Most candidates described the special groups as a welcome sign of this program’s commitment to diversity. For example, CM1 stated:
I think this Faculty of Education and the University have been incredible at reaching out to diverse segments of the population because the local urban schools are so diverse and I believe by giving advantages to minority applicants they were trying to iron out some of the inequalities that exist in society. . . . They said there’s special access for people, they encourage First Nations people, people of diverse backgrounds and minority applicants who apply . . . self-identified, and I took it more to mean based on race . . . and ethno-cultural background because it is visible persons they usually say as opposed to somebody who’s geo-racialized or something.

In other examples, CR4 said that “It’s a good thing so that you ensure that the needs of the student population are met” and CF3 said that all the categories were useful because they made it possible for the program to “serve the population better . . . by making sure that the teachers would be able to share something with the kids”. As well, CG1 stated that preferential admission “should actually be used for the purposes of diversifying the teaching profession so that the teachers that go out there look like their students”. In other instances, CA2 said that the special group checkboxes showed how the Equity Policy “was implied in the application process”, CF3 said that they were especially reassuring to “invisible minorities” such as disabled people and Aboriginals, and CR4 said that the checkboxes gave her a sense of entitlement:

Ok, so, there is a goal. It’s a good thing to identify yourself if the goal is to make sure that they’re actually recruiting, to make sure that they represent members of visible persons within the school setting as teachers. I’m one of those, and I believe I worked hard enough and I have good credentials, and it’s good also to see not only do I have these, but I also fit into this group that you want to have in the schools.

Yet the readers and candidates who supported preferential admission for special groups also challenged the exclusion of so many minorities from the special group list. Many perceived this practice as an indication of institutional elitism, homophobia, and racism.

5.3.2.2 Institutional Elitism
Several readers described the practice of privileging some groups over others as elitist because the short, closed list of special groups perpetuated the exclusion of many traditionally marginalized candidates. For example, RI1 said that she had been on the committee responsible for this year’s special group categories, and that there had been extensive debate over how many and which groups to include. In the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States, religious diversity had been the most
contentious issue. Its exclusion was ultimately justified by the fact that candidates could describe religious affiliation in their personal essays.

In another example, RI3 said that the Program was contravening the Equity Policy by including so few special group categories. She advocated “research into a census-like array of tracking candidates . . . to seek out information about as many protected grounds as possible, grounds that are protected under the [provincial] Human Rights Code”, and stated that the current set of special groups favoured some traditionally marginalized candidates over others:

I could well be a Canadian born person of Chinese descent . . . part of a privileged ethnic-cultural and racial special group living in a huge urban Chinese community, think equity is an absurd idea, have little regard for black people or Aboriginal people, or any of the people most systemically disadvantaged by our system, think that my race has never really bothered me, and get in ahead of say a white working-class person who had no category by which to identify, who is an advocate for equity, who did better on the equity question, but didn’t manage to tick off the box like the Chinese person. . . . And it would be equally absurd, just in case I end up sounding like I don’t think a Chinese identity is at all useful, not to have accepted the Chinese person because Chinese people are under-represented in our school system.

In other perceptions of elitism, RE2 said that the Information Form should have categories that recognize “socioeconomic need and sexual preference”, and RI9 said that in recent years some candidates had inserted their own category for sexual orientation because it was missing from the list.

Candidates concern about institutional elitism was in fact quite widespread. For example, CF3 questioned the practice of tracking special group affiliation saying, “If you don’t consider the special group categories you’re discriminating, and then if you do, you’re in a way discriminating as well”. In another example, CG1 questioned whether any form of discrimination might be justified “in order to correct past injustices”. As well, CA1 asked, “How equitable is it to privilege certain types of identification over others?” She also said that she was personally conflicted over taking advantage of preferential admission policy:

I was not entirely comfortable with ticking a special group checkbox if that means getting an extra privilege, because that would be counter to the program’s Equity Policy. I understand the Equity Policy and . . . it’s not for privilege. It’s for equity and giving people . . . putting people at the same starting place is how I understood it when I looked at it.
In another instance, CF2 considered the impact of the Equity Policy:

Such a small and discrete number of minority categories is a breakdown between the equity philosophy and the Candidate Information Form because any fixed set of checkboxes limits how candidates can identify themselves”.

These concerns point to the limitations of using a pre-determined, closed list of special group categories to identify and encourage minority candidate applications.

5.3.2.3 Homophobia

Many candidates perceived the absence of a special group for sexual orientation as indicative of institutional homophobia. For example, CR6 said:

I do notice there isn’t any box for homosexuals, gays, or lesbians. And, I’m … but, now that I see this here, I think, whether someone would want to check that off, I don’t know. Maybe some people would feel uncomfortable doing that or maybe some people would have no problem. I noticed that group is not on there. I think it should be on there.

In another example, CF2 stated that the program ought to be concerned about “how someone who is not strictly heterosexual would feel about this application”. As well, CG3 said that she had checked off the Visible Minority category and “hoped for the best”, but only by default in the absence of an LGBT category. She also stated that “The program’s willingness to acknowledge me as a visible minority but not as a lesbian . . . was just another attempt to homogenize special group identities”. Perhaps the most aggressive victim response to the exclusion of gendered minorities came from CG1 who added a gendered box to his Information Form:

I tested it by adding a sexual minorities box . . . many people that saw my application before I submitted it, they begged me to take out the box that I added . . . to white out the Queer or LGBT box and I refused to and I said, “No, this is a political move. If they don’t accept me because of that then I can’t do anything and I don’t want to go into an institution like that anyway because that just signifies to me, or clarifies a lot of understanding that I have about this institution”. So if they were to deny me based on that factor it was meant to be. I’m not meant to go there and I definitely don’t want to go there if that’s their attitude. . . . The reason why I did it is because my identity is very important to me. I am Canadian and I’m very proud of that but I’m also proud of being Chinese and I don’t see why there can’t be that duality. I struggled for a very long time feeling like I had to choose, you couldn’t be one or the other, that the two couldn’t coincide together or you couldn’t co-exist. . . . So I decided after all that struggle that I am proud to be who I am, that I am a queer Asian man, I’m Chinese, and I am Canadian.
CG1’s passionate narrative addresses not only the Information Form’s omission of a special group for gendered minorities but the dilemma faced by candidates who had to choose only one special group affiliation. In another example, CG2 stated:

There are very particular groups that this program appears to want to have identified . . . highly visible groups. I imagine that this program, given its equity statements, can’t just speak to the poster people of special groups who exhibit or who are visible special groups. It really has to do more than that. It has to speak to the experience of being marginalized and what that means and . . . to strive a little bit harder to be truly equitable.

Furthermore, CR6 said that there should be a box for gender minorities, and that “I don’t know anyone who is part of that group and who is a teacher or a teacher candidate”. Her comment may have said more about how institutional homophobia discouraged gays and lesbians from disclosing their sexual orientation than it did about her personal network in the preservice program.

Candidates also linked the problem of a homophobic admission policy to issues in the classroom. For example, CG1 said, “Sexual minorities, 10% of the general population are taken to be queer, though no statistics are available . . . and that’s hard to determine because you can’t determine someone’s sexuality unless they tell you”. As well, CA1 said that for the sake of serving the student populations in schools, the Information Form needs a category for sexual orientation. Furthermore, CG2 stated:

If there been a sexual special group, I would gladly have ticked it . . . They say they’re looking for Aboriginal groups, they say people with disabilities, but they have nothing there for sexual minorities or gender minorities. So in a sense it’s reflecting our political culture and what it means to get a job in our culture rather than what it actually means to target and want to include people who are marginalized or part of equity-seeking groups. I saw that disconnect and I felt that this program is like any other institution: high-minded ideals but in practice it’s actually probably disconnected . . . So it gave me pause and it gave me a reason to think that I’m going to have just as much of a struggle here, because in a sense their high-minded policies haven’t really funneled down to the practice . . . If the people reading this Information Form weren’t homophobic, I would be welcome as a student that this program really needs, that school boards across this province really need . . . simply because we’re an under-represented group.

In another instance, CG3 said she was very disappointed that:

There wasn’t a category for people identifying as LGBT. I have mixed feelings about it because of my ancestry but at the same time I think it’s very important that the university be aware of this kind of applicant and be representational of the population as a whole . . . If there had been a category for LGBT special group affiliation I would have ticked it along with visible persons. In my essays I did make a point of
mentioning that I’m lesbian because I think that’s an important part of who I am. I have no intention of coming into school and being other than who I am so they may as well know from the get go.

CG3’s determination to disclose her lesbianism at work was especially important because it ran counter to the local school boards’ unwritten but inviolable policy against gay and lesbian teachers’ revealing their homosexuality in the classroom.

CR1 described how homophobia undermines student populations:

Diversity encompasses so many different things in terms of . . . racial diversity, cultural diversity, in terms of gender, sexual orientation, learning ability. . . I guess being sensitive to the diversity and the diverse needs of students in your class and responding to those, being sensitive in responding to those needs is quite important. I mean to treat your class or your school just like a homogenous group I think is when you could kind of negatively affect certain people.

These examples show how the omission of a special group for gendered minorities reflected a homophobic admission policy, ignored the needs of LGBT students in public school classrooms, and fell short of the Equity Policy mandate for teacher candidate diversification.

5.3.2.4 Racism

Although the Candidate Information Form contained a special group category for Visible Minorities, many readers and candidates expressed concern about racism as an institutional norm. For example, RI3 stated:

There have been criticisms for a long time about the lack of diversity of our teacher candidate pool . . . I know school boards have blamed us and other faculties of education for failing to produce diverse teaching pools. There’s been an increasingly effective lobby by internationally educated professionals that institutional racism in the form of devaluing the non-Canadian experience, that’s been an enormous barrier.

Candidates attributed their impressions of racism to several factors. For instance, CF2 said, “If I didn’t know this university’s reputation and I saw that Information Form, I think I would be horrified to see all these special group categories that you have to tick off according to your culture or race”. In another example, CG2 said that collecting data on special group affiliation perpetuated marginalization “by forcing people to stand out. . . I’ve experienced enough racism and homophobia in my lifetime that I did not want to come to an institution and have to feel the exact same thing”. As well, CA2 stated that the special group for Aboriginals would work against Aboriginal candidates because many city-based post-
secondary educators were biased against Reserve-educated students. Furthermore, CA1 described a classmate’s experience of racism: “A black friend of mine is from Barbados, which is predominantly black. She never experienced racism there, yet here she is a visible minority who deals with it daily”.

Some candidates also exhibited racism in their opposition to special group categories for race or ancestry. For example, CM1 stated:

I am listed as a minority only because I’m a white male applying to teach the primary grades, which implies to me that were I to select the secondary levels I would no longer be listed as a minority. So there could be . . . you could construe it as disadvantaged in that way that suddenly you lose your special group affiliation.

In another example, CM2 said that he supported treating every candidate equally and was firmly opposed to equity-driven advantages for visible minority candidates. The previous year, he had tried unsuccessfully to gain admission as a majority candidate and said this about the process: “My belief, as politically incorrect as it is, is that my language skills, in English particularly, are greater than [those of] the majority of people who are speaking English as their second language, and they got in”. These comments show how the process for admitting candidates with minority identity did not screen for equity sensitivity.

5.3.2.5 Special Group Labeling

Many candidates stated that decontextualized labeling misrepresented many Aboriginal, disabled, gendered, and racialized minority candidates. For example, CR3 stated:

There are problems with the disabilities, the types of disabilities, and even with Aboriginal persons. It’s pretty routine, but if you’re half Aboriginal, and then a member of a visible special group . . . there are various forms of visible persons. I am a visible minority but I was born and raised in Canada so that might exclude me from that group if they’re comparing me with groups that just came from another country, that have a teaching degree, and their English is not as good as mine but they still have qualifications from another country. . . . They need to have subgroups . . . to further explain . . . not status but identity . . . that I did go to school here.

In another example, CF2 said:

Such a small and discrete number of minority categories . . . understates the difference within individual groups. . . . The checkbox labels could mean different

---

6 Historical Treaties between Aboriginal/Native Bands and the Government of Canada define the Status rights of Aboriginal Canadians and require many of them to live on Indian Reserves to avoid forfeiting some of their Status privileges (Tiller, 1996).
things for different people, and in specific cases. . . . There is a wide range of mental and physical disabilities, just as there are significant differences between an Aboriginal person who’s lived their whole life on a Reserve and an Aboriginal person who had one Aboriginal grandparent but who’s grown up in the city.

CF2 also stated that the checkboxes oversimplified candidate identities, and pointed out the need for more information about what kinds of mental and physical conditions were eligible disabilities: “Such a small and discrete number of minority categories is a breakdown between the equity philosophy and the Candidate Information Form because any fixed set of checkboxes limits how candidates can identify themselves”. In another example, CR3 said, “Which visible persons are less visible within our teaching profession? Which groups are represented more than others? What’s important is . . . getting it to be more even”. So much ambiguity arising from decontextualized labeling made it difficult for many candidates to identify comfortably with the special group categories.

5.3.2.6 Special Group Disambiguation

Although the policy of preferential admission for candidates who belonged to the special groups was intended to support equitable candidate diversification, candidates were troubled by the way that these groups conflated multiple forms of identity. They proposed an alternative way of representing candidate demographics that designated personal and subject identities as broad classifications and the special group categories as narrow classifications. Table 6 illustrates this scaffolding. Candidates identified three subgroups based on subject specialization: Native French Speakers, Men in Grades K-12, and Women in Physics; as well as four subgroups based on personal identity: Aboriginals, Disabled Persons, Gendered/Invisible Persons, and Racialized/Visible Persons. Although some might suggest that Native French Speakers is also a personal identity subgroup, classifying it as a subject specialization is consistent with the candidate perspective. Candidates also stated that disclosing subject identity was usually a pragmatic and safe procedure, whereas disclosing personal identity was always a delicate and stressful political decision that was fraught with vulnerabilities. The discussion continues with candidate perspectives on each of the special group categories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups (3)</th>
<th>Name Codes</th>
<th>Sexes</th>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policymakers / Administrators (3)</td>
<td>AD1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externals (4)</td>
<td>RE1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internals (9)</td>
<td>RI1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native French Speakers (3)</td>
<td>CF1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CF2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CF3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men in Grades K-6 (2)</td>
<td>CM1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in Physics (1)</td>
<td>CW1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginals (2)</td>
<td>CA1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Persons (1)</td>
<td>CD1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendered/Invisible Persons (3)</td>
<td>CG1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CG2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CG3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racialized/Visible Persons (6)</td>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.3 Non-Academic Qualifications Based on Subject Specialization

Although candidates described subject-based minority status as relatively safe from institutional harm, they also raised concerns about the each of the subject-based labels. They addressed issues of label ambiguity, disrespect for cultural norms, sexism, and disregard for market demand in a way that sheds new light on the seemingly straightforward practice of identity labeling.

5.3.3.1 Native French Speakers

Readers interpreted this special group category as a response to the need for more French teachers, especially given growth in the number of French Immersion schools, yet they also described it as very ambiguous. Some said that it included anyone who had attended school in French, others that the category belonged to candidates with at least one French-speaking adult at home. Still more said that this category only included natives of the province of Québec where French is the official language, and another group said that it included Francophones from anywhere in Canada.

Candidates offered slightly different perspectives. They said that this Native French Speakers could refer to Francophones (French-speaking persons) from the French province of Québec, any other predominantly French region of Canada, or candidates from any other French-speaking country. For example, CR5 stated:

Is this category here because Canada is a bilingual country or do they want it to get more French teachers? . . . It makes a difference where people are from because French accents are pretty varied around the world and even across our country.

In another example, CF3 expressed concerned about the importance of language in matching the teacher pool to the needs of students in the classroom:

Special group categories may over-generalize the sameness of candidates with common heritage. . . . I taught a lot of kids in the French school systems who were coming directly from African countries and it’s like this child from the Congo is not the same as that child from the Congo.

As well, CR1 questioned whether this category was intended to assess qualifications for future French teachers or whether “It’s just the diversity kind of thing. I would suspect that it was more on the diversity side of things than on subject area”.

Another group of candidates interpreted the Native French speaker category as a label for Canadians who learned French as part of the mandatory public school curriculum or while living in another country. For example, CA1 assumed that the French category was mandatory because French is one of Canada’s official languages, but she also acknowledged that “It could represent a variety of candidates from Québec, elsewhere in Canada, and from the international Francophone community”. In a similar example, CG1 said that “If you’re from Senegal or one of the other colonized countries is that going to get you in, or are they looking for Québécois French?” This question took into account Canada’s long-standing and often fractious relationship between those in the French-speaking province of Québec and those in the rest of Canada’s Aboriginal Reserves, predominantly English-speaking provinces, and mostly indigenous territories.

In other instances, candidates experienced personal discomfort over interpreting the designation. For example, CF2 was uncertain whether she qualified as a French candidate because she had grown up in a bilingual home and worried that the French category might apply only to Francophones from unilingual homes. She also said that this labeling was “insulting” because it overlooked the fact that many Canadians grow up in multilingual families and are therefore “native speakers of several languages”. In another example, CF1 said that she objected to the term Native French Speaker instead of the more respectfully and internationally recognized term Francophone. She also stated that, as a Canadian, she found it “highly offensive” to be portrayed as a member of a special group. In contrast, CF3 took no offense from the category label, saying that “The Francophone category was unusual in an academic program application” and that it had given her encouragement because, “It might tip the balance in my favour if all things were equal in regard to other applications”.

5.3.3.2 Men in Grades K-6

Some readers interpreted this category as a simple logistical strategy for drawing more men into the primary grades, yet others objected to privileging any special groups on the basis of sex, and a few said that it was inappropriate to designate men for special consideration at any teaching level. For example, RI2 stated:

I don’t find that males are necessarily underprivileged, even if they are teaching primary school. I mean, there may be fewer of them, but they don’t fit with some of these others where people are actually marginalized in the education system.
For example, CF1 said that the category probably existed because of a need to match teacher and student populations and to advantage a traditionally marginalized group. In another example, CF3 said that because of public concern about male pedophiles, “It might be more difficult for these people to be successful in applying” and that this category would encourage men interested in teaching Grades K-6. CM1’s remarks confirmed her point of view:

Well special group affiliation is valuable. There is some measure of worth to being considered a minority . . . in this context, in the context of entering a profession where there is encouragement . . . to have certain types of people teaching at specific levels.

In other examples drawn from personal experience, CM2 stated that he felt “encouraged by the little box”, and discussed what an unusual experience it was for him to be considered part of a special group: “I never viewed myself as a minority and it’s strange, uncomfortable. I was born and raised in Canada so I’m used to not being the minority”. CM1 concurred:

I never viewed myself as a minority and it's strange, and it's because I'm a white male, but I never viewed myself as a minority. I was born and raised in Canada so I'm used to not being the minority. So the benefit that I hoped to gain was simply that of being a male and trying to get into the teaching strain that I was competing against fewer applicants for the same number of spots, there'd be a competitive advantage that way.

However, both men seemed defensive in the way that they described having only “ticked off the box” to strengthen their chances of admission, as if they were embarrassed about taking advantage of minority status.

5.3.3.3 Women in Physics

This category met with skepticism from readers and candidates, partly because female Physics teachers outnumber their male counterparts in most regions of the country, and partly because it discriminated on the basis of sex. For example, RI9 said that although “We would like the candidates to recognize that they have to accommodate for males and females, because there’s a difference”, it might “be better to ask all candidates to indicate whether they are male or female”. In a candidate example, CA2 said that attributing special group affiliation to Women in Physics did not make much sense because, “There are plenty of women who teach it”. In another example, CG1 found this category laughable, saying that “the whole idea of naming women as a minority” is misdirected given the overwhelming
number of women in education, and “the category needs to be taken out or reworded, really reconsidered because . . . women are actually entering the profession at higher rates than men”.

This concludes candidate discussion about subject identity, a conversation that bridged issues of nationality, linguistic fluency, positioning within Canadian society, and the needs of students in the nation’s public schools. The focus now shifts to candidates’ unanswered questions about the role of special group affiliation in the admission process.

5.3.4 Non-Academic Qualifications Based on Personal Identity

In contrast to minority status based on subject specialization, candidates described minority status based on personal identity as a precarious position subject to bias, attack, and manipulation. Their discussion again focuses on the complications generated by label ambiguity, as well as on questions of indigenous rights, support for the disabled, and institutionalized racism. Their perspectives illuminate more equitable ways of thinking about how to label personal identity.

5.3.4.1 Aboriginals

This program reduced Canada’s more than 100 Aboriginal tribal designations and scores of Métis identities into a single Aboriginal category, a practice that was emblematic of the off-hand way in which Canada’s earliest inhabitants are dismissed by authorities at all levels of society. Yet readers framed the special group for Aboriginals as an appropriate response to growing numbers of Aboriginal students in public school classrooms and the low numbers of Aboriginals who typically apply to the preservice program.

Some candidates also supported the category. For example, CF3 stated that the Aboriginal box gave candidates the extra support that they might need with the admission process because “an Aboriginal person, they might have different things that might prevent them from applying. They might not have been as successful academically”. In an example of personal experience, CA2 said that the inclusion of an Aboriginal category gave Aboriginal candidates like her a better chance of acceptance. Yet some candidates challenged the Aboriginal category, such as CG1 who said that “The Aboriginal label is very problematic
considering Inuit and Métis peoples don’t necessarily identify as Aboriginal”. In another example, CA2 stated:

Aboriginal is a very all-encompassing and therefore meaningless term when it is used out of context. I actually find that problematic because on other forms, when it says Aboriginal Person, First Nations, Métis, I could tick off all three. . . . Application forms which recognize Aboriginal heritage are encouraging, but I don’t see them as a special privilege, but as a right that should be offered.

As this comment indicates, anger levels ran high among some Aboriginal candidates and reflected what many activists have come to think of as an entirely justified position against Canadian Apartheid.\textsuperscript{7}

\subsection*{5.3.4.2 Disabled Persons}

Discussion about the special group category for Disabled Persons was limited, though there was consensus that more information was needed to explain who qualified as a disabled person and how one could qualify for specialized, academic support. For example, CD1 said, “I chose the disabilities category to increase my chances of admission, but . . . I was not completely sure that I qualified for disabled status”. As well, CA2 said, “This designator needs to be more explicit and open-ended”, and CF2 challenged its value because “The category could mean different things for different people . . . with the disabilities, there’s such a wide range of that”. CG2 said that there ought to be a distinction between “mental disabilities and physical disabilities” so that eligible candidates could access candidate support services. In another example, CR2 said:

This is not clear at all. What is a person with a disability? It could be people who have mental illness, any form of mental illness. Possibly it caused them not to meet certain requirements or even reach the deadline.

As these comments indicate, support for disabled candidates fell far short of what could be considered equitable. The lack of context or criteria by which disabled applicants could assess their eligibility for support was matched by the low level of information about what kinds of support they could expect to access upon admission.

5.3.4.3 Visible Minorities

This category was contentious, drawing disparaging responses from readers and candidates. Some readers recommended that it be eliminated because it was too vague. Most candidates acknowledged this special group’s important role in the fight against racism, but also pointed out its impracticality as a candidate label because the information about who belonged in the category was so misleading. For example, CG2 described how the notion of visibility reflected the Program’s stance within the culture of urban education:

Some of us are detectable by the larger culture and what that means is that some of us have adopted through a variety of socialization processes different ways of speaking or it’s maybe simply we do not have the same type of male armour that maybe sometimes our heterosexual counterparts perform so socially, and that gives us away as being men who might be more likely to be homosexual. So it raises the issues of visible persons. If I was a lisping, fashionable young gay man with bleached blond hair, which might be an archetype of our culture, does that identify me as a visible minority? Or is it because actually I pass, I’m able to pass as being straight and white, that I’m not a visible minority? . . . It’s actually tricky when you think about visible minority. It’s a bit of a paradox, but what I had understood by that is if you look like a minority then that does something for this program. It does something in the teaching world that you’ve been identified as the people we want to have on our posters, or out there, or the face of this program, and that’s who we want in our classrooms.

In other examples, CR6 said that “Having one category for all visible persons fails to provide any kind of useful information”, and CD1 stated that:

It creates a false impression of equity. In a multicultural city like this one, it is impossible to define visible minority on appearance alone. . . . Does this group include foreign nationals, members of majority non-white urban populations, or provincial or national minorities?

Furthermore, CA2 stated that in a large urban setting like this one, a Visible Minority category was meaningless because it applied to everyone: “Anybody can tick that any male, any female, any ethnic background. We’re very diverse, very multicultural. I’m not sure that there’s any one group that is in the majority and I’m not trying to be facetious”. Moreover, CA1 stated:

It lumps everyone into one category. Well, I guess it’s just an abstraction, right, because it presumes that being part of a visible special group necessitates a certain type of experience, but it doesn’t always”. Matching student populations is a tricky thing because you have to decide what you’re matching. Are you matching women teachers to women students? Are you matching language, culture? . . . There are issues of being able to find enough teachers of a certain background and culture and linguistic ability . . . I guess it comes to the philosophy of education. If you know you’re educating for peace and social justice and cultural awareness . . . then people
from special groups can offer insights into actual experiences that can be helpful for students dealing with those experiences.

In a related comment, CF3 said:

Visible persons is a murky classification given the ways in which peoples’ ethnicities influence their physical appearance and what they consider professional attire. How different do you have to be from white to be a visible minority? It’s problematic and there are different interpretations.

In another example, CG1 stated:

I didn’t want to stand out . . . by ticking a box. . . . I don’t want to look like “the other”. I’m tired of either having to check off “other” or look like the “other” in my classrooms. I’m Canadian . . . I grew up in this city and I hate that idea of being the perpetual international player in my own country, the constant question, the barrage of questions of “Where are you from?” When I say, “Here”, then people usually respond with, “No, where are you really from?” and I say “Here”. What they really are asking is, “Oh, your ethnic origins, like where do you come from? Like you’re really not from here”, and the whole notion of that if you’re not white then you can’t be from here.

As well, CG2 explained why he was ambivalent about the special group option:

So I didn’t check it off but it was definitely something I had both checked and then unchecked, thought about it some more, left it unchecked . . . as somebody who, yes, had an experience of difference because of race, but again I didn’t feel comfortable checking the special group affiliation categories.

In another example, CG1 stated how useless the Visible Minorities label is in a contemporary urban Canadian context:

I think that the visible special group is not transparent. Visible minority, what does that mean? I think almost everyone is a visible minority. . . . If you’re going to talk about racialized dynamics and ethnicity, to some degree we’re all minorities.

As well, CR5 said that “There are lots of visible minorities. So maybe, if we’re more specific . . . we’d be able to see what specific special groups are applying to our program or just to the teaching profession in general”. Furthermore, CG2 suggested that:

They should up the ante as a really prominent school in this province and set an example for the local district school boards, other school boards, and the provincial curriculum. . . . Instead of asking candidates to tick off minority checkboxes . . . embed Internet drop down menus within open questions such as: “Do you identify with a special group? Would you like to identify that special group for equity purposes? Do you identify with a gender special group? Do you identify with a sexual special group?”
The scope of candidate frustration provided strong evidence of the need to revise this category. Two of the gender minority candidates also expressed more specific dissatisfaction with the Visible Minorities label. For example, CG1 said:

This is not very descriptive. This is so vague. It’s so general. Anyone can be a visible minority in this city, really... I would like to have put Chinese down and that’s who I am, even Asian.

In another example, CG2 talked about his own appearance and the role of social context in shaping visible minority status:

As somebody who was called Paki and Nigger for the first 1 years of my life, it was difficult for me not to check off visible persons, but... nowadays my skin is a little whiter. In a sense, I was trying to recognize that people who are of richer colour... are probably more marginalized and more targeted. Even though I was a person of mixed race, even though I’m somebody who does not feel like I genuinely belong in the white category, even though I’m a person who has experienced racism in some extreme forms, I thought that it would be disingenuous for me to check that off and put myself in the same category as people who frequently and daily have a sense of difference because of their darker colour.

How deeply racism had violated CG2’s sense of identity illuminates much of the anxiety that candidates experienced over disclosing racialized identity on the Information Form.

5.3.5 Non-Academic Qualifications Based on Candidate Experience

Support for assessing candidate experience through four personal essays (Figure 4) was widespread among readers and candidates, though there was some opposition to the essay topics. In particular, one candidate described Essay One: Motivation for Becoming a Teacher as sexist, and several noted how difficult it was to track down verifiers who would attest to their responses in Essay Two: Prior Experiences Relevant to Teaching. As well, most candidates said that the Candidate Handbook contained conflicting instructions about whether to address issues of equity in all four essays or only in Essay Three: Strategies for Using Equity in the Classroom. The resulting confusion left candidates groping for meaning and experiencing high levels of anxiety. Most candidates also objected strongly to the expense and inconvenience of having to submit their completed Information Forms on the Internet. Discussion continues with more specific responses to the individual essay topics.
5.3.5.1 General Responses to the Essay Format

Reader support for the essay format was mixed though candidates were unanimously in favour of the way that the essays enabled them to bring all of their important personal and professional information to the attention of admission personnel. For example, RI2 said:

The experiences we have in life shape our pedagogy, shape our way of thinking, shape our interest in becoming teachers. . . . Our goal is to make the instructions transparent so that they know what they're being asked for . . . so we can't have any tricks.

Essay One: Motivation for Becoming a Teacher Based on your background and experiences, explain the reasons you have decided to become a teacher of the age group (grades) you have indicated. (Refer to pages xx in the Handbook before completing this essay.)

Essay Two: Personal Learning from Prior Experiences Related to Teaching In reference to three personal experiences that have contributed to your understanding of teaching and learning, what was the experience, your role and responsibilities, and the length of the experience? Reflecting on this experience, what insights did you gain about teaching and learning, and how might these new understandings be useful to you as a future teacher?

Note 1: Candidates had to arrange for a former co-worker who had witnessed their performance to sign off on the dates of engagement and agree to serve as a referee.

Note 2: Acceptable experiences include, but are not limited to: classroom/school experiences, supply teaching, teaching overseas, working with people with special needs, work experience, leadership and/or facilitation within cultural groups or clubs, peer tutoring, parenting, experience with civil society (non-governmental, ongoing service to the community, camp counseling organizations, faith-based organizations), involvement in healing circles, and coaching. (Refer to pages xx in the Handbook before completing this essay.)

Essay Three: Strategies for Contributing to Educational Equity Why is diversity important in teaching and learning environments and, based on your experiences, how do you intend to make a contribution to equity in education as a future teacher? (Refer to pages xx in the Handbook before completing this essay.)

Essay Four: Additional Accomplishments and Professional Goals Being sure to include any particular or exceptional accomplishments, challenges, and/or experiences, what else would you like us to take into account in evaluating your suitability as a future teacher? (Refer to pages xx in the Handbook before completing this essay.)

Figure 4. Candidate Information Form: Essay topics.

In another example, RI9 said that some candidates had written openly about experiences of relational and systemic discrimination. As well, readers described the essay process as an efficient way of enabling candidates to describe “their personal and professional aptitude as
future teachers” (RI8), and to provide “something about the background of the candidate . . . and the candidate’s suitability for teacher education which marks alone on a transcript wouldn’t tell you” (RI9). In another example, RI7 stated that the essays were a voluntary way for candidates “to offer any kind of demographic data that they want to provide for us, and we’ve told them that it may be used in the selection process”. Also in support, RE2 said that this year’s changes to the wording of the essay topics allowed “the most committed, the most intelligent, and the most empathetic individuals to gain entry”, and rounding out the discussion of the essays’ intrinsic merit, RE4 commented on their holistic value:

You really get a sense throughout the Information Form of what experiences this person might have with diversity and how they might react or govern themselves in situations where they were called upon to deal with a situation with diversity … just their view on diversity in general and how it might relate to teaching.

This sharing of power over what information to include in the essays gave candidates discretion over how to present their special group identities and experiences in a way that would communicate their suitability as future teachers.

Candidates echoed this perspective. For example, CR4 said, “You could talk about what challenges you have faced in society, how that has shaped you . . . made you a better person, and how you can contribute to society”. CR5 said that the essays “gave me a chance to express my unique point of view”. In another example, CG1 said that candidness was essential in an application form and that the essay questions enabled him to make an authentic impression on the admission personnel:

I would hope that they would read through it and see that yes, I am very insightful . . . I am very critical . . . I have a lot of experience, I’m very caring and I’m really committed to education . . . and I’m not just going to throw out these random words to please them and . . . what I wrote came from the heart, and it’s not something that I just did in half an hour.

CA2 said that “The Form was just the right length for candidates to state their cases and demonstrate professional writing skills”, and CR4 said that the essays made enough room for people “to give a complete impression of themselves. More is good . . . how do you capsule yourself in just maybe two essays?” In other examples, CR3 said that the essays were “extensive” and that she liked the challenges of fitting her answers into such small answer spaces because “it made her think”. CA1 said that the questions were “relevant and helpful . . . because they really did get you thinking and when this is for your application it has to be
sincere”. Finally, CW1 stated that the essays “were broad enough that you could really incorporate whatever you wanted to in the answers”.

Yet, some readers raised concerns about the essay format. One said that candidates needed more space for their answers “so they could describe their insights into teaching strategies for all students in a multiethnic classroom”. In another example, RI5 offered a particularly fine-grained perspective on factors that may have limited the scope of the personal essays:

Are the questions that are being asked the appropriate questions? . . . Do we really know what makes for an effective teacher? Do we really know and are we asking questions that we need to know about a beginning teacher? . . . I mean, it's a pretty tricky question and there are a range of related factors that are inter-connected. . . . I think there's some interesting literature that has been emerging over the last 20 years around what makes for really high-quality teaching and learning and some of the work, for example around expert teaching, talks about a range of knowledge bases that are important for teachers to have, but also it's not only about knowledge bases. It's about how those knowledge bases get translated in learning contexts. In other words, you can have a person that has a great understanding of psychological development or the social context of learning or be a great historian or scientist but that doesn't necessarily mean they can translate that into effective practice that motivates and encourages learning. So there are sort of the knowledge bases that are informing but there's also this huge translation process that takes place that needs to be considered.

In this example, RI5 raised new questions about the content of the four essays, the complexity of the admission process, and the relationship between admission criteria and teacher performance.

In other instances, readers raised the issue of essay plagiarism, stating that it was impossible to determine the extent to which candidates did their own writing. The consensus among these readers was that a proctored writing process might be a good investment. For example, RI3 said “God help me if I’m pushing for standard tests . . . but this would help us overcome the sense we have that many an essay has been written by someone other than the candidate him- or herself”. Furthermore, a few readers stated confidentially that they had personally coached some of this year’s candidates on how to improve their personal essays.

5.3.5.2 Essay One: Motivation for Becoming a Teacher

This essay caused frustration for many readers who said that the topic did very little to illuminate candidate differences. For example, RI9 stated, “Well basically, any answer is acceptable unless you say ‘I’m a pedophile.’ Most people would just say, ‘I love kids and teaching,’ and then state their philosophical niceties”. However, RI3 said that this essay often
revealed important information about a candidate’s character, and gave an example in which a candidate had revealed himself as racist:

I was reading about someone who was trying to describe racism as not very widespread. They used language to that effect - that it was occasional, and in his role as a teacher, he merely talked about changing the values and sense of self-esteem of people who might on occasion experience inequality. He wrote as if the goal was to help the person who sees themselves as a victim, to provide them with the tools to deal with this.

This essay elicited few candidate remarks. CR2 said that this essay gave her a chance to say that “As a Filipino-Canadian, I hope to practice my teaching with respect for all children, including building their self-esteem and their appreciation of their cultural heritage”. CD1 attributed her motivation to “past teachers”, and CA2 said that “I do have a daughter and I need to do what’s going to get us ahead”. CF2 attributed her recently developed interest in becoming a teacher to “very positive feedback” while “volunteering in schools as a motivational speaker”. As well, CG2 described his motivation in terms of working with students at risk:

Having been a youth myself throughout my teen years and feeling that these are the youth that I most easily create a rapport with, I felt that in that sense, I might be able to bring a great bit of value to that. . . . I believed that I was going to pick up certain nuances and be able to deliberate about what social justice work looks like in a classroom setting.

In contrast to the other candidates, CM2 objected to Essay One saying that “The application process seems to be written for that person who goes to high school, enters university, gets their four-year BA and then goes into teachers’ college, which I find frustrating”. CM2’s frustration was rooted in having been turned down on his previous application, a rejection he attributed to sexist non-academic qualifications. Yet overall, candidate responses to Essay One suggest that it was important to them to be able to discuss their ideals and values, and to communicate openly about what motivated their interest in teaching as a career and their belief in themselves as teacher candidates.

5.3.5.3 Essay Two: Prior Experiences Relevant to Teaching

This essay had undergone fundamental change in response to the Equity Policy, a change that acted as a lightning rod for faculty and other readers who resisted equity-based reform. Instead of the earlier requirement that candidates complete 100 hours of volunteer work in a school classroom, they now had the option of completing three experiences in a location of
their own choosing. As well, the duration of each experience was now at the candidates’ discretion, though verification of what work they had performed was required from a co-worker or supervisor. The following excerpt from the Candidate Handbook (Appendix B) described these new options:

*Note 2: Acceptable experiences include, but are not limited to: classroom/school experiences, supply teaching, teaching overseas, working with people with special needs, work experience, leadership and/or facilitation within cultural groups or clubs, peer tutoring, parenting, experience with civil society (non-governmental, ongoing service to the community, camp counselling organizations, faith-based organizations), involvement in healing circles, and coaching.*

Most readers acknowledged that the new requirement was intended to value experiences that might be typical of special group candidates who were unwaged, low income, or marginalized by sexism, homophobia, or racism.

Many readers welcomed this reform. For example, RI3 said that there had been ongoing conversations about changing this qualification to make it “less reliant on 100 hours of eligible school-based experience, more amenable to internationally educated teachers . . . and less [acceptable] to simply talk about what one had done”. In another example, RE1 said that the essay worked well because “The focus should be on the insights into teaching and learning instead of . . . what the experience was”. This change constituted a huge shift in emphasis from an activity that may have had little learning value to one that was instructional and could be applied to one’s professional work as a teacher.

The new format of this non-academic qualification theoretically made it possible to evaluate all candidates on the strength of their equity-mindedness in addition to tracking their identity as members of special groups. Although most readers gave vague descriptions of how this process might play out, RI3 stated that it reflected how important it was to:

> Get people off the idea that if they’re black they’re good at doing equity; if they’re queer they’re good at doing equity; and shift their focus to what they would make of their identity . . . to describe their personal background experiences as the motivation for their work with marginalized students and for whatever they would do to promote equity, diversity, and social justice. . . . By asking for that information, the essay is supposed to privilege people who are closer to marginalized or disadvantaged students, or people who’ve had a lot of privilege who could then parlay that privilege into observations they’ve had about it, so that in as universally privileging a way as possible, we wouldn’t have to use affirmative action strategies.

Further probing as to the meaning of “affirmative action strategies” only established that the policy on how special group status might be used in the admission process was unclear and subject to frequent intervention.
Like the readers, candidates also expressed mixed responses to this essay. On the positive side, CA2 stated that this essay explicitly demonstrated the program’s sensitivity to the marginalization experienced by minority candidates. Several also said how affirming this essay format was because it did not require them to seek verification “from a supervisor”. CM1 said, “You had to get your three experiences approved by somebody . . . but they weren’t judging what you were saying really . . . they just signed off”. CR5 also called this essay format “especially supportive” because it left all candidates at liberty to choose the “three verifiers” who would provide letters attesting to their prior learning experiences. In another instance, CR2 said that she “loved how you could talk about diversity in your experiences and what you have learned and all that”, and that she hoped this specialized knowledge “would be the basis of admission”.

In other examples, CG2 stated that because the Information Form did not include a checkbox for gendered minorities, this essay gave him the opportunity to be explicit about the value of his gay status: “I felt that I had to in a sense go out of my way to communicate what was unique about me and why this program would want students like me to be there”. Other candidates said that their response to Essay Two was the deciding factor in applicant acceptance. For example, CF1 said that “You could have someone who would be able to check every special group checkbox, but if they didn’t have the right previous experience, they wouldn’t be taken”. These comments were inconsistent and contradictory, illuminating how leaving candidates too much room to interpret the Admission Policy had saddled them with a marginalizing handicap.

Finally, CF1 identified this essay as a necessary bulwark against the admission of minority candidates with insufficient experience. She stated, “With things being as they are . . . you could have someone who would be able to check almost every minority checkbox, but without the right previous experience, they wouldn’t be taken”. So many positive responses to this essay illuminate how encouraged candidates felt by the unusual opportunity to discuss marginalizing experiences and by the respect that these experiences attracted as legitimate sources of teacher knowledge.

In opposition to this essay, many readers said that it undermined the program’s international reputation for academic excellence. For example, RE3 objected strongly to what she
considered an excessively lax prior experience qualification, stating that candidates needed “at least a year or two to have enough time to get the right experiences”. She also contrasted her experience as a teacher candidate to this year’s selection process:

I personally give very low weight to out-of-school experiences as prerequisites for a teacher’s education. When I applied, it was three different classroom-related experiences. Now, it’s even one-on-one tutoring help. As long as you can describe what it is that you’ve done. To me it’s not strong enough because . . . the example is not rich enough compared to being in a big classroom. And what role was it that you were in when you were in the classroom . . . just a helper cutting, or did you have a chance to make a lesson and teach it?

Some candidates also said that they found it challenging to complete three “teaching-related” experiences prior to applying for admission. For example, CF3 said that this policy favoured candidates who had known several years in advance that they would be applying to the program. Other candidates said that this policy favoured middle class candidates who would have had time to volunteer at summer camps while they were in high school or doing their undergraduate studies, and older individuals who had volunteered in their children’s schools. Unlike these two privileged groups, “Most minority candidates had to work full-time, often at two or three jobs, in order to save enough money to afford to work part-time while they were teacher students”. In another objection, CR2 said that the phrasing of this essay was clear to her but that it may have been “misleading” to candidates who lacked a Canadian education or who were unfamiliar with Canadian English:

I think it’s difficult for minority candidates who are not Canadianized because they are not familiar with . . . these phrases and the things that the Information Form reader is usually accustomed to reading. . . . I’ve been through university in Canada and I’m aware of the same codes that they’re looking for and how to write things in a certain way to get the message across.

CR2’s reference to “codes” raises the issue of professional conventions, ways of describing student performance, and what parents and caregivers often allude to as “teacherese”. It was difficult to determine whether she was sympathetic toward the immigrants that she described or whether she was just bragging and being racist.

In another instance, CF3 said that the limited amount of answer space for this essay made it difficult to express insights from her prior experiences. Each one is “just one little paragraph so you can’t really go much into it and yet they do want you to be personal and to be deep”. In another objection, CR6 said there had been too much space on the Information Form and
that “It’s been a while since I’ve been doing applications. I didn’t really know what to say differently . . . so that I’m not repeating myself. That’s what was tricky for me”. These objections to the second essay embody resistance to the program’s move away from its long-standing and exclusive reliance on in-school volunteer learning as a pre-requisite for teacher training. They also point to issues of classism, racism, and xenophobia that seemed resistant to Equity Policy infusion.

5.3.5.4 Essay Three: Strategies for Using Equity in the Classroom

This essay provoked widespread conflict among readers and frustration among candidates, yet it addressed key admission policy principles that underpinned the Equity Policy mandate for candidate diversification. For the first time, this essay was mandatory for all candidates, not just for those who self-identified as Visible Minorities. In another change, the essay instructions now asked candidates to describe the importance of diversity in teaching and learning environments, and to explain how educational equity would play out in their future work as teachers. Readers and candidates were mixed in their responses to this year’s essay format.

Many readers praised the essay’s new focus as well as the decision to make it a requirement for all candidates. For example, RI3 stated, “There was a rise in alternative ways of being seen as excellent and in diverse routes to getting a high score on the application”. These changes were implemented to accommodate the kinds of individuals whose social identity traditionally had made it difficult for them to gain program acceptance. As well, RI3 said that there had been a gradual appreciation in the importance of candidates’ equity-mindedness and in providing space on the Candidate Information Form “for alternative needs, just space for people who are willing to prove that they know something about what it means to be an equity-minded educator”.

In other examples, RE1 welcomed the fact that the admission committee was finally asking for a conversation about white privilege by asking all candidates to complete this essay. RE4 agreed that white privilege was an important part of the equity conversation and that:

I would be concerned if I didn’t see any evidence of that in an Information Form . . . and would certainly look upon a candidate who was sensitive to these types of things in a much better light, all other things being equal. . . . Diversity issues mean different things in different parts of the province, and . . . candidates who cannot demonstrate awareness of the range of diversity issues should be somewhat discounted.
RI7 described the essay’s new format as, “Our best effort so far to allow candidates to
demonstrate what they know about teaching and learning, about their role as teachers for
equity and social justice . . . and to tell us about what they might bring to the profession. RI9 said that with the restructuring of this essay, “The whole Information Form finally sends a clear message to candidates that ‘If you don’t have the right attitudes then don’t even bother to apply’

Many candidates described this essay as extremely relevant to what they wanted to say. For example, CA2 said that this essay “sought to know candidate sensitivity to discrimination”. CR1 found support from the way the essay asked him to express how his experiences “being a minority” made him “more aware of diversity issues”. He also said that this essay was something he “probably leveraged to his advantage”. In another example, CR5 stated that the essay was “really valuable” because it enabled candidates to represent themselves and their skills, and that she was “kind of happy about being able to give some of that personal information about myself, my experience”. Even these few examples, demonstrate how effective this essay was in enabling candidates to disclose their levels of awareness, personal sensitivity, and adroitness in presenting what they already knew about teaching as a career.

In other examples, two candidates took advantage of this essay to discuss their priorities for reaching minority students in the classroom. For example, CG2 used this space to detail his experiences and understanding of being racially and sexually different:

I built into my essay the ideas that I have been somebody who had an experience of being racially different where I grew up and also of being sexually different and … what allowed me to break out of the cycle of maybe self-hate . . . and to understand the importance of teaching self-worth and self-esteem to youth, a critical piece that I now understand intuitively.

In another example, CR4 described her plans for holding career fairs, even as early as Grades K-6, to help students and their parents to “understand the big picture”, including parents’ responsibilities and every child’s potential for success. CR4’s innovative approach to curriculum exemplifies the kind of community-rich thinking that minority candidates brought to the preservice program.

However, support for this essay was offset by concerns among some readers and candidates. Even readers who supported the focus of the equity essay expressed misgivings about the
procedure for completing it. Several said that the Candidate Handbook over-articulated the instructions for completing the equity essay to the extent that candidates only needed to copy key phrases onto the Information Form to get a perfect answer. For example, RI7 said, “We made a real effort to make it clearer to the point that we might have given so much information that . . . some of them just kind of fed that back to us in their response”. Putting it another way, RI2 said:

You know how kids are taught to use exactly the same words in the question as in their answer, but what it does is mask what they’re thinking about, and it just demonstrates that they’re able to behave and to answer. So it’s not that I would use that as a sign to remove the person or to keep the person, it just wouldn’t be particularly informative.

Another reader said that in addition to collecting rather vapid answers, this question ran the risk of increasing candidates’ vulnerability if they appeared too radical in their plans as future teachers. As well, RI6 stated that this essay could only function properly in conjunction with knowledge of a candidate’s special group affiliation and “only for individuals who are determined and who are not fearful to identify themselves”. These comments reinforced earlier mention of how marginalizing culture victimizes minorities by tolerating heterosexism and racism.

Most candidates’ initial enthusiasm about Essay Three was replaced by frustration because the instructions in the Candidate Handbook (Appendix B) and on the Candidate Information Form (Appendix C) were unclear. The general essay instructions directed candidates to include issues of social justice in all four essays, but the instructions for Essay Three directed candidates to incorporate notions of equity and social justice into a narrative about classroom teaching and management. Many candidates said that they felt discouraged and incompetent as they struggled to resolve the contradiction. For example, CA1 said that in all of the essay questions, “It is left to the candidates to identify themselves through their experiences and how they apply to teaching and learning”. As well, CG2 said that “You have to show that you’re open and committed to equity as part of all the essays”. Also, CM2 described having been rejected in the previous year’s competition and attributed his success in this round to “the new policy of mentioning diversity in all of the essay questions”. However, CR1 confined his equity remarks to Essay Three, saying “I mentioned insights I had being a minority going through the education system, and what understanding I would have and how that would impact my role as a teacher in the future”. CW1 said that she would have
preferred to discuss equity in their responses to all four questions, and CR4 stated that she “hated having to cram everything I knew into just one answer”.

In other responses, CF1 attributed her confusion to issues of English fluency. She explained that she had not done her undergraduate degree in English and that the instructions “could have been better. So I needed more assistance when it came to writing the essays”. As well, CR2 said, “I struggle with English and . . . there’s a disconnect there”. CR3 explained that she was so confused that she only discussed diversity in terms of her volunteer experience, not her own life experiences as a visible minority, and in another example, CR6 said that neither set of instructions contained enough detail to get candidates to discuss the real issues behind the Equity Policy. She said that the equity essay “is good, but it only had maybe one dimension of what equity is . . . I was thinking more along . . . race and ethnicity, something about Heritage Week. We had a Heritage Week in my elementary school one time, and we had Heritage Night”. CR6’s reference to additional dimensions of equity highlights the importance of school- and community-wide groups as agents in equitable policy implementation.

Another issue for minority candidates was this essay’s importance in determining their offers of admission. In light of the program’s Equity Policy, all candidates had the impression that this essay, above all, was the key to program admission. Yet this assumption put added pressure on them to decipher the instructions correctly, to include all of their equity-linked experiences, and to articulate their insights into equitable education as clearly and as elegantly as possible. Recognizing this dilemma, some readers recommended an alternative to the equity essay’s format that would reflect a more holistic approach to diversity. They suggested inviting candidates to weave equity into all of their essays, making each one into a richer conversation between themselves and administrative personnel, and a stronger reflection of the desirability of admitting traditionally marginalized candidates.

5.3.5.5 Essay Four: Additional Candidate Accomplishments

This essay seemed like an innocuous opportunity for candidates to share additional information yet it drew mixed responses from readers despite widespread support from candidates. It had remained relatively unchanged from previous years. For example, RI7 said that the question “has had some tweaking . . . to move it away from people just doing their
testimonial about themselves to something that had a bit more evidence in it”. As well, RI1 said that this essay was “another opportunity for candidates to describe their teaching goals, or highlight accomplishments such as being a performing musician or an Olympic athlete”.

A few readers said that candidates with weak transcripts could take advantage of this essay to strengthen their case for admission by pointing out how much they had accomplished under extremely challenging circumstances. Some readers even recommended that the Information Form include an optional essay for this purpose. For example, RI2 suggested this wording: “Can you explain how you believe you’ve gotten to these grades?” and added that “A lot of times these people would make great teachers”. However, the essay’s detractors described it as useless. For example, RI6 stated:

> It was a place where even strong writers often wrote silly things, points such as, “I once won an award”, or “I'm a really good typist”, or “I like to sing in the choir”. . . . You occasionally find something interesting, but 99.9 times out of 100 you don't.

This essay struck many candidates as an ideal opportunity to highlight additional aspects of their identity and to further elaborate on their experiences and professional goals. For example, CM1 said, “This is a good one that can be tweaked a little bit to say more about your philosophy of education”. CF3 said that this essay was a chance for candidates to describe their personal career goals, like “wanting to do something for the French community, identifying with the French community, and things like that which I couldn’t really say anywhere else”. In another example, CW1 said she liked the fact that “Any candidate could talk about their specific culture or any other kind of background they may have that would identify them”. CW1 also stated that she took advantage of this essay to cite her many scholarships and awards in Physics. Essay Four was important to many candidates because it provided space for them to discuss their ideals and vision as well as to establish how valuable they would be as future teachers.

5.4 Admission Policy Articulation

Effective policy articulation takes into account policy implementers and beneficiaries, balances thoroughness with brevity, and respects publication timeliness. However, respondents from all interview groups identified troubling gaps and untimely changes in this program’s admission policy.
5.4.1 Admission Policy Gaps

One of the biggest concerns about admission policy gaps in an equity-based admission process is how they create stress for minority candidates and confusion for admission personnel. This study uncovered conflicting and incomplete information in the following areas: Qualification precedence and weighting, minority status disclosure, and admission precedence and quotas among the special groups for preferential admission. Though in different ways, all of these gaps tended to undermine the process of equitable candidate diversification.

5.4.1.1 Qualification Precedence and Weighting

Even under the aegis of the Equity Policy, academic qualifications continued to be the primary admission requirement. A minimum GPA was used as the first filter to reduce the number of candidates to a level that approximated the number of available program spaces. This year’s minimum GPA was a “C” average in a candidate’s most recent university degree. As well, candidates specializing in Grades 4-10 or 7-12 had to provide evidence of sufficient performance in their specialty subjects. Administrators supported this policy, yet readers and candidates expressed mixed responses to the continuation of the status quo. Many readers favoured keeping the minimum GPA at a moderate level in order to advance a wider spectrum of candidates. For example, RE2 stated:

I don’t think that a high academic cut-off point should be the only determining factor in making you a good teacher…. Rather than raise the academic score cut off, I would rather keep it at 75% and attract [more] candidates than raise it to 85% and attract [fewer] candidates. I’m not saying that the [special] categories that we identify here would not be represented in a score . . . of 85%. I just think that we’ve got to look at a broader spectrum.

In terms of qualification precedence, several readers said that they were uncertain what the policy was, others said that they had a clear sense of what the rules were but could not pinpoint any documentary sources. For example, many readers stated that individuals with low grades on either their academic transcripts or Candidate Information Forms would not receive offers of admission, though they disagreed about which instrument took precedence. Others said that the two instruments were evaluated independently, and a few even stated that a low transcript was not an automatic rejection.
Several candidates also said that they were comfortable with the status quo. For example, CF2 stated, “I think the logical way to operate would be to look at the transcript first . . . then the Information Form . . . and then the special group categories”. In another example, CR4 said that although candidates still had to have “a strong Information Form, the checkboxes “gave visible minorities that extra edge”. As well, CA2 said that she responded to the Aboriginal checkbox on the Candidate Information Form because she knew that the program would extend preferred admission to Aboriginal candidates. Other candidates stated that they had to draw their own conclusions about qualification precedence in order to strategize their responses on the Candidate Information Form. A couple said that they were certain about the qualification weighting, though they could not recall their sources. For example, CD1 stated, “The weighting varied so that Aboriginals and people with disabilities received special consideration”. As well, RI2 said that “The special group categories don’t necessarily make much difference” and others said that special group affiliation would make no difference at all because “those statistics were used only for internal auditing”.

Although the Candidate Handbook stated that the program was “dedicated to admitting qualified candidates who reflect the diversity of [this city] and of [this province’s] schools”, it was unclear at what point, or to what extent, non-academic qualifications such as special group affiliation entered into the assessment process. AD1 explained it this way:

The growing use of non-academic qualifications had posed a problem that threatened the program’s reputation because admitting a candidate had to be a decision based on academic excellence. . . . Even though some would argue that you should just go literally based on grades and take the top X percentage. . . . This additional information brings the context of the learner to the decision making process, makes the learner’s background and experiences much more visible and transparent.

As is often the case among senior administration in complex organizations, the administrators in this study may have been unaware of how important information about special group status would be to the Information Form readers and the special group candidates. Readers disagreed about the policy on qualification weighting. Many said that the Information Form carried more weight than the academic transcript but others disagreed. For example, RE1 stated:

My understanding I think is that people with certain grades like A’s and B’s or whatever on the Information Form were definitely . . . accepted in that . . . I mean, I think that what happened is that . . . the Information Form was given 50% of the
weighting and your academics were given 50% of the weighting. . . . If, for example, you have more Forms that are all at the same level . . . then my understanding is that’s where the special group categories would come into play. But you know what? I don’t know where I’m coming up with this. It may just be what I think should happen.

In further discussion, some readers said that the weight distribution would vary according to a candidate’s identity-based classification or in proportion to the demographics of the entire candidate pool. For example, a candidate with a strong Information Form but a weak transcript could probably count on the Form’s being given extra weight. RI7 wondered how equitable the process would be when it came time to ranking candidates whose Information Forms were given the same passing grade and said, “I don’t want that huge pool of pass to be decided on academics”. In another example, RI4 stated that “The special group checkboxes are helpful in that they give the reader a sense of a level of sophistication and understanding in these particular areas”, though he was unsure whether special group affiliation had “an impact in the selection”.

Candidate responses to the confusion around qualification weighting were less sanguine. For example, CF3 said that not knowing the relationship between special group affiliation and other qualifications for admission undermined the positive effects of its inclusion on the Candidate Information Form. In another example, CG1 said that being uncertain about the weighting was very stressful, especially because the Information Form had no category for gendered minorities:

You had to have a 70% average in your teachables and then they didn’t explain after that. I am the only Chinese person but I’m also the only Asian person in these classes. So that just begs the question, “What are they doing with these special group categories? Are they just randomly selecting like saying, okay, we’ll have one Chinese person going into History . . . did the fact that I put queer help me in there because they need to fill that quota that they need to have . . . you know the rainbow flag representative at this very conservative institution . . . I don’t know.

CR4 said that she resented not knowing whether she had been accepted “because I checked off the category or . . . whether I just got in on merit”, and even though none of the candidates knew how much weight attached to special group affiliation, they all favoured increasing it.

To instill equity into the weighting process a few readers and candidates made suggestions for policy reform. In one example, RI3 stated:
There has to be balancing . . . if a person has to have a minimum mark to get in, shouldn’t they need to have a minimum standard of equity to get in too? So, for example, and at the very least, if a Chinese Canadian candidate did not do well on the equity question, they should not benefit from any affirmative action movement.

In another example, CG2 recommended giving at least 50% of the weight to special group affiliation information as to academic data, increasing the chances for promising candidates with only moderately high academic performances to gain acceptance.

5.4.1.2 Minority Status Disclosure

The issue of minority status disclosure was so contentious that even the administrators expressed concern about how it played out in the admission process. Those who thought disclosure was mandatory said that the Handbook offered minority candidates special consideration for admission (Appendix B, Sections 2, 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, and 15). Yet how candidates used the special group checkboxes was of concern to the administrators. The boxes did not always function as intended because some minority candidates did not divulge their special status. As AD2 explained:

The candidates tick it off if they want to, but not all candidates will say anything about it, those demographics. . . . The problem is knowing exactly who those candidates are and being able to get any good indicators of who they are because . . . people may not want to say whether they’re members of . . . a traditionally marginalized social group.

About half of the readers also said that the instructions in the Candidate Handbook and the Candidate Information Form were unclear on this point. In one example, RI9 said that the checkboxes “are only there for statistical reasons, so there is no real advantage to being a minority from the point of view of the Information Form. You know, you don’t get any special privileges”. Yet in contrast, RI6 stated:

It's not coherent . . . not friendly. . . . It just says you’d better let us know. . . . I would feel really uncomfortable checking it off because I wouldn't know what it was for. I think something as simple as putting the Equity Policy on the front page [of the Candidate Information Form] . . . I’m sure that’s been suggested and there's been really strong resistance to it. It would give the wrong impression that we were favouring certain people.

Most candidates said that, although they had initially felt supported by seeing the special group checkboxes on the Information Form, they later became uneasy over the role of special group affiliation in the admission process. Many said that the instructions in the Handbook and on the Information Form did not make it clear that disclosure of special group affiliation
was mandatory. For example, and reading from the Information Form, one candidate said, “With reference to . . . in the Candidate Handbook, please identify yourself, if appropriate, as one or more of the groups listed below. (Check all that are applicable.)” But what did “if appropriate” mean? Candidates interpreted the guideline in ways that were contradictory and surprising. Most agreed that anyone with subject identity status (Native French Speakers, Men in Grades K-6, and Women in Physics) must disclose this information as a matter of academic logistics, yet they were uncertain whether the obligation to disclose minority status extended to identity status candidates (Aboriginals, Disabled Persons, Visible Minorities).

Finally, a few readers suggested refinement of the candidate tracking process to include special group applicants who had not received offers of admission. For example, RI3 made this suggestion:

> I think it would be very helpful to work on two areas at the same time: tracking all candidates versus just the ones who got accepted. So, for example, while we might not yet have a sufficient bureaucratic or institutional commitment to do affirmative action around LGBT candidates . . . it certainly couldn’t hurt to find out the difference between those who applied and those who were accepted.

In addition to tracking rejected special group applicants, it would be helpful to learn more about the thinking of other potential candidate groups. For example, some minorities may have detected offensive cultural factors such as classism, homophobia, racism, or xenophobia within the Admission Policy instrumentation and decided not to apply to this program.

### 5.4.1.3 Risks Associated With Identity-Based Minority Status

In a surprising development, administrators stated that there was a delicate process between balancing the protection of candidate privacy with gathering enough information to understand the level of diversity within the candidate pool. Yet, in what amounted to an acknowledgement of candidate risk, AD2 stated:

> Some of them will not want to reveal a lot of personal information and will see it as entirely inappropriate. I don’t think that we should push very hard on that. . . . We can only ask for information if we’re absolutely clear what we’re doing with that information.

---

8 “Doing affirmative action” refers to a policy of admitting traditionally marginalized candidates over others in cases where all parties’ academic and non-academic qualifications are equivalent.
Many readers also expressed concern that the admission documents did not include any information about the protections for candidates who disclosed special group identity, and some wondered how many of the candidates had decided not to disclose their special group affiliation.

Uncertainty about the purpose for tracking special group affiliation also created high levels of anxiety among the candidates. For example, CA1 stated that the Handbook information does not explain the role of special groups in the admission process:

> In reading that guide . . . at that point I just wanted to know more. . . . I don’t think it explained them very well. It kind of threw them out there, just you pointing out that it’s optional and referring to their equity policies but not telling you very much about those equity policies.

Most candidates in the personal identity subgroups said that it was “impossible to stop guessing” what the real purpose was for collecting information about special group affiliation. For example, CF2 stated:

> It doesn’t work for either kind of people. Whether you’re a minority or not, you have a reaction to it and you wonder why. You’d think well, “What are they trying to find out? What are they going to do with this information?”

As well, CR6 said that she “felt stressed” but hoped that “maybe they only wanted to see what specific special groups are applying to our program or to the teaching profession in general”. In another example, CA2 stated:

> There are some candidates with disabilities that may be so concerned about how repugnant their particular disabilities might be that they don’t tick the category and give up the support that is available free of charge to all disabled students on campus.

In a related example, CF2 said that she had felt very confused, frustrated, and even threatened by the need to disclose her special group affiliation: “There’s something mysterious . . . it sort of separates you from the application process when you have to identify yourself and you don’t know exactly why. There’s fear there. It’s intimidating”.

Ultimately, most candidates did declare special group affiliation to increase their chances of acceptance though, in some cases, they were acting against advice from friends and family. For example, CA2 stated:
I feel very strongly about not checking off that special group affiliation category … for a couple of reasons. One, you do get singled out on your forms. People in admission are aware of the fact that you’re identified as being different, and I also felt that I’d rather I got accepted on my academic merit as opposed to on my status as a person in order to make up some sort of status quota.

In another example, CG1 said that after “a painful process of deciding” he ticked two special group categories and yet remained ambivalent about his decision: “I hope that it was what I actually had to say that allowed me to gain admission”. As well, CF2 said that she hoped ticking the French checkbox had given her application an edge, but that:

Even though I had a graduate degree, I only gave myself a 50:50 chance of getting into the program. You hear all kinds of stories . . . so and so had two degrees and didn’t get in, so I guess I bought into that.

Furthermore, CF1 said, “I had a lot of trepidation, but I also ticked the Aboriginal box as a natural response to my true status and in hopes of having a better chance to get in”.

Weakening candidates’ inclination to take advantage of special group affiliation was uncertainty and fear about the standards of practice that would safeguard their right to privacy. For example, CR6 said that she “felt stressed” about how the institution might use her personal information, though she hoped that “Maybe they only wanted to see what specific special groups are applying to our program or to the teaching profession in general”. In another example, CG2 said that he was surprised and somewhat alarmed when he found out, “in a very off-handed way through a friend, that a friend was on the committee reviewing the applications . . . and that this person happened to be a doctoral student”. As well, he stated that the admission documents should have made it clear just who would have access to candidates’ personal data.

Some candidates also opposed the special group classifications specifically because they carried the risk of stigmatization and ridicule. For example, CG1 said, “In some ways it’s good so you know that so-and-so’s applying but . . . in many ways, it could have more negative consequences than positive”. For example, CR1 said that “Minority status categories cast doubt on the professional worth of any successful minority applicant, even if you didn’t tick a minority status category to get in”. As well, and in a final example of candidate vulnerability to minority status disclosure, CR2 stated:
Special group affiliation attracts resentment from the white population . . . and they just kind of wonder whether you got in purely on the other merits . . . it just keeps you wondering because there are times when people need more representation of a certain community. Showing preference to any minority community, no matter what qualifications they have, causes resentment because they assume that if you are a minority, you did not get in just on merit.

5.4.1.4 Special Group Precedence and Quotas

Despite the intended role of the special groups to be beacons of hope for traditionally marginalized minority candidates, confusion about how they played out in the admission process turned them into sources of candidate confusion and anxiety. Many candidates wondered whether the Admission Policy evenly advantaged all of the special groups, or if not, what the hierarchy might be. For example, CR1 said that “I don’t know why I give less importance to say an Aboriginal person or a visible minority or a French speaker”. Most candidates also presumed that there was a quota for each special group. For example, CG3 said “I can’t see how else they would use this information . . . Perhaps you would have a lottery . . . to be controlling and proactive of the situation”. He also wondered whether great candidates might have been rejected because they were missing qualifications that applied only to their group. Other candidates also viewed quotas as a mixed opportunity. For example, CA2 stated:

Applications will be low among Aboriginal people unless a quota access program is known. If you’re unaware of the fact that there is space that you will be accepted into . . . then you’re not going to apply. . . . I thought I would be accepted based on the Aboriginal quota, my high GPA, and a strong volunteering profile . . . and I also felt that I’d rather I got accepted on my academic merit as opposed to on my status as a person in order to make up some sort of status quota.

In another example, CR1 said that he found it frustrating that the rules for minority candidate selection were so confusing:

You just kind of wonder whether you got in purely on the other merits that were measured in the application process or what . . . it just keeps you wondering because there are times like in other areas, whether it’s in a work place or so on when people practice hiring and, if they need more representation of a certain community, there can be kind of resentment among the other people like, oh well, you just got in because you’re a woman, or a minority, or etc., and not just on, I guess, merit. So I mean there’s that kind of thing you might play with in your head but nothing tangible other than that.

From another perspective, some candidates questioned what would happen to minority candidates whose group quotas were full. For example, CR4 said that minority candidates
could end up competing against each other at a level that exceeded that of candidates in the
general pool and “end up being knocked out”. As well, she said that fear of her own quota
being full was the main reason she had found it “so hard” to decide whether to disclose her
special group affiliation. CA2 also wondered whether, when quotas were full, “rejected
candidates were automatically put back into the general pool”. Finally, and as an alternative
to special group quotas, CG3 suggested:

Perhaps you would have a lottery. . . . If you were definitely going to be controlling
and proactive of the situation, then definitely you would want to give favour to
individuals from diverse backgrounds, if the qualifications were equal.

5.4.2 Admission Policy Changes
The unexpected and last minute online changes to several points of admission policy created
panic in some candidates, resentment in others, and distrust of the administration in most.
Yet administrators and many readers hailed the role of the Internet in this year’s admission
process as a significant development in support of minority candidates. The policy changes
appeared as electronic updates to the Candidate Handbook and substantially altered the non-
academic experience-based qualifications, the course placement process, cohort structure and
location, and the relationship of some preservice courses to graduate programs.

5.4.2.1 Experience-Based Qualifications
The program’s last minute change to its experience-based qualifications expanded the
requirement for 100 hours of classroom-based learning to include a variety of out-of-school
experiences that were at the candidates’ discretion. Under the new regulation, candidates also
had control over how many hours they spent in each activity.

Most readers were unaware of any policy changes, yet RE3 stated that they had occurred
very close to the application deadline and only in an unexpected link from another page on
the program’s general website. It turned out later that her information came from one of the
candidates who she had been coaching on how to complete the Candidate Information Form.
As well, most of the more traditional, subject status candidates felt cheated by the suddenness
of the change and by the way that the new policy appeared to devalue their in-school
qualifications. For example, CF2 stated:
The last-minute decision to accept a whole new range of experiences and . . . not even counting the number of hours any more . . . may have made my application less competitive than it had been under the old rules.

The contrast between the pre- and post-Equity Policy experience qualification was not only one of the most striking changes in the admission process, but the central point of resistance among readers and candidates who worried that it would compromise the program’s academic reputation.

5.4.2.2 Course Placement

A second last minute policy change had to do with the process for course selection yet several candidates stated that they did not receive the information until after they had formally accepted offers of admission. With only a few hours’ notice, these candidates were instructed to attend an evening meeting to select their courses, and for some program concentrations to undergo personal interviews. These sudden and inflexible onsite time commitments were problematic for many low income, single parent, gendered, and racialized minority candidates. For example, CM1 stated:

There was the information session which was put on by the different course leaders . . . it’s only on for a couple of hours so you don’t have time to visit them all and they have specific presentations . . . some are more heavily involved in literacy, some are involved in numeracy, sciences . . . .The option that I eventually chose, I chose because the presenters who were going to be the instructors were the most organized in terms of their presentation . . . and I appreciated that. The other two presentations that I attended, one of the instructors . . . halfway through he said by the way, “I’m not going to be here”. So from my standpoint I’ve just wasted my time listening to some guy that I was now attracted to who’s not going to be involved in this.

Several candidates also said that they were shocked by the sudden discovery that some seminar groups required an entry interview, though they varied in their support for the requirement. Because this preservice program did not require interviews as part of its non-academic qualifications for all candidates, this seeming irregularity released a torrent of agitated discussion. Candidates who favoured personal interviews called them a good strategy for reducing institutional bias and said that, given the importance of teachers’ interpersonal relationships it was shortsighted to base candidate evaluation exclusively on written information. For example, CA1 said that in the absence of an interview, the readers are “kind of forced to use their own images of the candidate which may differ, but that
doesn’t seem to be equitable”. In another example, CG3 stated that written instrumentation “may be deficient since it relies so heavily on candidate skills in narrating the contributions that their life experiences can make to teaching”.

In other examples, CW1 said that interviews were a way of guaranteeing that candidates would get more attention from admission personnel. She said, “I hand this in and you just read it . . . so I think an interview, even just a phone conversation, would help. . . . I think it’s essential”. As well, CR1 advocated interviews as a means for distinguishing among candidates who may appear on the surface to be equally qualified. In a supportive though cautionary tale, CM1 stated:

The program can’t really afford to make mistakes, so you should try and know as much as you can . . . this is teaching so it’s all in the classroom, so who is this person, what’s their philosophy, what’s their persona, what’s their house on fire, you know, what really gets them excited, what are they like? Are they humorous, are they you know stone-faced, just who are they? . . . And then that gives admission candidates a chance to ask questions too. . . . I think that having an interview would make it more informative, a bit more transparent, just the candidate speaking freely about his or her own background and the admission officer or one of the instructors speaking freely and openly about the program and about their experiences in the program. There would be a deeper connection, so I think that would enhance the quality of the candidates.

A few candidates also said that interviews would have improved their own chances of admission. For instance, CM2 said, “I like the interview process because I come off well in an interview”. In another instance, CM1 said that he would have preferred to meet in person with the people who were assessing him: “I wanted to express my background and my interest and my passion . . . to be able to give a little bit of a more personal touch to it by doing a one-on-one”. Similarly, CR1 said that “I think you can sense when someone’s really interested. . . . You can tell by body language and voice that what they’re saying is kind of true, or perhaps an extension of the truth”. As well, CF1 advocated interviews “to get a better sense of an applicant’s persona. . . . This one seems comfortable with the interview process but very shallow and limited in her ability to express herself or her teaching ideas”. Furthermore, CF1 stated that an interview in which she could have “better demonstrated her passion and authentic approach to teaching” would have been supportive.

In opposition to the interview requirement, one candidate described how unjust she thought it was to be told, at the very last minute, that she needed to pass a personal interview to qualify
for a seminar group specializing in diversity. Describing herself as “a person of colour who has endured multiple instances of racist victimization”, she stated that this interview procedure was “inconsistent with the stated goals of the Admission Policy that minority candidates were to be treated equitably”. In another example, CR3’s response to the prospect of interviews made it clear that she feared institutional racism:

Why would there have to be a face put on there? . . . You’re saying that you want visible persons, and we’re assuming that means all different types, also blacks. . . . There’s such a negative image associated to us that the chances of acceptance would be low after being interviewed by white folks.

In another objection to the interview requirement CR4 said:

I was filling out this application and . . . when I clicked on the urban concentration, a whole set of special group categories opened up . . . the additional stress of, if you wanted that program, if you chose it as your first option, then an interview . . . you had to answer a whole plethora of different questions . . . talk about different situations, would you be a good candidate for this, just so much more work and that was additional stress. . . . Ours took a lot more time, and I’ve heard from a couple of people, their friends, when they saw it, they didn’t even bother applying.

Candidate rancor over the range of inequities that they perceived in the course placement process was so strong that at times it seemed to supersede their objection to last minute policy disclosure.

5.4.2.3 Cohort Structure and Location

In another last minute policy announcement, candidates found out that many cohorts or program specialization groups would meet off-site at various locations belonging to the public school boards. Most were opposed to the inflexibility of this policy and to its implications for the collegial, geographic, academic, and job-related implications of their course selections. From a collegial standpoint, candidates said that the process had suddenly required them to join a permanent group of students and instructors with a specialized academic focus. For example, CR3 stated:

It was really very tense. You’re in the program, but now you have to choose your groups . . . and then you had to wait and see which one, if you got your first choice or your second choice or here’s the stress again.

This method of course assignment made it impossible for candidates to move from one group to another during the academic year despite the potential benefits of reducing their transportation expenses, working with new study partners, or sharing care expenses for
family dependents. It also denied candidates any flexibility in their academic specialization or seminar group placement regardless of their levels of prior learning, personal interest, or academic challenge, and without consideration for candidates’ desire to escape institutional cultures that were racist and/or homophobic.

Candidates were also troubled by the fact that the various seminar groups convened at multiple instructional locations, some of which were at a considerable distance from the Faculty of Education. For example, CR3 said that “We were asked to choose which instructional groups we wanted to be in. Some people chose, on the basis of geography, to be close to home. . . . I put that I’m willing to commute”. However, several candidates described the off-site locations as inconvenient and expensive. For example, CA1 said that “The Faculty location is great”, and that it had been a determining factor in her program choice. In another complication, candidates in the French instructional stream had no choice over where they would take their studies. For example, CF1 stated:

> Group placement does not always reflect applicants’ first choice though it directly determines practicum location and all that that entails in terms of limiting expectations for future employment to the same school or another one nearby and within the same school board.

In another instance, CF3 said that she had been unable to attend the course selection meeting and was fully misinformed by the information on the program website. It stated that all candidates would have a choice over which seminar group they joined based on “rationales and information on the location of the practica schools”. Furthermore, CF1 said that the policy on where to locate students, combined with “the heavy emphasis on impressing one’s placement principals, excludes candidates who do not want to work for the local school board”. She also said how restrictive the policy was because it excluded Catholic candidates. For example, “Practicum placements and pairing with associate teachers is geared exclusively to the public school system and completely ignores the skills and needs of French candidates”. The secrecy surrounding the program’s various instructional locations created not only inconvenience and expense among most of the minority candidates, but it left the majority of them with a feeling of distrust toward the admission personnel and the Program Chairs.
5.4.2.4 Course Cross-Listing with Graduate Programs

It came as an unnerving discovery to most candidates that some of their elective courses would be cross-listed with graduate programs in the Faculty of Education. None of them wanted to go on record as objecting to this policy, but several said that they were “absolutely overwhelmed” when they discovered that they were expected to compete with graduate students, many of whom they assumed were experienced teachers and school leaders. For example, several candidates said that they were being disadvantaged by having to do group work with graduate students who had probably “never given a thought to the meaning of equitable teaching”. Furthermore, to accommodate the graduate student timetable but at great inconvenience to the preservice candidates, cross-listed courses were scheduled in the evenings and did not break during the weeks designated for candidate field placements. As well, there was no information about the procedures for course evaluation which placed extra stress on candidates who were obliged to make immediate decisions about their course preferences. By the time that some candidates realized the ramifications of being in these cross-listed courses they were told that it was too late to make changes to their timetables. Financial belt-tightening notwithstanding, the decision to admit graduate students to preservice course electives represented another marginalizing violation of Equity Policy principles. It clearly weakened minority candidates’ chances of success by raising the stakes in the very few courses that complemented the mandatory curriculum.

5.5 Chapter Summary

Chapter Five discussed Teacher Education Admission Policy from the perspectives of admission policy instrumentation, program qualifications, and admission policy articulation. Because the Faculty of Education did not publish its preservice admission policy, administrators relied on the following documents to convey the regulations governing the admission process: Candidate Handbook, Candidate Information Form, and Candidate Information Form Assessment Rubric. As well, they expressed minor concern over some issues of policy articulation, particularly the ambiguity that surrounded issues of qualification precedence and weighting. Pro-equity readers agreed with reforms such as publishing the Candidate Handbook in print as well as on the Internet, the Internet-only format for
Candidate Information Form completion, and opportunities for candidates to communicate in person with Registrarial Staff.

However, even Equity Policy advocates were concerned about the Handbook’s overly explicit instructions to candidates about essay composition on the Candidate Information Form. Other readers stated that equity-based reform threatened to undermine the program’s academic excellence and international reputation. Many readers also pointed out gaps in the policy governing candidate minority group affiliation, and expressed conflicting views about the benefit of introducing candidate interviews as a qualification for admission.

Candidates described many unanswered questions about the mandatory disclosure of special group affiliation, personal risk, the ethics of preferential admission policy, special group ranking, special group quotas, and qualification precedence and weighting. Were they accidental, incidental, intentional, or some combination of the three? What is certain is that these policy gaps impacted differently on subject identity and personal identity candidates. The latter group’s inability to access clearly articulated guidelines during the admission process created highly stressful challenges for all Aboriginals, Disabled Persons, Gendered/Invisible Persons, and Racialized/Visible Persons. Efforts to interpret the unpublished Admission Policy were impeded by the last-minute publication of some important policy details.

The unexpected disclosure of important policy details left several candidates thinking that if they had had this information sooner, they would have withdrawn their applications for admission. These details were added to the program website without any accompanying correspondence to alert candidates to their publication. Most candidates said that they been advised to check the program website for “regular updates” until about three months before the application deadline, at which point all details would be finalized. However, many candidates said that there were several points of admission policy that had been published within days of the application deadline, and others said that they were not aware of these last-minute notices until after they had accepted their offers of admission.

Those who discovered this information after the application deadline had passed were in a double bind, being ineligible to withdraw from the program without financial penalty and having missed the application deadlines for other preservice programs that they might have
preferred under the altered circumstances. The last-minute policy details consisted of new information about the following program requirements: Revised non-academic qualifications; an in-person only course selection process; exceptional course logistics that concerned enrollment, location and mandatory interviews; cross listing of some courses with other degree programs, and barriers to financial assistance.
Chapter 6

6 Teacher Education Admission Procedures

6.1 Introduction

This is the third of the three data chapters. It presents administrator, reader, and minority candidate perspectives on four procedures arising from Teacher Education Admission Policy, namely candidate recruitment, reader recruitment, reader training in equity-based assessment, and Candidate Information Form assessment. Strategies for candidate recruitment tend to focus on visible minorities. Recruitment of ad hoc admission personnel to engage in Candidate Information Form assessment is supplemented by a mandatory equity-focused training course. Yet readers are divided over the value of Equity Policy training, and the training course experiences multiple setbacks due to a faculty assessment procedure and unskilled leadership.

Candidate Information Form assessment also evolves in unexpected ways that reflect both structural and agency interference. From a structural perspective, the size of the reader pool, the layout of the Information Form, and the instructions for personal essay completion and assessment are all sources of interference with equitable assessment. From an agency perspective, readers also disrupt the assessment process through the exercise of individual will in resistance to the Equity Policy, through bullying and friction among themselves, and by exercising idiosyncratic reading patterns. The result is a set of admission procedures fraught with confusion, conflict, and suboptimal candidate diversification.

6.2 Candidate Recruitment

Despite the Equity Policy mandate for equitable candidate diversification, efforts to recruit traditionally marginalized candidates remained consistent with what had been done in previous years to target racial minorities. Admission personnel contacted the program’s community partners, including active-duty and retired schoolteachers, principals, superintendents, parent groups, and school volunteers, to identify community groups that might respond well to recruitment, and to work out specific strategies that would respond to the values and cultural practices of those groups. This approach was necessary because some cultural groups were not receptive to their recruitment efforts. For example, AD3 stated that
issues like social status and family honour predisposed some groups to discount teaching as a creditable profession. In another example, for some of the recent black immigrants to Canada, especially Jamaican blacks, “Teaching would be considered out of reach, so the aspiration would be beyond the expectation of the parents”; and in another case, he said that “Folks from Hong Kong and the like don’t view teaching as a particularly high status activity. They’re much more oriented toward business, medicine, and other conventionally high stakes and higher earning occupations”.

Administrators attributed much of the existing recruitment process to the implementation of earlier suggestions from community partners, though the attitudes underlying these suggestions seemed somewhat limited to preserving the status quo given the provision of generic outreach programs. For example, AD1 described “a summer mentorship program and a future teachers club, both of which encouraged candidates from visible minorities to enter into teaching, starting with connecting at the high school level”. The club was open to Grade 12 students with an interest in becoming teachers and offered them a day of instruction at the Faculty of Education where they received lessons in career preparation that included choosing appropriate subject credentials as undergraduates.

It is questionable whether either of these programs did much to enable marginalized individuals to visualize themselves as actual teachers, and AD3 acknowledged the shortcomings in the program’s recruitment strategies. To make recruitment a successful process, he suggested creating a partnership among many different kinds of organizations such as teacher unions, provincial governments, and universities that would establish “a scale of collaboration that would ensure a wider range of students considering teaching”. However, for this type of collaboration to be effective, it would have to be premised on equitable principles, guided by leaders with strong equity sensitivity, and include high school students from each of the special groups who were targeted for recruitment. Special group candidate recruitment is a complex process subject to external cultural beliefs as well as to internal structural barriers caused by conflicting attitudes toward diversity and the inclusion of traditionally marginalized groups.
Readers stated that candidate recruitment now focused on increasing the number of applications from traditionally marginalized groups and responding to requests from minority communities. For example, RI9 stated, “Recruiters often make presentations to public organizations in response to invitations from groups such as the Hellenic Society, Somalian-Canadians, and a transition program for would-be teachers who had not completed high school”. In another example, RI3 stated that the Equity Policy was useful in motivating Registrarial Staff to be more responsive to the needs of candidates with special group affiliation.

However, some readers questioned the recruitment program’s effectiveness. For example, RI1 pointed out the importance of program marketing but asked whether the “pro-minority message was being advanced in all different types of literature, all the different ways that are going to reach all of the groups that would reflect the diversity?” In another example, RE4 said that the recruitment program was not working well enough to ensure “the numbers of candidates that would fit all the categories of diversity”. As well, RI5 advocated a more fundamental approach to candidate recruitment, one that would take into account program quality:

I think a more comprehensive strategy of outreach needs to be in place. I think even courses of study within our program need to be viewed as being relevant to diverse communities. So, for example, the new urban teacher option that’s been recently introduced and some of the other ones, people have to be able to see themselves in some of these programs.

Readers who described the strategies for candidate recruitment were not personally involved in the process and often conflated their expectations with narratives of what really happened to attract diverse candidates at the community level.

Candidates said that they were aware of the program for minority candidate recruitment and that it made them feel especially welcome, though none of them had been recruited. Furthermore, many said that they were surprised and disappointed by how few gendered and racialized minorities there were within the preservice program. A few candidates also made suggestions about how to improve the recruitment process. For example, CM2 said, “I don’t know if we could get a more diverse pool. Perhaps if there was more interaction with candidates prior to admission then there would be”. In another example, CG3 said that “Recruitment in the middle years in inner city school communities may help attract minority
candidates who are better prepared and supported and hence more successful”. She also said that school-based recruitment seminars should be held earlier in the application cycle to give candidates more time to get their finances and personal commitments in order.

CG2 also made several recommendations:

Candidate recruitment should be directed at academic groups for traditionally marginalized students such as the University of Toronto Transition Years Program (TYP). TYP was set up originally as a black college for students that had been away from high school or were usually unable to complete high school for entirely their own reasons. . . . So it’s those types of places that have people who are so eager to return to university, they’re going to do an extra year, they’re going to struggle, they’re going to finish off their high school studies and they’re going to start university. . . . They’ve taken the initiative to go through a process and get back and focus and intend to learn. . . . I imagine multicultural places as being a place for recruiting . . . and candidate recruitment should include sexual minorities along with visible persons and students with disabilities.

These suggestions for recruitment reform address important issues of targeted prospecting, program timing, and the need for more contact time among recruiters and potential candidates. While discussing alternative ways of expanding candidate pool diversity, several candidates attributed their ideas to “equally deserving” friends and colleagues who either had not received offers of admission or who had declined them. It seems reasonable to infer from the richness of their suggestions that reviewing applications from failed applicants and interviewing applicants who declined offers of admission might provide valuable information about the admission process.

6.3 Admission Personnel Recruitment

How did reader recruitment differ from candidate recruitment? Reader recruitment was an annual exercise that supplemented the ranks of full-time admission personnel with several dozen internal and external ad hoc readers. AD1 described the reader pool in this way:

Tenure stream and lecturer faculty, some of whom have extensive experience as teachers in the field, teachers in the field who subsequently pursue academic higher education work . . . teachers and principals who are working with our teacher candidates in the practicum and the internship . . . seconded faculty who come to us to work for between three and five years . . . sessional lecturers . . . graduate students. Some of them are folks who are retired who come to teach one or two courses . . . or teaching assistants . . . [some of whom] are graduate students.

She also distinguished between internal and external readers, stating that the external readers gained a special advantage from their engagement in the assessment process. For example,
associate teachers and principals “come in to work with us on admission because it’s an investment for them. These [candidates] are the learners that they’re going to be working with in the field”. AD1 also supported the collaboration that occurred between faculty members and field partners during the admission process because it helped to reduce the tensions that typically erupted over teacher candidates who did not perform well during field placements.

A number of institutional groups were tasked with the responsibility for recruiting a more diverse reader pool. RI6 described her experience in the role of Department Chair:

For example, not only how people from the field are recruited, with what criteria, but the extent to which people with equity sensibilities are given any incentive at all to participate. . . . I feel badly about this, but it’s part of the picture. I feel badly about it because I’m implicated in this. The Associate Dean for Teacher Education now wants each department Chair to provide, and it’s really about deployment . . . to provide a certain number of Information Form readers among the tenure stream faculty. I haven’t been able to bring myself to carry out that directive. While I think it’s very important for people from the department, for the department, for the whole equity direction, I cannot bring myself to open my mouth and say to my colleagues, “We must provide X number of readers”. I just, I can’t do it.

The inability of the preservice program from . . . we’re now on the third Associate Dean for Teacher Education in my history. Every single one has not only lacked the sensibility and the imagination to do anything differently, but is so driven by the realities of trying to get a massive operation under way that there’s no . . . it’s very difficult to keep issues of quality and issues of equity prominent in the process. It’s all about filling slots. It’s a huge, huge process. I’m empathetic. I cannot, I just find myself unable to play my role in that. This been some of my most frustrating work to the point where I have not, I haven’t sent out the form letter to faculty in this department saying you have to read Information Forms. And I have only very recently, kicking and screaming, had yet another conversation with the Associate Dean and her assistant about preservice staffing for next year. . . . It’s always a conversation that we have about who I can drag into supplying a body to fill a slot in a program that we have no authority over.

RI6’s final comment illuminates how Information Form assessment was the only exception to a long-standing administrative separation between the preservice and graduate programs. The preservice program’s reliance on graduate personnel to process the enormous number of Information Forms required these highly skilled individuals to perform a repetitive and
perfunctory procedure. Many readers described this policy as frustrating and counterproductive because it failed to nurture collaboration and did not take advantage of the valuable knowledge and experience that was potentially available through consultation with faculty, research associates, other support staff, graduate students, and external networks within other university departments. As well, the absence of theoretical and practical cross-pollination created an unnecessarily adversarial culture that fostered resentment and distrust between preservice and graduate personnel.

A few readers described other aspects of reader recruitment, though on condition of anonymity. They stated that many of the field partners responsible for this year’s recruitment program had received little instruction, and that the records of previous years’ readers were disorganized and incomplete, containing minimal employment contact information and, in some cases, subject or grade specializations. Moreover, there was no budget to cover the cost of occasional teachers. This meant that the reading process excluded classroom teachers who wanted to be Information Form readers but could not afford to take several days off without pay. For all of these reasons, an equitable admission process depended on providing all but a few experienced and novice readers with a course in equitable assessment procedures.

6.4 Admission Personnel Equity Training

Training for Information Form readers was an annual event intended to convey changes in admission policy assessment procedures. Yet with the advent of the Equity Policy, the challenge of conveying substantial reform to a widely divergent group of readers was unprecedented. AD3 described the training program as a useful way of expanding the reader pool and relieving the workload of a core group of faculty who had traditionally “carried the bulk of the work” and read “way more information forms than others”. In another example, a reader described the politics that underpinned the training requirement:

There was an effort to wrest control of the Information Form evaluation process, the training, from the Elementary and Secondary Program Chairs because . . . they were widely perceived among equity experts of ability as not being friends to equity, and therefore many of the messages . . . the training process tended to dampen and belittle efforts to see excellence in a variety of quarters.

These Program Chairs are among the readers who gave interviews for this research, though on condition of keeping their administrative positions confidential.
Administrators expressed concern about the challenge of delivering an effective training course to a large group of readers with so many different levels of professional accreditation and prior experience in Information Form assessment. For example, AD2 stated:

A lot of them come in having not been part of the committee that decided on things and they come in to read the information form or whatever and they say, whoa, what’s happening here. . . . I think when there’s more understanding throughout both field partners and internal people . . . once they’ve understood why we’re doing what we’re doing, there will be more acceptance and agreement about where we’re going.

In another example, AD3 stated that what was needed was “the kind of wide effort to focus on equity as an institution . . . that would make Equity Policy training mandatory for all faculty and staff, and equity classes mandatory for all candidates.” Readers also commented on the training mandate. For instance, RI7 said, “The revised equity qualification was a significant challenge that required readers to think differently about what they were doing.” As well, RE4 stated:

It was strongly recommended . . . I would say that it was mandatory and if you couldn’t go then you worked with an experienced Information Form reader to come up to speed with the process. There was also a suggestion that you talk to either the coordinator of the whole process or work with other readers from the [Registrar's] Office.

In another example, RI9 said:

They spent money on reader training, not only on the faculty here but the support faculty that came in from the schools, training them in this area which many people have said they were not aware of . . . They have to spend money having refreshments and all that sort of thing, yes, just developing the workshop.

Some readers said that they anticipated the assessment process with a sense of interest in selecting new candidates and that it was a rare opportunity to work with some of their favourite colleagues. For example, RI9 described the camaraderie and informal collaboration during his previous experiences as an Information Form reader:

The readers were all in the same room in groups . . . and the trainers were also there so if people needed to ask questions. . . If there was something that was of particular interest to the whole group I’d just say, “Hey folks, stop reading for a while. There is something that I think I should bring to your attention”, and we’d point it out.

Other readers either did not attend the training session or they did so under protest, and some said that the training course had fallen short of their needs and expectations. For example, RE1 stated:
I do think that . . . even though the evidence of the [Equity] Policy was definitely and physically there, there could have been other steps that were put in place to ensure that it actually came to fruition as well.

In another example, RE1 said:

So I think, sure, all of us were required to take the training, but I could have taken the training, come to the Information Form [grading session], been exhausted for example, read through things quickly, had someone that I really knew well who had been reading with me for the last 10 years, and just flown through things.

A few senior readers openly opposed equitable candidate diversification, saying that they did not need training, and others stated that they were not in the habit of taking instruction from “low-level field personnel, junior faculty, and so-called equity experts from all over the place”. Some also confided that the Program Chairs were incompetent as Equity Policy course leaders.

The course itself was designed to sensitize readers to their own biases and to familiarize them with the principles and procedures for equity-based Candidate Information Form assessment. As RE4 stated, “Equity Policy training included an extensive discussion about diversity issues” and “the need to refocus our priorities to recognize and value experiences other than classroom teaching”. Training began with a team of internal and external equity experts who explained the rudiments of equity-mindedness. For example, RE3 stated:

During our training meeting, the equity rep did come in . . . . She used up actually a good half an hour . . . to insert under the equity guidelines, rules, or whatever, examples of what we should be keeping an eye on, and there actually is one section of the Information Form that tells people . . . to write about minority, ethnicity, yep, strong commitment to social justice. So the person who came in spent a lot of time giving us different examples of this third essay and what to look for in there.

In another example, RE4 said that readers were alerted to changes in the policy that governed candidates’ prior experiences related to teaching, and instructed to value “the experiences of a parent or of someone who is working in a nine to five job but who had other responsibilities” beyond the classroom. As well, she described how the contents of the Information Form supported special group candidates:

From a student’s point of view, a student that was sensitive to, aware of diversity issues would certainly be able to express those types of views not only in question -- whatever it was -- but throughout the other questions that are asked of them in the Information Form. They would highlight them, for example, in talking about their experiences and what they learned from their experiences. So those who could really deal with diversity issues in a more complete way would be expressing that throughout their Information Form.
In another example, RI3 stated that the training session was intended to teach readers the difference between “equity consciousness” which is a learned state of mind, and “equitable representation” which has to do with “people’s innate characteristics such as skin colour and sexual orientation”.

The equity experts' were followed by the Elementary and Secondary Program Chairs who demonstrated how to grade Candidate Information Forms (Figure 3) using a Candidate Information Form Assessment Rubric (Figure 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td>Surname, Given names, Application #, Street, City or Town, Province, Postal Code, Email address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Special Group Checkboxes</td>
<td>Aboriginals, Disabled Persons, Native French Speakers, Men in Grades K-6, Visible Minorities, Women in Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grade Levels &amp; Teaching Subjects</td>
<td>For Grades K-6 and 4-10, indicate one teaching subject. For Grades 7-12, indicate two teaching subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>International Status Checkbox</td>
<td>For internationally licensed teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>General Instructions</td>
<td>Submission deadline, formatting details, instructions for completion; full details available in the Candidate Handbook (strongly recommended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Personal Essays</td>
<td>Motivation, prior experience, knowledge of equity, other accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Signatures</td>
<td>Candidate and three verifiers who will confirm the answers to the second essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Office Use Only</td>
<td>Date received, coded boxes, other blank boxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3. Candidate Information Form: Main sections.*

To demonstrate the assessment process, the Program Chairs used previously graded Personal Information Forms in which candidate identity and contact information had been redacted. RE4 described the process as follows: “We had one session where we were taken through the Candidate Information Form and we became familiar with the types of things that we were going to be asked to do as readers”.
Yet neither of the Program Chairs were equity experts and they sometimes gave contradictory instructions. After the demonstration, the Program Chairs put the readers into pairs to engage in practice grading exercises. They attempted to create reader pairs based on common subject specialties, but many experienced readers reassigned themselves into pairs that reflected collegial preferences, accommodated a novice reader’s preference for guidance from a familiar experienced reader, or vice versa. Some readers disagreed with this arrangement. For example, RE2 stated, “The training wasn’t as fulsome [thorough] as it could have been . . . . The groups were not well thought out . . . because it was self-nominated”.

In allocating the practice Information Forms for assessment, the Chairs matched candidates’ and readers’ academic specializations. For example, readers with experience as French
teachers or FSL faculty instructors received Information Forms from Native French speaking candidates. However, this matching process overlooked the fact that some French candidates also belonged to the special groups for Aboriginal and Visible Minorities. The process also disregarded what kinds of identity candidates had disclosed in their essays. As a result, many readers found themselves responsible for Information Forms that they felt unqualified or uncomfortable in assessing. Their only recourse was to seek help from other readers or from the Program Chairs who were responsible for supervising the assessment sessions.

The process for Information Form grading had several steps. First, each reader did an independent evaluation of an individual Form and assigned it an overall assessment grade. RE1 described the experience this way:

Through the training we were told that if we really felt that the application botched the third essay that we could fail the person. I mean, it wasn’t that we had to . . . give equal weight to all four essays and then if they got A, A, D, D . . . we could still read things holistically. So if we really felt that they didn’t have any sense of equity at all and we felt that this person really doesn’t have the potential, then we could evaluate based on that.

Readers worked at different speeds, but once both readers had completed their assessment of the same Information Form they compared grades. If they had assigned the same grade, that grade became the final grade on the Form. If the grades differed by only one degree such as the difference between “B” and “B-”, they negotiated the final overall assessment grade. However, if the grades differed by two or more degrees such as from “B” to “A-”, they called in a third reader with subject or equity expertise, when available, to conduct a three-way negotiation of the final mark. For example, AD1 stated:

So our process of admission involves . . . an Information Form and that Information Form is read and judged by educators. Our policy is one where . . . they won’t just be read once. We have a range of criteria for how they’ll be read and likely a second read will occur for many. . . . For example, if you had a field-based person and a faculty person, or a newer career teacher and a more experienced teacher partnered, and let’s say they disagreed on what the rating is . . . would that impact their ability to say, “No, I disagree with your rating?” No it wouldn’t.

In another example, RI5 said that although two readers was not a magic number, three might be, if it ensured that all candidates received equitable assessment. As well, RE1 stated:

It would sometimes depend on what the discrepancy was. So if it maybe was a discrepancy around . . . the equity piece . . . we would have someone else that had a strong background in those areas . . . . If the problem had more to do with knowledge
of teaching subjects than with equity, the third reader largely might have been just
someone else sitting at your table.

Sometimes a pair of readers encountered a “special” Form with an equity or subject issue that
they did not feel qualified to adjudicate. In these cases, they handed the Form over to a third
reader whose professional experience as an equity expert or a subject specialist determined
their being selected to assign the grade. As RI6 stated:

> There are these conversations among two or three individuals about specific
> Information Forms, and that goes on particularly when either there’s an unusual case
> or when there’s a difference in how the individual readers rate a particular Information
> Form.

These conversations were one of the most effective steps during Admission Policy
implementation because they matched reader expertise with candidate experience. Yet
readers expressed varying degrees of approval with the training process. For example, RI5
said that the process was a good one because “the trainers were people with expertise in
assessment and evaluation . . . in the areas of equity, diversity, and social justice . . . people
who understand the context of teaching”. Other readers said that the training process had
fallen short of their needs and expectations. For example, RE1 stated:

> I do think that . . . even though the evidence of the [Equity] Policy was definitely and
> physically there, there could have been other steps that were put in place to ensure
> that it actually came to fruition as well.

In another example, RE2 said that:

> There’s a big voluntary component to everything that goes on around here. This is
> interesting to me, coming from a school setting, because it’s sort of the intersection of
> this notion of academic freedom and accountability. I think you have academic
> freedom but I think you need to be accountable for something too, which is a really . . .
> it’s an interesting dilemma.

Several novice readers also stated that the training agenda was so condensed that they barely
had time to absorb the equity-based policy changes, much less familiarize themselves with
the assessment procedures.
6.5 Structural Influences on Candidate Assessment

During the assessment process, the Primary and Secondary Program Chairs were responsible for supervising readers and for doing their own Information Form evaluations as time permitted. Yet several complications arose that exceeded both their expectations and their administrative authority. Reader pool size, layout of the Candidate Information Form, and instructions for essay completion and assessment all contributed to structural barriers during Information Form assessment.

6.5.1 Reader Pool Size

Many returning readers approached this year’s grading process in the belief that the tradition of engaging an understaffed reader pool would once again create logistical problems and high stress levels. As well, experienced and novice readers felt the need to spend more time on each Information Form than the supervisors initially allocated. For example, RI1 said:

This transition is probably the biggest change that we’ve had and it's been impacted very much by the fact that for the past few years the Information Form assessment process has not been completed within the time frame. We’ve had a small group of extremely devoted but extremely exhausted Information Form readers often having to read the last 800 Information Forms. . . . We've been concerned about equity . . . from the perspective of the workload of the readers.

Readers experienced the heavy time demands in different ways depending on their level of commitment to equitable program reform, professional workload, and transit time to the assessment site. As well, readers’ other responsibilities remained unabated in the absence of compensatory institutional support. For example, internal readers could have benefited from release time, or credit toward promotion or tenure. External readers could have benefitted from funding to cover the cost of occasional teachers, transit, and family care. Near the end of the two-week period that had been set aside for Information Form assessment, and faced with hundreds of ungraded Information Forms, the Program Chairs pressured readers to return for additional grading sessions, but this approach only ended up embittering many who had been willing participants and angering others who had donated much of their discretionary time.
6.5.2 Layout of the Candidate Information Form

What influence did the layout of the Candidate Information Form have on equitable candidate assessment? In particular, readers and candidates raised issues about the positioning of the special group checkboxes and the sequence of the personal essays. Figure 3 summarizes the main sections of the Information Form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td>Surname, Given names, Application #, Street, City or Town, Province, Postal Code, Email address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Special Group Checkboxes</td>
<td>Aboriginals, Disabled Persons, Native French Speakers, Men in Grades K-6, Visible Minorities, Women in Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grade Levels &amp; Teaching Subjects</td>
<td>For Grades K-6 and 4-10, indicate one teaching subject. For Grades 7-12, indicate two teaching subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>International Status Checkbox</td>
<td>For internationally licensed teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>General Instructions</td>
<td>Submission deadline, formatting details, instructions for completion; full details available in the Candidate Handbook (strongly recommended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Personal Essays</td>
<td>Motivation, prior experience, knowledge of equity, other accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Signatures</td>
<td>Candidate and three verifiers who will confirm the answers to the second essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Office Use Only</td>
<td>Date received, coded boxes, other blank boxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3. Candidate Information Form: Main sections.*

In one example, RE4 stated, “We’re supposed to give that some consideration . . . and our candidates are getting more diversified”, a trend that many readers said increased the influence of the checkboxes during Information Form grading. In another example, RE1 said:

If I’m holding two Information Forms in my hand and they both received A+ but I only have one spot to fill, then . . . I’ll go to the Information Form with the box that is going to help diversify the teaching pool. . . . However, if an Information Form that is from one of the equity-seeking groups received a C, but one from the main group received an A+, then I’m still going to go with the person who seems to have the most potential in the sense of the A+, right? But having the boxes allows this faculty to kind of look at who all of their candidates are and to hopefully . . . create more of a diversity among our teacher candidates.
As well, RI2 said, “As much as I’m not interested in the minority status categories . . . they are in some way identifying what matters”.

Most candidates stated that the location of the special group checkboxes on the Candidate Information Form was an important element in the grading process. For example, CF1 stated that the location of the special group checkboxes “up front” increased the chances of success for minority candidates and represented “quite an opportunity” for minorities to dominate the majority. However, many candidates opposed the positioning of the checkboxes. For example, CG1 said, “If the readers see the identity boxes first and they see, oh black student or, oh so-and-so, they may lower their standards or expectations of this person . . . doing this candidate a disservice”. In another example, CF2 wondered whether admission personnel might react differently to “someone who’s ticked off a category than they would to someone who hasn’t”, and how this reaction might influence their assessment of that candidate’s Information Form. In other instances, CA2 said that placing the special group checkboxes after instead of before the essay questions might downplay reader bias toward atypical candidates, and CR5 said that she did not want her status “to be the first thing known about her when someone was reading through her application” because it might “colour either way how the readers are looking at the application”. As well, CA1 said:

> It’s possible that readers might prefer to see information about candidate identity after reading those short essay questions. This would give them a chance to try and see what kind of assumptions they made about the identity of each candidate.

In light of the special groups’ power to trigger such strong responses, it might be more equitable to give readers Information Forms without any special group information.

The personal essay sequence also troubled a couple of minority candidates. In one example, CG3 said that because Essay Four asked candidates to describe exceptional accomplishments and teaching goals, “It might have been more useful as the first question on the Information Form”. As well, CF2 said that leaving this kind of information until the end of the Information Form reduced its ability to offset reader bias against highly accomplished minority candidates. Candidate discussion about the Candidate Information Form evaluation process reflects many concerns about homophobia and racism, and underscores how these marginalizing forces shaped candidates’ experiences of the admission process.
6.5.3 Instructions for Essay Completion

Instructions for completing the Information Form were stated in the Candidate Handbook but many readers said that they were excessive to the point of interfering with the assessment process. For example, RI7 said, “We made a real effort to make it clearer to the point that we might have given so much information that . . . some of them just kind of fed that back to us in their response”. As well, RI2 said:

> You know how kids are taught to use exactly the same words in the question as in their answer, but what it does is mask what they're thinking about, and it just demonstrates that they’re able to behave and to answer. So it's not that I would use that as a sign to remove the person or to keep the person, it just wouldn't be particularly informative.

Statements from several candidates confirmed these drawbacks. For example, CR5 stated that the suggestions in the Handbook “produced a better, sort of more succinct” impression of what the program was offering and of what was expected from candidates. CR5 also said that she “used the wording in the Handbook to try to fit my answers in the essay questions”. As well, these overly detailed instructions may have enabled candidates’ to overstate their belief in equitable practice.

Misalignment between the Candidate Information Form and the Assessment Rubric was even more pronounced in the multiple inconsistencies in the instructions for Essay Three. RI7 said, “The revised equity qualification was a significant challenge that required readers to think differently about what they were doing”. To support their new thinking, many readers now found it necessary to supplement what they had learned during Equity Policy training and, in the absence of a published Admission Policy, turned to the Candidate Handbook (Appendix B) for procedural clarification. In this case, the Candidate Information Form labeled Essay Three as, “Strategies for Contributing to Education Equity”, whereas the Assessment Rubric did not mention “Education Equity” and instructed readers to assess candidates on how well this essay described, “The importance of diversity in teaching and learning environments”.

As well, several readers said that during Equity Policy training, they had been instructed to assess candidates’ knowledge of equity in all four essays. Finally, a few readers stated that the Assessment Rubric required candidates to discuss equity in relation to “socially-just
teaching and learning environments” in Essay Two and in relation to “diversity in teaching and learning environments” in Essay Three. This amounted to four separate sets of instructions about how to treat equity within the personal essays, and created the possibility that candidates may have been penalized either for failing to discuss diversity in Essay Three or for discussing equity only in Essay Three. Many readers said that they were still troubled by the grading procedure for Essay Three. For example, RE1 stated:

The equity issue, I think, was the one that caused the most discrepancy, yeah. I don’t know if that was for all the readers but for me I know that was something that I take a lot of interest or concern or care about, right? . . . I think I could generalize that for most people . . . [the hardest part] was the equity component.

In another example, RI3 stated that several of her co-readers had been confused about the difference between equitable representation and equity-mindedness, and that she hated being the only one in a whole group of readers who argued that a candidate ought to fail: “Everyone else said, ‘But see, he talks about his immigrant experience,’ as if that didn’t go hand in hand with someone who was incredibly prejudiced”. RE3 provided yet another perspective on Essay Three:

During our training meeting, the equity rep did come in . . . . She used up actually a good half an hour . . . . to insert under the equity guidelines, rules, or whatever, examples of what we should be keeping an eye on, and there actually is one section of the Information Form that tells people . . . to write about minority, ethnicity, yep, strong commitment to social justice. So the person who came in spent a lot of time giving us different examples of this third essay and what to look for in there.

RE4 came to a different conclusion about how candidates should write about equity:

From a student’s point of view, a student that was sensitive to, aware of diversity issues would certainly be able to express those types of views not only in question -- whatever it was -- but throughout the other questions that are asked of them in the Information Form. They would highlight them, for example, in talking about their experiences and what they learned from their experiences. So those who could really deal with diversity issues in a more complete way would be expressing that throughout their Information Form.

In a final example of how the instructions for essay completion caused confusion, RI7 said that her understanding of the essay’s role in the admission process was still evolving: “I’m still learning and thinking my way through how, what’s the best way to use that information”.
6.5.4 Instructions for Essay Assessment

Like the instructions for essay completion, those for essay assessment were also unclear and contradictory. Many readers said that they found themselves faced with uncertainty about how to grade the personal essays using the Candidate Information Form Assessment Rubric (Figure 5). Some said that the experts demonstrated how the Information Form supported special group candidates, but that they rushed through the process. For example, RE4 stated:

From a student’s point of view, a student that was sensitive to, aware of diversity issues would certainly be able to express those types of views not only in question -- whatever it was -- but throughout the other questions that are asked of them in the Information Form. They would highlight them, for example, in talking about their experiences and what they learned from their experiences. So those who could really deal with diversity issues in a more complete way would be expressing that throughout their Information Form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATE INFORMATION FORM ASSESSMENT RUBRIC</th>
<th>Candidate’s Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grading Legend</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = Excellent, B = Good, C = Average, D = Poor, F = Do Not Admit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of Individual Essays</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Reasons why you have decided to become a teacher for this age group/grade</td>
<td>A B C D F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Three personal experiences that inform your understanding of teaching and learning</td>
<td>A B C D F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Discuss the importance of diversity in teaching and learning environments.</td>
<td>A B C D F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) What else would you like us to know that is relevant?</td>
<td>A B C D F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses writing conventions that indicate that the person will be model for classroom communication</td>
<td>A B C D F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Comments (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Readers’ Initials</strong></td>
<td>Final Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A B C D F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5. Candidate Information Form Assessment Rubric.*
RE4’s impression that candidates had a choice about whether to discuss equity in every essay reflects how the admission process was explained to readers. However, candidates received a different set of instructions about how to complete their personal essays. RE4 also said this about her grading difficulties:

> I always have difficulty on the in-betweens, you know, the in-between the “A” and “B” grades, that straddling . . . the fence area. Is that person somebody we absolutely have to have or is this person . . . ? And at the other end . . . we don’t struggle so much with the lower end because we know that they’re not really appropriate. . . . But I struggle with those borderline good to excellent candidates.

RE4 also described how the change in this year’s requirement for candidates’ prior experiences made it difficult to grade Essay Two:

> Even though everyone agreed that all kinds of learning takes place outside of school, I myself needed to refocus because I was in a mode where I was quite focused on classroom experiences as the most valuable types of experiences and I needed to expand my horizons.

In another instance, RI6 had anticipated that the instructions might not be satisfactory:

> The way the Information Form is constructed, and particularly the way the new process has been developed, does not allow for a holistic read . . . the way the questions are phrased: "Briefly outline X. Reflecting on this experience, explain Y". Different individuals are likely to focus their attention on one domain or another primarily . . . By domain, I mean Essay One or Essay Two or Essay Three.

When readers asked for clarification, the Program Chairs told them to “use your best judgment”, an instruction that greatly reduced inter-rater reliability.

A few readers said that there had been excessive instructions to candidates for completing the personal essays. For example, RI7 said, “We made a real effort to make it clearer to the point that we might have given so much information that . . . some of them just kind of fed that back to us in their response”. As well, RI2 said:

> You know how kids are taught to use exactly the same words in the question as in their answer, but what it does is mask what they’re thinking about, and it just demonstrates that they’re able to behave and to answer. So it’s not that I would use that as a sign to remove the person or to keep the person, it just wouldn’t be particularly informative.

Readers also objected to multiple inconsistencies in the specific instructions for Essay Three. In one instance, the Candidate Information Form described Essay Three as, “Strategies for Contributing to Education Equity”, whereas the Assessment Rubric did not even mention
“Education Equity” and instructed readers to credit candidates who described, “The importance of diversity in teaching and learning environments”. In a second instance, candidates were told to “Discuss the importance of diversity and equity in teaching and learning environments” in Essay Three. However, several readers remembered being told to give candidates credit for discussing equity in all four essays. Under these circumstances, deserving candidates could have been doubly penalized, once for failing to discuss diversity in Essay Three, and once for discussing equity only in Essay Three.

Although none of the readers articulated these contradictions, many of them said that they were still troubled by the grading procedure for Essay Three. For example, RE1 stated:

> The equity issue, I think, was the one that caused the most discrepancy, yeah. I don’t know if that was for all the readers but for me I know that was something that I take a lot of interest or concern or care about, right? . . . I think I could generalize that for most people . . . [the hardest part] was the equity component.

In another example, RI3 stated that several of her co-readers were confused about how to assess the difference between equitable representation and equity sensitivity, and that she hated being the only one in a whole group of readers who argued that a candidate ought to fail: “Everyone else said, ‘But see, he talks about his immigrant experience,’ as if that didn’t go hand in hand with someone who was incredibly prejudiced”. RI7 said that her understanding of the essays’ role in the admission process was still evolving: “I’m still learning and thinking my way through how, what’s the best way to use that information”.

The Candidate Information Form and Candidate Information Form Assessment Rubric were intended to work together to support the Equity Policy mandate for teacher candidate diversification. However, the Candidate Handbook instructed candidates how to complete the Information Form, but readers received no written instructions about how to use the Assessment Rubric. A few readers said that the Assessment Rubric contained an “Overall” grade specifically for the use of “writing conventions that indicate that the person will be a model for communication in the classroom”, but that the instructions to candidates about how to complete the Information Form assessment made no mention of it. When readers confronted the Program Chairs with this contradiction, they were told to leave the section blank or just use their own judgment. Either action weakened inter-rater reliability and the equitability of the grading process. As well, several readers stated that the Rubric section for
Additional Comments was ambiguous. Unlike all of the other sections on the Rubric, this one did not have a letter grade. The Program Chairs responded to questions saying that the comments would be withheld from candidates but used internally in the event of a candidate challenge over being denied admission. A few readers were concerned how administration might use negative comments and others described them as a complete waste of time in an already labour intensive process.

In other examples, many readers said that they had discovered part way through the grading process, that there had been contradictory instructions for calculating the Final Grade on the Assessment Rubric. For example, in Session A, some readers had been told to calculate the Final Grade by equally averaging the four essay grades and the one overall grade on the Rubric. In Session B, other readers had been told to average the four essay grades into a sub-total and then average the sub-total and the overall grade to come up with a Final Grade.

Given the use of letters instead of percentage grades, and with the added instruction to use no more than one “+” or “−” suffix with each grade, the averaging process did little to reflect nuanced differences among the Information Forms and interfered with equitable assessment.

6.5.5 Alternative Recommendations for Candidate Assessment

Recommendations for alternatives to the current essay process arose from reader concerns about plagiarism and the need for more candidate information. Although the literature made no mention of plagiarized information forms, several readers said that it was impossible to determine the extent to which candidates wrote their own essays. The consensus was that a proctored writing process might be a good investment. For example, RI3 said, “God help me if I’m pushing for standard tests . . . but this would help us overcome the sense we have that many an essay has been written by someone other than the candidate him- or herself”. A few readers also stated that they had personally coached some of this year’s candidates and, several candidates said that they had received help from family or friends in the profession to improve the quality of their essays.

The need for more candidate information translated into support for adding candidate interviews. Most readers asked to be included in this discussion even though they were sharply divided on the question and disagreed whether interviews should replace or merely supplement the Candidate Information Form. In support of interviews, readers stated that
they would yield clearer and more reliable insight into how individual candidates would perform as teachers. For example, RI4 said that three sources of information would be best and that interviews would provide a way “to best triangulate that information and select the candidates that would be most appropriate for this type of work”. In another example, RI6 stated, “There’s no question that in many cases, an interview would be superior . . . though, I don’t think it would solve all of our problems”. RI4 said that adding interviews as a non-academic qualification would cause a ripple effect that would alter the weighting of the admission qualifications and might cause modifications to the essay content. For example, the requirement for candidates to write an essay about their life and work experiences might be reworded, downsized, or eliminated altogether.

Some readers said that interviews were a useful way to assess candidates’ interpersonal communication skills and to acquire more accurate information about their relational skills. For example, RI2 said that “People can come off in really interesting ways in interviews. They might know all the right things to say. They might be able to speak about their experiences without necessarily being able to act on them in a class over time”. She also said that interviews could help in assessing candidates who were “able to pay attention to the ways in which being marginalized in the educational system would influence their own pedagogical strategies and their approach to education . . . but whose grades were exceptionally low”. In other examples, readers stated that interviews could focus on candidates’ understanding of the program’s instructional model, or on the goodness of fit between candidates’ academic backgrounds and their curriculum objectives.

Other readers pointed to the limitations of written communication in assessing human potential. For example, TR3 said that:

We can’t assess the best teaching candidates just using pen and paper assessment but, in our society and in most Western societies, the way we are assessed, education and performance and so on, is by some paper and pencil method for the most part.

Also recognizing the need for face-to-face interaction RE2 stated:

I have a dream . . . that my ideal process would include an interview. . . . I’d say we’re on the road to doing the best that we can, more than the paper process, but it’s still a paper process. Where else in life do you do selection of anything or anyone with paper? . . . I know that it’s onerous and cumbersome, but I still think that it would yield very positive results, and possibly a different result than solely an Information Form on paper would suggest.
RE2 raised the issue of the relationship between candidates’ written and oral skills and the importance of taking both of these into account in the admission process. At this site, clearly no attention was given to candidates’ body language, facial expressivity, or standards of courtesy during social interaction. TR3 spoke to the need for this kind of information, saying that from interviews:

> We can get a presentation. We can see whether that person has very articulate oral skills. . . . Teachers have to have a presence and be able to pin the classroom. You can get all those things in an interview. So I’m saying the more information you have, the better. So if we can have both you know, that’s better, but in the absence of one then I would prefer the Information Form.

TR3’s support for the Information Form reflected his belief in the essays’ power to provide support for special group candidates who might be vulnerable to racism.

From another perspective, several readers linked the addition of candidate interviews to issues of diverse candidate representation and equity sensitivity. However, most of these readers framed their discussion as a debate over whether to admit more physically identifiable candidates or more equity-minded teacher candidates. This “either/or” posturing contradicted the intent of the Equity Policy by setting up the Policy’s two overarching principles in competition with each other. RI3 was the only reader who stated specifically that both were important in a pool of teacher candidates:

> You don’t just need professional types from schools, but members like parents organizations, social workers, people who work for justice for children and youth, newly graduated teachers themselves. . . . I think it’d have to be racially, culturally diverse. You’d have to, I would think, have people with great equity expertise.

A few readers also described the relationship between interview structure and the specific kinds of candidate information that could be obtained. For example, RI3 said that interviews could be behaviour descriptive, designed to draw out information about candidates’ experiences and insightful learning from those experiences, thereby making it possible to identify equity-minded candidates with greater accuracy:

> Answers would vary from a wider group of candidates that could spin tales about what they’d expect to be heard. . . . “Well, have you actually ever worked with low income students?” “Uh, no I’ve never known, never been intimately connected with anyone low income in my life”, versus the minority answer, “Well, in fact, I grew up in public housing where I tutored my brother. I also tutored someone, who uh, you know, a black youth, who did in fact tell me that racializing stereotypes were at play.
In another example, RI6 described interviews as a way of refining the selection process:

> A lot of times, we don't really know. This person seems fairly naïve, but we don't get the sense that this person would be … harmful. And that's the best we can do with the Information Form. . . . Sometimes you'll find an application where the writer is not savvy enough and who talks about “those ignorant people”, or who makes some over-statements about how they would not be treating children fairly, or whatever. But actually, there's a lot that we cannot pick up from the Information Forms, and I don't know that we'd pick it up from the interview either.

These last two examples illuminate more of the complex strands within the admission process and suggest ways of accessing reliable information. Yet they also articulate some limitations in using interviews to assess teacher candidates.

In other examples of how interviews might be useful, RE4 stated, “I think there is a place for a meeting to probe some of the issues that we want to probe in a deeper way”, though she also acknowledged the problem of scarce resources saying, “At some point it becomes a question of capacity. What person power do we have to conduct these interviews or meetings?” RI4 agreed that “It is one thing to say it would be great if we could all have individual interviews with every teacher candidate, but is that really feasible with the resources that we have?” As well, RI6 stated, “I recognize the difficulty of trying to organize interviews for [so many] applicants. There’s no question that in many cases, an interview would be superior . . . but I don’t think it would solve all of our problems”. Uppermost among those problems were the prevalence of classism, homophobia, and racism, all of which could have been leveraged against traditionally marginalized candidates during a personal interview. Discussion now shifts from readers who were supportive of holding candidate interviews to those who rated them as a necessary evil or even a liability.

A few readers described the interview as a necessary precaution rather than an enhancement to the current process. For example, RE3 said that interviews make it possible “to keep the cows out of the gate”. [Editorial comment: From an interviewer’s standpoint, of the three readers who lacked English fluency, RE3 had the most difficulty making herself understood. She also asked me to read aloud several questions on the Interview Guide and then explain what they meant.] In addition to “keeping the cows out”, RE3 said that interviews made it possible to understand candidate claims on the Information Form:

> Identify the voice of the author and whether they have successfully - I won't use argued, but - communicated with me that deep down, this program is for them, that
RE3 addressed the challenge of effectively communicating one’s thoughts but omitted any reference to how interviews might help establish author authenticity, equity-mindedness, or special group candidate representation. These and other drawbacks are characteristic of the comments that readers made in opposition to adding candidate interviews.

Readers who opposed holding candidate interviews stated that in an equity-based program, personal interviews could be very stressful for Aboriginals, disabled persons, and gendered and racialized minorities. In other examples, RI1 said that interviews are always biased because, “Everything would impact the interviewer, from the way the person’s hair is done, to their accent, their gender”. These comments imply a program culture so fraught with classism, homophobia, and racism that traditionally marginalized candidates would have little chance of receiving an equitable evaluation of their capacity to be excellent teachers. In a similar vein, RI1 stated that interviews were inadvisable:

I really do believe that interviews might be useful but I think there’s far more reasons to not consider interviews. We don’t have the work force to do it . . . I believe the subjectivity monster in an interview - if we look at human processes we already see how difficult it is to keep people on track using a rubric . . . I feel that everything from the way the person’s hair is done to their accent, their gender, would impact greatly and so I have some real reservations about interviews.

The use of policy-informed rubrics, though consistent with preservice admission practice across many campuses, does not guarantee high levels of inter-rater reliability. The level of reliability does improve, however, when the use of a particular policy rubric is coupled with the recruitment and mastery training of pro-policy assessment personnel.

Turning to the candidate’s role in the interview process, a few readers said that interviews were useless because it is so easy for candidates to lie about everything from their values to their career goals. Although this possibility certainly exists, the risk of undetected candidate misrepresentation during a personal interview is probably lower than that which would occur during the assessment of a personal Information Form. RI5 expressed misgivings about the potential of any assessment methods to accurately assess incoming candidates:

I’m not sure, for example, that an Applicant Information Form or an interview get at performance all that well. I’m not sure, when you have [so many] applications, whether it’s
even realistic to think that there could be some form of performance other than perhaps performance talked about more explicitly in the interviews and in the Information Forms and in other forms or ways of getting it.

Both assessment methods are vulnerable to inconsistencies arising from admission personnel’s intent to resist policy and candidates’ attempts to enhance their eligibility for acceptance. Also among reader objections was the prohibitive cost of adding candidate interviews. For example, RI9 was one of many readers who objected to interviews for logistical reasons:

I mean if there are many candidates . . . it’s a huge commitment in terms of financial and human resources. Even a weeding out process to reduce the number of interviews would be prohibitive given the high number of applications that would need reviewing.

In another example, RI2 placed interviews low on the list of financial priorities:

I think, if I were going to put money into something that would not be the first thing I would put money into. I would put it into something other than the applicant Information Form. I’d put it into . . . some kind of outreach, or trying to connect with associate teachers, trying to find associate teachers who in some ways, at the very least, aren’t blatantly harassing students in their class. I mean that doesn’t always happen, but ok. That’s where I would put the resources rather than into the interview, rather into other comparison stuff.

To offset interview costs, TR3 said that some teacher training programs require candidates who meet the paper qualifications to have interviews and to pay an extra fee for the service.

Notwithstanding the high cost of interviewing large numbers of candidates, discounting interviews solely on financial grounds seems shortsighted. Consider, for example, what would happen if future research were to prove that some interview structures led to the selection of candidates who demonstrated high levels of equity-mindedness, outstanding classroom leadership skills, exceptional rapport with students with diverse identities, and very low rates of career-switching. These kinds of outcomes could make the case for greater targeted investment in candidate interviews during the admission process. This concludes the presentation of experience-based qualifications and completes the foundation for the final discussion about qualifications for program admission. Next, candidates depart from the literature in their responses to last-minute Admission Policy disclosure.
6.6 Agency Influences on Candidate Assessment

In contrast to the structural influences on candidate assessment, reader influences were less visible, more varied, and deeply rooted in individual will. Many of these influences worked against equitable candidate diversification and grew out of entrenched opposition to the Equity Policy. Others, such as reader friction and bullying, typified rivalries between internal and external readers and the antagonism that some senior faculty felt over being forced to collaborate on a level playing field with much less experienced educators. A final source of reader interference with the assessment process stemmed from readers’ idiosyncratic grading patterns, a practice that arose in part in response to insufficient assessment training.

6.6.1 Resistance to the Equity Policy

Many candidates expressed concern that reader resistance to the Equity Policy might have prejudiced Candidate Information Form assessment. For example, CF3 stated, “There are some people who don’t think it’s fair to privilege some groups over others, but maybe not so many at this institution because they have to understand and accept the rules of the Equity Policy”. As well, some candidates said that they “counted on” at least some of the readers being minorities because “self-identity would be a key factor in how someone would evaluate”. For example, CM2 said that “We always have assumptions about what we see and, especially if you are coming from the dominant group, you probably see yourself”. Furthermore, CF2 said that not knowing the readers made her uncomfortable: “I had this impression of the professors and they’re sitting in the institution and they’re reading with their glasses on and the long beard . . . and you don’t really know what they’re thinking”. Several readers said that they had observed reader resistance to the Equity Policy. For example, RI9 said that there were “people who were seconded, or field partners, who . . . really had no interest in doing anything other than replicating themselves” during the admission process.

Some readers also said that they had observed colleagues who refused to follow the new, equity-based assessment guidelines and were using “the same old pre-equity criteria” to evaluate their Candidate Information Forms. For example, RI6 described a scenario in which a couple of external readers refused to accept the new qualifications for candidates’ prior experience:
At least two of the individuals who were field partners . . . said these are not regular classroom experiences and therefore they don’t count and we should not admit this person. And of course, my response, and a few other people’s responses were, this is exactly what we want. This is typical of the kinds of teacher experiences our teacher candidates are likely to experience, and it’s actually a big plus. So that’s an example . . . or somebody who says . . . my teaching experience is doing community development training, or somebody who has other kinds of unusual experiences. And we used the “outstanding other” category a lot, as a way of saying . . . and it wasn’t a matter of just, in our own minds filling a quota, we were really looking at the quality of the applicant, and the way they understood and were likely to construct themselves as teacher candidates, given the combination of experiences and values that they brought to their work . . . which remarkably, or not remarkably, a number of special people [third readers] who had not had a lot of academic exposure simply couldn’t see and couldn’t value.

Possibly these external readers had been among the sizeable group who boycotted or were unable to attend Equity Policy training or, as RI5 pointed out, they may have been just victims of habit. He stated:

I think a number of the past Information Form readers are current Information Form readers, so I think there is sort of a lens that readers bring to these Information Forms that is probably shifting, but probably not shifting quite as quickly as the Information Form has shifted.

6.6.2 Friction and Bullying
Reader friction was another source of interference with the grading process. Jurisdictional rivalries among internal and external readers also interfered with the efficiency of the reading process. Several readers said that there were differences between the ways that internal and external readers did their evaluations and some members of both groups claimed that the other group was not capable of assessing Candidate Information Forms. Some of the senior faculty complained repeatedly about having to work with field personnel and junior faculty, and a few said that the Program Chairs were incompetent.

In another scenario, some experienced readers bullied novice readers to resist the equity-based marking scheme. On condition of anonymity, a few readers stated that during Equity Policy training some senior faculty had tried hard to persuade them to “watch out for issues that might undermine the program’s reputation”, a euphemistic way of advising against the admission of gendered and racialized candidates. Novice readers responded in various ways depending on how much support they detected among the other readers in the room and the attitudes of the Program Chairs. In some cases, the novice readers felt reassured by the intervention of senior faculty or field partners and accepted that these elders had a better
understanding of “the right thing to do” than they did. Yet in other cases, novice readers stated that they just “moved away from the jerk” and sat at another table. As well, one reader waited for a few minutes and then permanently walked out of the grading process feeling “totally confused and humiliated”. The pattern that emerges is one of central control by the Program Chairs and senior faculty who resisted Equity Policy implementation.

6.6.3 Idiosyncratic Reading Patterns

Readers’ idiosyncratic reading patterns contributed further inequities to the assessment process though not necessarily as intended resistance to the Equity Policy. Several readers stated that they needed to vary the order in which they graded the essays in order to stay focused. For example, RE1 said that the position of the checkboxes did not really matter because he tended to bounce back and forth while he was assessing an Information Form because “the social identities on the front that the candidates are able to check off form part of the picture”, and he wanted to “keep that information in mind” as he was reading. In another example RI5 stated:

I’m not sure. I go back and forth. I know it’s helpful to give more information and provide an indicator of the demographics. . . . I’m actually more interested in what has been written here [pointing to the essays] and I’m not sure I need necessarily to see this.

In other digressions, some readers said that they found it more productive to grade the essay questions out of order. When the Program Chairs tried to curtail this practice, the readers said that varying the marking sequence was necessary “to keep the new grading scheme in mind”. RI5 stated, “I will read the same words as my best colleague and we’ll have a different way of viewing what’s coming across in those pages”. As these examples show, reader-driven setbacks created powerful interference with the process of equitable Information Form assessment.

Finally, what had become a symbolic reading process degenerated completely into procedural stalemate. The readers had collectively graded over 10% of the Information Forms, yet in the context of an unpublished Admission Policy and inadequate policy articulation in the Candidate Handbook, the Candidate Information Form, and the Assessment Rubric, the Program Chairs found themselves in a procedural crisis characterized by increasingly hostile readers, an ethically serious breach of accountability, and the resource
implications of such a complete logistical breakdown. A senior administrator eventually took charge and directed readers to resume their work using whichever one of the holistic and compartmentalized marking schemes they preferred. The grading process resumed within a highly charged atmosphere and despite objections from several readers. This intervention resolved the immediate crisis but in a way that left all but a few readers acutely frustrated and only enabled those remaining to grade about 35% of the Candidate Information Forms.

In what must be close to a landmark case of working conditions putting unexpected time demands on policy implementation administration, the Program Chairs ended up grading about 65% of the Information Forms. As one of them stated, “That process with the Rubric and the comments really did make it slower and so we were meeting from January until virtually the end of March”. Pro-equity readers who were aware of this situation expressed feelings ranging from dismay to outrage. For example, RI1 stated:

We’ve been concerned about equity, both from the perspective of the workload of the readers, but also in terms of fairness to the candidates because those candidates, too many of them, have Information Forms read by the same small group of people.

Despite Equity Policy training, the assessment process retained very little semblance of equitable representation, equity-mindedness, or inter-rater reliability.

6.7 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, administrators, readers, and minority candidates discussed the procedures that characterized the preservice admission process: Candidate recruitment, admission personnel recruitment and Equity Policy training, and candidate assessment. Strategies for candidate recruitment remained largely unchanged from previous years and tended to focus on visible minorities. Recruitment of additional admission personnel to engage in Candidate Information Form assessment also tended to replicate previous practice though it was supplemented by a mandatory equity-focused training course.

Candidate assessment evolved in unexpected ways that reflected both structural and agency interference. From a structural perspective, the reader pool was far too small to accommodate the hundreds of Candidate Information Forms that needed to be graded. As well, there were concerns about the layout of the Information Form. In particular, readers and candidates
debated the location of the special group checkboxes that tracked candidate eligibility for preferential admission, and questioned the sequence of the personal essays. Some readers also expressed concerns about plagiarism and the need for candidate interviews. Agency interference arose from multiple sources. Almost half of the readers openly resisted the equity-based mandate for teacher candidate diversification, and several took it upon themselves to bully junior or novice readers into taking a similar stance in their approach to Information Form grading. There was also friction between internal and external readers and some hostility from senior faculty toward junior educators and external equity experts. Finally, readers’ idiosyncratic reading patterns added another layer of interference with inter-rater reliability. These factors all contributed to a largely inequitable assessment process.
Chapter 7

7 Supports and Constraints That Influenced Equitable Candidate Diversification

7.1 Introduction

This chapter synthesizes the way in which administrators, admission personnel, and minority candidates interacted with admission policy structure during admission procedures in an urban, Canadian teacher education program. It answers the research question, “How did equity-based admission policy shape candidate diversification in an urban Canadian teacher education program?”, as well as the following sub-questions:

1) How did the admission policy context (for example, the Faculty of Education Equity Policy) shape admission policy structure, agency, and procedures?
2) How did institutional structure (for example, the Candidate Handbook) shape equitable candidate diversification?
3) How did institutional agency (for example, admission personnel) shape equitable candidate diversification?
4) How did admission procedures (for example, Candidate Information Form assessment) shape equitable candidate diversification?

As the data will show, policymakers (administrators), policy implementers (Candidate Information Form readers), and policy beneficiaries (minority candidates) experienced the admission process in a way that re/produced conflicting institutional norms. For example, the primacy of academic excellence existed simultaneously with homophobia, racism, and limited support for the Equity Policy. This policy mandated teacher candidate diversification and underpinned admission policy changes to the procedures for candidate recruitment, support, and assessment.

Administrators supported the new admission procedures, though they varied in their expectations for a successful outcome. Readers were divided over candidate diversification, and most minority candidates welcomed it, but the admission process did not evolve as intended. Elaboration of the data analysis shows how policy context, policy structures, and institutional agency shaped an admission process fraught with structural constraints and individual resistance to equitable candidate diversification.
7.2 Teacher Education Admission Policy Context

The admission policy context consisted of external and internal factors that interwove to support and constrain admission policy implementation. In the external context, state laws and university regulations established formal policy boundaries, and international competition for the best students ranked uppermost in the minds of administrators and many readers as the driving force in policy development. However others thought that the needs of diverse urban school populations should take precedence (Jordan, 2010). In the internal policy context, administrators and readers credited the Equity Policy, program partnerships with field practitioners, and candidate support services with contributing positively to an equitable admission process. Yet other readers viewed these factors as both supporting and constraining equitable candidate diversification, in particular because many of the service providers were not given Equity Policy training (see Nieto, 2000). As well, candidate accessibility to support services, providers’ low familiarity with admission policy details, and discrimination against Aboriginals and black women were problematic.

7.3 Teacher Education Admission Policy

There had been little coordination over how to implement reform within the admission process which resulted in changes that introduced constraints within key policy structures (see Fuhrman et al., 1988). Most directly influenced were admission policy documents, program qualifications, and admission procedures.

7.3.1 Admission Policy Documents

Because this teacher education program did not publish its Admission Policy, the Candidate Handbook, Candidate Information Form, and Candidate Information Form Assessment Rubric became the de facto policy documents. The Handbook contained program guidelines and instructions for completing the Information Form, some of which were also summarized on the Information Form. Candidates and several readers supported the policy of granting preferred admission status to six special minority groups: Aboriginals, Disabled Persons, Native French Speakers, Men in Grades K-8, Visible Minorities, and Women in Physics, and of enabling candidates to leverage their academic accomplishments and personal experiences
through four personal essays. The language in both documents reflected a move toward harmonization with Canada’s national database, StatsCan\(^9\) (Crocker & Dibbon, 2008).

In an undisclosed development, the Internet also played a central role in the admission process. Candidates could access the Candidate Handbook in both print and online formats, but instead of completing their Information Forms by hand, now they were required to complete them online in a single Internet session (Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010). This policy overlooked the expense of computer access and the fact that minority groups tend to experience disproportionately high levels of poverty (Portelli et al., 2007). For the admission process to be truly equitable, its burden on prospective candidates must be commensurate with candidates’ individual resources. In the case of candidates who lack sufficient resources, supplementary financing as well as complementary cultural, linguistic, and Internet instruction may be appropriate.

7.3.2 Academic and Non-Academic Qualifications
Qualifications for this program were an evenly weighted combination of academic achievement and non-academic characteristics consisting of candidate identity, background, and experience (Caskey et al., 2001). The academic qualification took precedence, requiring candidates to achieve at least a “C” average (GPA) in their most recent degree and to complete course pre-requisites for specializations in Grades 4-10 and 7-12. Non-academic qualifications took into account candidates’ affiliation with a set of special groups that were targeted for preferred admission, as well as information about their background and experience that they presented in a series of four essays (Casey & Childs, 2007). Yet these requirements gave rise to issues arising from candidates’ special group affiliation, their experiences and goals, and gaps in admission policy articulation.

7.3.2.1 Special Group Affiliation
Many candidates questioned the special group tracking policy because it marginalized minorities who identified with more than one special group, or with a group that was excluded from the list. As well, they disambiguated the set of special group categories into

subgroups based on subject specialization and personal identity, attributing subject identity to Native French speakers, Men in Grades K-6, and Women in Physics, and personal identity to Aboriginals, Disabled Persons, and Visible Minorities.

In other instances, candidates and some readers perceived evidence of systemic exclusion within the admission process, citing barriers such as institutional elitism, homophobia, and racism. They considered preferential admission to be an elitist practice regardless of whether it advantaged traditionally successful groups or marginalized minorities. A few candidates even chose not to disclose special group affiliation on these grounds. As well, a few readers and most candidates interpreted the absence of a special group category for gendered minorities as evidence of institutional homophobia. Candidates who self-identified as gendered minorities resented being invited to disclose racial but not sexual identity even though the practice may have paralleled school board policy that prohibited homosexual populations (see Callaghan, 2008). Many candidates also perceived the requirement to identify culture or race as a form of racism that perpetuated marginalization by forcing people to stand out against their will (Dei, 2003).

Another issue related to special group tracking was the problem of ambiguous labeling. Although equity-based classifications that occur within institutional contexts are inherently subjective and often lack transparency, especially when they embody criteria such as race, class, or mother tongue, the aggregation of candidate identities into seemingly arbitrary categories may disincline candidates to comply with disclosure requirements (McLaughlin, 1987). In this case, candidates were unsettled by the unexplained selection of a particular set of special groups for preferential admission, and frustrated by the ambiguous nature of the special group labels. For example, their questions about the category for Native French Speakers addressed Canadian cultural norms that raised issues of bilingualism, multilingualism, Anglophone and Francophone parentage, and the language of candidates’ secondary education. In another example, candidate questions about the category for Men in Grades K-6 focused on concerns about sexism, student abuse, and the absurdity of advantaging men in such a sexist society. As well, candidates perceived the category for

Francophone and Anglophone are the Canadian terms that designate the “official” founding populations.
Women in Physics as having outgrown its usefulness at a time when the great majority of new teachers with science specializations are women.

Candidates were no less supported by the labels for special groups that tracked personal identity. They questioned how the category for Aboriginals conflated Aboriginal, Indigenous, First Nations, Inuit, and Métis populations, and pointed out how emblematic this practice is of the way in which Canada’s original populations are dismissed by authorities at all levels of society (Stackhouse, 2010). Candidate discussion about the category for Disabled Persons focused on the need for clarification about who qualified as a disabled person and how they might qualify for specialized academic support according to their mental and physical needs. It also included speculation about institutional fears that the admission of disabled candidates might lower program test scores or increase the incidence of individual harm (Green, 2009). Finally, candidates dismissed the Visible Minorities category as meaningless given the range of ways in which visibility can be interpreted. For example, it can refer to degrees of variation from whiteness, differences in overall body type, differences in professional attire, or other characteristics that in a large urban setting could apply to anyone.

7.3.2.2 Candidate Experience and Goals

Experience-based qualifications have gained prominence as good indicators of how well candidates respond in diverse school populations (Demetrulias, Chiodo, & Diekman, 1990) and this program required candidates to describe their teaching-related experiences in four personal essays. Although readers supported the essays’ holistic approach because it enabled the most committed, intelligent, and empathetic individuals to gain entry, they also expressed concerns about plagiarism and recommended a proctored writing process.

Responses to the individual essays were also mixed. Candidates valued the first essay because it asked about their motivation for becoming a teacher, yet most readers described it as a waste of time because everyone’s answers were the same. Administrators valued the way that the second essay asked candidates to link their knowledge about teaching to three prior experiences of their own choosing, and candidates supported the way that it provided space for gendered candidates to be explicit about the value of their experiences as gays and lesbians (Goldstein, 2005). However, many readers opposed this essay and the policy behind it, namely the extension of eligible experiences beyond 100 hours of classroom interaction, a
Some readers supported the essay that asked candidates to describe the importance of equity and diversity in teaching and learning environments (see for example, Nieto, 2000), though others said that it often amounted to rather vapid answers and could only function properly with knowledge of a candidate’s minority status. Many candidates found it extremely relevant because it enabled them to express sensitivity to discrimination, marginalization, diversity issues, and teaching as a vehicle for activism. Some readers considered the fourth essay superfluous but others, along with many candidates, liked the space it gave candidates, especially those with borderline transcripts who often make the best teachers, to elaborate on their identity and to discuss professional goals, special accomplishments, and experiences of overcoming adversity.

7.3.2.3 Policy Articulation

In the absence of a published admission policy, the Candidate Handbook and the Candidate Information Form became the primary sources of information about admission policy. Yet multiple gaps in policy articulation left readers and candidates with unanswered questions about issues such as qualification weighting, disclosure of special group affiliation, and special group precedence, weighting, and quotas. As well, last minute changes to the non-academic qualifications disadvantaged candidates who had already submitted their applications to this program or had decided not to apply to other programs whose deadlines had passed (McLaughlin, 1987).

Speculation about the weighting between academic and non-academic qualifications ranged from certainty that they each constituted 50% of the application grade to contradictory convictions that they each carried a dominant percentage. Candidates found uncertainty over this point very stressful and generally favoured weighting academic and non-academic qualifications equally. The weight of special group affiliation within the non-academic qualifications was also a mystery to most readers and candidates, though some believed there was an extra edge for Visible Minorities and others that Aboriginal affiliation would guarantee admission.
Whether minority candidates were required to disclose special group affiliation was also unclear to many readers and candidates. Most assumed that disclosure was mandatory for candidates who affiliated with special subject groups (Native French Speakers, Men in Grades K-6, and Women in Physics) as a simple matter of academic logistics. However, they were unsure whether the obligation extended to special identity groups (Aboriginals, Disabled Persons, Visible Minorities), and concerned that special identity affiliations disclosure might unleash risks for candidates in these groups (Caskey et al., 2001). In fact, fear of the risks associated with identity disclosure triggered a variety of candidate responses. Some checked off more than one special group affiliation, others withheld their special group identities, and one added a box for gender minorities.

Special group precedence, weighting, and quotas also remained unclear to most readers and candidates. Some attributed preferential admission to Aboriginals and Disabled Persons, whereas others believed that Aboriginals, Native French Speakers, and Visible Minorities were considered last. It was also assumed that each special group had a fixed quota and candidates wondered what had happened to candidates whose special group quotas were full. There was also consensus, though concern, that the admission cut-off standard fluctuated from group to group, and that the level of competition within some of the special groups might have been higher than that for regular candidates putting minorities at a disadvantage.

Candidates responded to these concerns with several recommendations about how to make the admission process more equitable. These included holding a lottery for all minorities, and making a more robust commitment to LGBT affirmative action through an evaluation process that would include LGBT candidates, LGBT applicants who did not receive offers of acceptance, and LGBT applicants who declined them. 11

Despite the importance of providing candidates with timely information, this program made several changes to its online admission qualifications just a few weeks before the application deadline (Caskey et al., 2001). At this time, it was stated that candidates who disclosed minority status would receive preferential admission status, and they now had the option of linking their knowledge about teaching to experiences inside as well as outside the

---

11 “Affirmative action” refers to a policy of admitting traditionally marginalized candidates over others in cases where all parties’ academic and non-academic qualifications are equivalent.
classroom. Some candidates were unaware that the admission policy would be updated online, and several reported feeling cheated by the way that the new policy devalued their classroom-based qualifications. Others indicated that they would not have applied to this program if they had known sooner about these policy changes, and some who discovered the policy changes after the application deadline were in a double bind; they were ineligible to withdraw from the program without financial penalty and the application deadlines for other preservice programs that they would have preferred had already passed.

### 7.3.3 Admission Procedures

There had been little coordination over how to implement equity-based changes within the admission process because those responsible for implementing reform had not been involved in developing new policy structure and procedures (Fuhrman et al., 1988). This resulted in an unsystematic series of changes to several key admission procedures: Candidate recruitment, admission personnel recruitment and training, candidate assessment, and admission notification.

#### 7.3.3.1 Candidate Recruitment

This program’s recruitment process reached out to high school–based minorities regardless of their academic track record, though it fell short of the equity mandate by focusing for the most part only on racialized minorities (Falkenberg, 2010). There was concern among many readers that the recruitment program was not working well enough to support all of the special groups on the Candidate Information Form, and hope among administrators that there might be a solution through creating partnerships with organizations such as teacher unions, provincial governments, and universities. Candidates also perceived merit in approaching inner city school students in Grades 4-6, and in offering them the extra academic support that they would need to successfully complete high school and an undergraduate degree. It was also suggested that the recruitment seminars for non-traditional and undergraduate programs be held at least two years before the application deadline to give candidates enough time to get their finances and personal commitments in order.
7.3.3.2 Admission Personnel Recruitment and Equity Training

Recruitment of supplementary admission personnel was an annual exercise that brought in internal and external educators to serve as Candidate Information Form readers. This year, some institutional groups were tasked with responsibility for recruiting a more diverse reader pool, though they received no incentives to attract individuals with equity sensibilities (see for example, Matsumura et al., 2010). Candidates raised issues of readers’ professional competence, in particular when they learned that undergraduate and graduate students were active in the assessment process (see Linton, 1927). Ultimately, the composition of this year’s reader pool showed few signs of equity-minded infusion. External readers consisted of active duty and retired superintendents, principals, teachers, community leaders and civil servants, and the internal readers were mostly senior program administrators, seasoned and junior faculty, support staff, and students. Suggestions were made to recruit new readers from diverse and traditionally marginalized groups, and in particular to target those who demonstrated a commitment to social justice (see for example, Rodriguez et al., 2010).

Information Form readers were required to attend an Equity Policy training course designed to sensitize them to their own biases as well as to the experiences and identities of the minority candidates who would affiliate with special groups on the Candidate Information Form (McCaskell, 2005). Attendance was not enforced, and many individuals with prior experience as Information Form readers resented being asked to train alongside novice readers. Although equity experts opened the training session, they were followed by preservice Program Chairs who lacked a full appreciation of the new equity-based assessment procedures. Procedures for reader pairing, Information Form allocation among the readers, session pacing, and facilitator disorganization were also problematic, resulting in an assessment process that was constrained by both structural and agency influences (see for example, Solomon & Allen, 2001).

7.3.3.3 Structural Influences on Information Form Assessment

In the absence of an assessment pilot, Information Form assessment encountered structural constraints such as the size of the reader pool, the layout of the Information Form, and the instructions for essay completion and assessment (see for example, McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). The reader pool was disproportionately small, causing pressure on readers to invest
more time in the reading process. They experienced the time demands in different ways depending on their regular workload and transit time to the program site. In the absence of release-time funding from the Faculty of Education or the local school boards, the assessment process tended to rely on experienced external readers who were more able than new hires to leverage time away from their usual responsibilities. Yet pressure from the Program Chairs to return for additional grading sessions embittered many readers and did little to offset the number of Information Forms that remained for the Chairs to assess (see for example, Berne, 1994).

The layout of the Candidate Information Form caused concern among readers and candidates who questioned how the positioning of the special group checkboxes would influence reader assessment. Some favoured having the special groups at the top of the form, others thought that information about minority status should come at a later stage, and still more perceived that all information about candidates’ minority status should be withheld from the readers. Candidates also favoured placing the open essay about personal achievements at the beginning instead of the end of the essay section to offset any bias that readers may have intuitively felt toward special group candidates.

Further structural constraints lay in the instructions about the four personal essays. In particular, multiple and contradictory sections in the Handbook made it unclear whether candidates should discuss equity in all four essays or just in the essay that asked about diversity and social justice (see for example, Skrla et al., 2009). Readers were also aware that excessive instructions may have enabled candidates’ to overstate their understanding of equity sensitivity and equitable practice. Readers also encountered gaps and contradictions in the instructions for essay assessment. For instance, the special group checkboxes did not appear on the Assessment Rubric, and although readers had been told during equity training that they should consider candidates’ special group affiliations, there was no information about how to factor this information into the grading scheme. Also problematic regarding the Assessment Rubric were a section for Additional Comments, a space for a final grade, and unresolved reader confusion over how to calculate the final grade. All of these influences contributed to reduced inter-rater reliability.
7.3.3.4 Agency Influences on Information Form Assessment

Readers and candidates identified three reader actions that might interfere with equitable Candidate Information Form assessment: Resistance to the Equity Policy and idiosyncratic grading patterns (see for example, Sleeter, 2009). Reader resistance manifested as unwillingness to comply with the new Assessment Rubric, disrespect for candidate confidentiality, fractiousness intended to disrupt the assessment process, and bullying novice readers into preserving the program’s academic reputation by down grading Information Forms from gendered and racialized candidates. Much of this behaviour could have been avoided through careful planning, broad-based consultation among all stakeholder groups, and competent leadership (see for example, Grubb & Flessa, 2006). Readers’ idiosyncratic grading patterns also interfered with Information Form assessment. Several readers varied the order in which they graded the essays in order to conserve their ability to concentrate and make it easier to keep the new grading scheme in mind. Others kept referring back to the special group checkboxes to verify their candidates’ minority status, and a few either did not read the special group information until after they had graded the essays or not at all.

Under the circumstances, it was impossible for deserving candidates to escape penalty arising from structural inconsistencies in the Information Form assessment process. Although Information Form assessment began as an administrative procedure with low levels of conflict and ambiguity, reader resistance and interpersonal conflict transformed it into little more than a symbolic exercise with low levels of inter-rater reliability (Matland, 1995). To achieve equitable access, programs must resist the practical appeal of simply adding equity training to existing and inherently inequitable program structures, and engage in a process of program-wide transformation that will result in widely shared equity sensitivity and commitment to equitable candidate diversification (see for example, Arnesen et al., 2009).

7.4 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, elaboration of the data analysis has shown how the admission policy context shaped admission policy reform, and how institutional structure and individual will contributed to an admission process fraught with supports for and constraints against equitable candidate diversification. Individual will was exercised by three groups of institutional agents: Policymakers (administrators), policy implementers (readers), and policy
beneficiaries (minority candidates) in a way that re-produced the primacy of academic excellence, homophobia, racism, and limited support for the Equity Policy. Administrators supported the new admission procedures though with various expectations for a successful outcome. Readers were divided over the mandate for candidate diversification, and minority candidates welcomed it with only a few reservations.

In the absence of a published admission policy, candidates turned to the Candidate Handbook and the Candidate Information Form for information about the admission process. Gaps existed in the relative weighting of academic and non-academic qualifications, and accusations of institutional elitism, homophobia, and racism were leveled at the set of special groups with which minority candidates were required to identify. Further confusion arose from the policy that required minority candidates to disclose special group affiliation, in the precedence, weighting, and quotas among special groups, in the instructions to candidates about how to complete personal essays on their background and experience, and from the last minute disclosure of policy changes to the non-academic qualifications.

Admission procedures also suffered from less than equitable influences. Candidate recruitment focused on visible minorities to the exclusion of other special groups, reader recruitment failed to either increase the size of the reader pool or infuse the assessment process with a fresh pool of equity-minded readers, and Equity Policy training for experienced and novice readers only produced low levels of inter-rater reliability. In consequence, and despite what may have been the administration’s best intentions, institutional structure and individual will did more to constrain equitable candidate diversification than to support it.
Chapter 8

8 Thesis Summary and Recommendations

This final chapter provides the reader with an overview of the research project, culminating in a robust set of recommendations for research, policy, and practice in equitable teacher education admission policy implementation. Other highlights include the summaries of Chapter Three, which describes the methodology, and of Chapter Seven, which describes the research findings. Research significance arises from findings in new areas such as program partnerships, candidate support services, non-academic qualification terminology and labeling, as well as admission personnel training.

8.1 Thesis Summary

This summary provides a synopsis of the previous seven chapters. Chapter One introduces the research problem as the chronic under-representation of minority teachers within urban school systems. This lack of proportional representation creates barriers to minority student learning which arise when minority students do not recognize themselves in the faces, voices, and language of their teachers. However, what events led to this research focus? The theoretical framework describes the researcher’s transformative experiences while teaching English and French Immersion (all Ontario Grades K-OAC), chairing a 23-person Social Studies Department, and holding executive positions within AERA, CSSE, and OISE’s Faculty Council. Repeated exposure to the marginalization of minority students generated interest in eliminating this inequitable practice and in challenging the systemic foundations that re/produce it, organizational norms such as classism, homophobia, and racism, as well as entrenched patterns of administrative oversight and procedural breakdown. Given the structure of the educational pipeline, in which principals, superintendents, and school board executives start their careers as teachers, diversification of the teacher workforce presented itself as the solution to minority student marginalization. The leap from a goal of teacher diversification to the need for equitable teacher education admission policy was immediate and led to the search for a Faculty of Education with a formal equity policy that supported teacher candidate diversification. Permission to conduct research within such a site made it
possible to frame the following research question: “How did equity-based admission policy shape candidate diversification in an urban Canadian teacher education program?”

A review of the literature in educational equity, teacher education admission, and policy implementation added depth and focus to the research question, culminating in the conceptual model which shows the relationships among admission policy context, institutional structure and agency, organizational culture, and teacher candidate diversification. The chapter concluded with a summary of the thesis.

Chapter Two consists of an unusual literature review in that it brings together work from three fields that do not often intersect in education research: educational equity, teacher education admission, and policy implementation. Although this review did much to advance data collection and analysis, it did not reach into every area of teacher education admission that emerged from the data. The literature on equity research explores the global education market, educational policy context, the needs of diverse school populations, and teacher candidate diversification. Teacher education admission theory considers primary and secondary program qualifications, admission policy instrumentation, and procedures for candidate evaluation. Policy implementation research focuses on policy development, stages of policy implementation, and the characteristics of complex organizations, including many of the visible and invisible factors that shape policy outcomes. The review of implementation theory provided a bridge between equity theory and teacher education admission policy.

Chapter Three presents the research methodology. It described the principal actors, the single case study context, and the research proposal, as well as the procedures for departmental and university ethics review. Data collection was consistent with qualitative research practice for site selection, and securing permission for access to institutional documents. Construction of the interview samples was designed to maximize personal diversity and to represent the institutional agents who had the greatest influence on the admission process, senior administration, admission personnel (including field-based volunteers), and successful minority candidates.

Data analysis was an iterative process in which demographic, thematic, and editorial coding facilitated the layering of emergent themes as well as the frequent rearrangement of
researcher narrative and transcript text. Data elaboration interwove research findings with lessons from the literature in a way that illuminated new insight into policy consequences. Data dissemination will be directed initially toward multiple audiences in educational equity, teacher education admission, and educational policy implementation, though there has also been interest from researchers in higher education admission and other professional degree programs. Distribution will take place through conference presentations, Internet websites, conference proceedings, articles in refereed journals, and practitioner handbooks. Translation will depend on demand and funding availability.

Chapter Four is the first of three chapters in which administrators, admission personnel, and minority candidates discussed their perceptions of the admission process during private, confidential interviews. Beginning with the admission policy context, these institutional stakeholders described factors in the external policy context such as international competition, the needs of diverse public school populations, and university policies on human rights and admission. Within the Faculty of Education, the internal policy context consisted of a newly enacted Equity Policy, program partnerships with field practitioners, and candidate support services. Most influential among these factors was the Equity Policy because of its mandate for equitable teacher candidate diversification.

Chapter Five presents widely divergent perspectives on the preservice admission policy with a focus on policy instrumentation, program qualifications, and policy articulation. In the absence of a published admission policy, the Candidate Handbook and Candidate Information Form became the de facto policy documents, though they contained multiple policy gaps that led to confusion among candidates and admission personnel. There was widespread support for the institution’s high academic qualifications, but resistance to some of the equity-based, non-academic qualifications such as preferential admission for six special groups of minority candidates. Even though these groups were labeled according to subject specialization and candidate identity, they underrepresented the diversity that is characteristic of urban populations. This exclusionary practice prompted allegations of elitism, homophobia, and racism from admission personnel and minority candidates. Impressions of inequity also surrounded the requirement for candidates to disclose their minority status, the risks that this disclosure might trigger, and the absence of information
about special group admission precedence and quotas. Other concerns persisted about confusing and contradictory instructions for completing the Candidate Information Form and finally the marginalizing impact of last minute policy changes.

Chapter Six focuses on preservice admission procedures that had been targets of reform in response to the Equity Policy mandate for teacher candidate diversification. They consisted of candidate recruitment, admission personnel recruitment and training, and the assessment of candidates’ non-academic qualifications. Some procedures underwent only token restructuring but others were fraught with confusing and conflicting changes. For example, candidate recruitment maintained past practice with an emphasis on established minority group contacts, and admission personnel recruitment, though targeted for diversification, experienced little equitable change. Personnel training focused on Equity Policy implementation but suffered from incompetent leadership and personnel resistance rooted in fears about how equity-based admission would weaken the program’s international reputation for academic excellence. The process for assessing Candidate Information Forms experienced setbacks due to a disproportionately small reader pool, inconsistencies between the instructions for document completion and assessment, and an unworkable assessment rubric. In combination, these events lowered inter-reader reliability and interfered with teacher candidate diversification.

Chapter Seven answers the research question and discusses how admission policy context, institutional structure and agency, and organizational culture shaped teacher candidate diversification. To understand these relationships, it is helpful to consider how each element in the conceptual model (Figure 1, above) contributed to equity-based admission policy implementation and the mandate for teacher candidate diversification. Implicit within this approach is the notion that organizational elements may simultaneously support and restrict policy implementation, but that by interrogating how each of these elements contributes to candidate diversification it is possible to illuminate new complexities within the admission process and lay a stronger foundation for equitable practice.

Beginning with the external policy context, international competition, diverse student needs, and university policies on human rights and admissions either supported teacher candidate
diversification or did nothing to impede the process. However, the internal contextual factors, namely the Faculty of Education Equity Policy, program partnerships with educators in the field, Faculty-based student support services, and organizational culture presented both supports and constraints to the admission process. The Equity Policy was supportive through its mandates for more diversified candidate recruitment, improved student support services, use of a more equitable Candidate Information Form, diversification of the Information Form reader pool, and Equity Policy training for all readers. Yet program partnerships exerted both positive and negative influences on candidate diversification. Positively, they strengthened relationships among classroom teachers, Faculty-based field supervisors, and preservice candidates, while enabling many classroom teachers to hand pick the candidates they wished to supervise during field-based internships. Negatively, the pervasive influence of these partnerships in the shaping of Faculty policies and practice tended to anchor the preservice program in traditional and often exclusionary norms.

Similarly, candidate support services both strengthened and weakened candidate diversification. Supportive elements consisted of an in-house Equity Officer, access to Registrarial personnel via snail mail, email, telephone, fax, and opportunities for personal interviews with or without an appointment. However, constraints also prevailed because the Equity Officer had very limited, daytime only hours of access, Registrarial staff knew almost nothing about the Equity Policy, and none of the minority candidates was able to qualify for financial assistance. Organizational culture was the last contextual factor that influenced candidate diversification and its impact was contradictory. There was broad support for the Faculty’s high academic standards, but this was tempered by deeply entrenched institutional elitism, homophobia, racism, and resistance to the Equity Policy.

In the absence of a published admission policy, the Candidate Handbook, the Internet, the Candidate Information Form, and the Information Form Assessment Rubric became the *de facto* and often contradictory sources of information about the admission process. In support of teacher diversification, the Handbook highlighted the Equity Policy, implied preferred admission for special minority group candidates, and provided very detailed information about how candidates should complete the Information Form. In constraint of an equitable admission process, the Handbook provided insufficient information about the rules for
disclosure of special minority group affiliation and about the risks associated with special group status. It also contained both confusing, and in some places, excessive instructions about how to complete the Information Form.

The Internet supported the admission process for upper- and middle-class candidates with strong IT skills, provided the benefits of off-site access to program information, and relayed last-minute policy changes to the few who knew to look for them. Yet for most candidates, it was expensive to access, required IT skills that were unfamiliar, and disadvantaged those with lower incomes and heavy demands on their personal time. It was only when candidates tried to submit their Information Forms that they discovered the need to submit them exclusively on line and in a single session.

The Candidate Information Form also both supported and constrained an equitable admission process. It strengthened the process by highlighting the Equity Policy, implying preferred admission according to six special group categories for minority candidates, and inviting candidates to complete four essays in which they could describe their identity, experiences, and prior learning relevant to teaching. On the other hand, it weakened the process by providing Information Form readers (assessors) with information about candidates’ minority status, by relaying confusing instructions for essay completion, and by giving candidates too little/much space in which to write their essays. Some candidates also perceived the essay topics as repetitive or too difficult, and found it difficult to provide verifiers for the essays about their prior experiences. As well, the Assessment Rubric was surprisingly problematic. Its instructions for grading the candidate essays contradicted the instructions for completing them. Furthermore, it contained sections for additional comments and an overall essay mark that were not explained in the instructions about how to calculate the final Assessment Rubric grade.

Another salient influence on the admission process was institutional agency, especially in the form of Information Form reader resistance to the Equity Policy. Other agency constraints consisted of an insufficient number of Information Form readers, incompetent Equity Policy trainers, reader resistance to Equity Policy training, external/internal reader rivalry, senior reader bullying of novice readers, and idiosyncratic reader grading patterns. In conjunction,
these constraints led to low inter-rater reliability, and presumably, compromised candidate diversification.

The final influence on teacher candidate diversification was organizational culture, a pervasive mixture of racism, homophobia, classism, and affection for the status quo. This culture influenced resistance to the Equity Policy and the omission of a special group category for gender-minority candidates. It also alarmed candidates who experienced its marginalizing influence during the admission process and fueled reader bias toward minority candidates.

On the strength of these insights, it is possible to state firmly, though sadly, that at this research site equity-based admission policy fell short of advancing teacher candidate diversification. However, there is hope in this new understanding about how to make the admission process more equitable and for the promise of expanding teacher candidate diversification.

8.2 Research Significance

This research builds on work by McLaughlin (1987), Bascia (1994), and Oakes (1995), yet offers new insight in its analysis of the relationships among educational equity, teacher education admission, and policy implementation. This study is also unusual because it diverges from the typically prescriptive focus of equity policy and the typically systemic agency of implementation policy. Instead, it brings together the complications inherent in policy implementation with the promise of teacher candidate diversification through an equity-based admission process.

Findings in existing areas of research add to the literature on secondary qualifications for admission (Brown, 2007; Casey and Childs, 2007; Coleman, 1966; Falkenberg, 2010; Gutiérrez & Baquedano-López, 1999; Johnson, 2007; Lenski et al., 2005; McCaskell, 2005; Mcfalls & Cobb-Roberts, 2001; Nieto, 2000; Noddings, 2006; Pritchard et al., 2010; Skrla et al., 2009; Zeichner, 2003; Zeichner &Conklin, 2008) by pointing out how secondary or non-academic qualifications are increasingly holding equal weight with measures of academic performance during candidate assessment.
Perhaps of greatest significance is the way that this work separates conventional non-academic requirements into subject-based and identity-based qualifications. This distinction respects differences between candidates’ voluntary, academic pursuits, and those qualifications that they have inherited such as physical appearance (“race”), gender, ethnocultural identities.

Closely linked to questions of candidate identity are issues of identity labeling. This study adds to the research literature on identity labeling (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Fusarelli, 2004; Kezar, 1999; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Mahrouse, 2001; Schama, 2005) by identifying instances of label misuse and of ambiguous meaning that arise from decontextualization, geographical variations, and overgeneralization.

This study also contributes to the research literature on admission personnel training (Adams, 1994; Berne, 1994; Clune, 2001; deLeon & deLeon, 2002; Elson, 2006; Fuhrman et al., 1988; Grubb and Flessa, 2006; Habermas, 1987; Hall & O’Toole, 2000; Kosnik et al., 2003; Matsumura et al., 2010; Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1989; McDonnell & Elmore, 1987; McLaughlin, 1987; Mitchell and Romero, 2010; O’Toole, 1993; Spillane, 1998; Wallin, 2001; Zeldin et al., 2005) by raising issues of homophobia, racism, bullying, and leadership incapacity.

Other new findings that do not appear in the literature focus on issues of equity within teacher education program partnerships and within candidate support services. Hopefully the synergy of these findings will contribute to a more equitable body of education research that helps eliminate student marginalization at all levels of public education.

### 8.3 Research Limitations

This study is limited by the narrow scope of a single site project (Cresswell, 2007). As well, there are no checks for content validity and data replication is impossible (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2004). Yet the high degree of care during project conceptualization, data collection, data analysis, and data elaboration may lessen the impact of these limitations. All other shortcomings are the responsibility of the researcher.
8.4 Recommendations for Research

This study underpins opportunities for continuing research into educational equity, teacher education admission, and educational policy implementation. Beginning with educational equity, the development of an equity lexicon would facilitate collaboration among educational researchers by providing them with both a common knowledge base and a familiar language of inquiry. For example, current research defines educational equity in terms of funding fairness, access to print-based skills, adequacy of educational opportunity, measurement of student achievement, social justice activism, personal consciousness, and respect for humanity.

In terms of teacher education admission, although the methodology lends itself to large scale replication, it would be useful to expand the number of interview groups to include minoritized candidates who did not receive offers of admission, as well as those who received offers but declined them. Another strategy that might be valuable in understanding how pro-diversification admission policy shapes the teacher candidate pool would be to collect statistical data on the levels of candidate diversity before and after admission policy implementation. However, there is need for caution because the percentages of identified minorities within the total candidate pool might be only estimates given that some candidates prefer not to sustain the risks associated with minority affiliation.

Continuing with teacher education admission, but on a much larger scale, multi-site research could provide new insight into equitable admission processes, not only within preservice teacher education programs, but also within all professional programs that lead to formal licensing. In teacher education, it would be useful to conduct comparative, multi-site research within pro-equity preservice teacher education programs in Canada and the United States using a data collection protocol that replicates the key themes in this study: external and internal admission policy context, admission policy structure and agency, and organizational culture. To uncover strengths and gaps in equitable assessment, it would be valuable to undertake a comparative study of admission policy instrumentation that identifies candidates’ non-academic qualifications. In particular, attention to the representation and assessment of candidates’ personal identity and prior experience would extend our knowledge about how best to capture this sensitive and powerful information. As well, further exploration of
admission personnel training with regard to policy reform could provide new insight into the roles that policy implementers play during teacher education admission.

Finally, this study offers a new perspective on educational policy implementation suggesting that it consists of four sequential and sometimes overlapping stages: problem identification, policy design, policy delivery, and policy evaluation. Although the scope of this project only supported the collection of original data during policy delivery, the findings make clear the importance of interactions between structure and agency within every stage of policy implementation. For example, in this study the need for teacher candidate diversification was well understood (problem identification), but the admission policy that was designed to enable that diversification suffered from contradictory and incomplete articulation (policy design). These structural weaknesses were compounded by agency resistance to policy reform (policy delivery), and very few resources were dedicated to assessing the causes of unwanted policy outcomes (policy evaluation). Nonetheless, this study suggests that intended policy outcomes are much more likely to occur when policy reform recognizes and supports all four stages of policy implementation.

8.5 Recommendations for Policy

Salient new policy recommendations address educational equity and teacher education admission. In terms of educational equity policy, the most pressing need is to articulate clearly two foundational principles: equitable representation and equitable interaction. Yet how might this be possible? Equitable representation refers to the inclusion of all minoritized groups, which in turn depends on an understanding of the breadth of diversity within minoritized populations. Minoritized group identities include an array of visible and invisible characteristics that are context specific, subject to external labeling, constantly changing in response to cultural mediation. The use of predetermined lists of group identities, such as those typically found on admission documents, is far less equitable than a process that invites minoritized individuals to name their own group affiliations. Also inherent in achieving equitable representation is the complicated and sensitive process of empowering minorities to disclose their own identities without incurring personal risk. A secure disclosure is essential to the policy implementation process, both on humanitarian grounds and from the practical standpoint of accurate candidate tracking. For example, if an equity policy requires
minoritized individuals to disclose their identities, it must do so in a way that guarantees respect and confidentiality. The need for absolute confidentiality extends to every level of institutional and public discourse in order to protect against further acts of prejudice and marginalization.

The second foundational equity principle is equitable interaction, yet for this to become normalized within organizational culture, many changes must occur. Paramount among them is the need for widespread and ongoing equity policy orientation that alerts those with power to the extent of their privileges, and sensitizes everyone to the ways in which representation, language, and resource allocation can re/produce marginalization. It is also important to develop procedures that encourage all institutional agents to report instantiations of marginalization and resources must be set aside to respond to these reports in a suitable and transparent way. In time, such equity policy structure may create a high degree of support for equitable interaction, whether tacit or genuine, so that exclusionary acts will be few in number and those that do occur will diminish in response to official sanction or voluntary intervention.

Greater attention to equity policy context could also strengthen equitable representation and interaction by affording advance identification of potential sources of policy support and resistance. For example, in an organization populated by predominantly white, middle-class, Christians there might be strong resistance to equity-based reform. To soften that resistance, it would be valuable to engage potential policy adversaries in early developmental conversations about problem identification and policy articulation. Another precaution would be to establish and enforce mandatory and ongoing equity policy training for all members of the organization. Although this training would probably be subject to initial resistance, with enough administrative leadership and commitment, principles of equity could become the foundation for all educational policy.

Turning to teacher education admission policy, this study highlights important considerations in the domains of policy conceptualization, policy articulation, and policy communication. As part of policy conceptualization, there must be great care in determining the risks and benefits to all organizational agents, to monitor related institutional deadlines that may have a
direct bearing on policy outcomes, to visualize admission procedures in sufficient detail, and to identify commensurate human and physical resources. For example, reliance on voluntary agents who are external to the organization may create barriers to the intended admission process.

Effective policy articulation depends foremost on the publication of a comprehensive policy document that serves as the definitive policy instrument. Policy articulation depends on careful consideration of all potential audiences, attention to the quality of language, and informed choices about the degree of explicit detail. For example, it is possible to neutralize the value of a candidate’s personal information form by publishing overly explicit instructions for its completion.

As to admission policy communication, it is important that admission personnel be fully aware of policy nuances and that there is strict adherence to a consistent text across all policy platforms. For example, if an organization uses print and online versions of its admission policy, it is essential that all audiences be made aware of what kinds of information might appear in each format and of when to expect online updates. Overlooking these steps creates advantages for candidates who have personal contacts within the organization and ultimately distorts any evaluation of policy outcomes. However, when all of these recommendations are implemented successfully there are likely to be many intended policy outcomes.

### 8.6 Recommendations for Practice

These recommendations stem from the principles of equitable representation and equitable interaction. They support teacher candidate diversification and address practice in four areas of teacher education admission: policy transparency, representations of diversity, collection of personal information, and personal information assessment.

#### 8.6.1 Admission Policy Transparency

The absence of a published admission policy at this research site forced admission personnel and teacher candidates to rely on the student handbook as the definitive admission policy instrument. Its contents were sometimes contradictory and far from comprehensive which precipitated multiple discrepancies in the way that the admission process unfolded. Also in
practice, the importance of policy transparency cannot be overstated. There must be great attention to detail to ensure that the principal admission policy document contains all of the information that may be germane to the several audiences that it serves. For example, if candidate diversification is part of an admission policy that has the same admission requirements for all candidates, this needs to be clearly stated to inform all within the organizational community that minority candidates’ academic accomplishments and ability are on a par with those of their majority classmates. In another example, if candidates are required to submit any of their application documents using the Internet, this needs to be stated clearly so as not to prepare those without internet access at home and avoid marginalizing low income candidates.

Further recommendations for policy transparency include stating the organization’s purpose in collecting minority status information, the requirement, if any, for disclosing confidential information and sanctions, if any, for misrepresenting or withholding it, the intended and permitted applications of confidential information, and the procedures for storage, access, and destruction of candidates’ confidential personal information. As well, the language of the principal admission policy document must be is respectful, inclusive, and easily understandable to an international readership. The language and contents of derivative documents, such as a student handbook or personal information form, must also be consistent with the parent document. Full policy accessibility is only possible when this consistency also extends to multiple formats of all policy documents. For example, if a student handbook is published under a common title in both print and online formats, the contents must be identical and the publication dates clearly visible. In this way, discrepancies between print and online versions, most likely due to online updates, will not cause confusion and hardship to minoritized candidates.

Other transparency issues that need careful attention are qualification precedence and weighting. For example, candidates need to know the relative importance of their performance on academic and non-academic qualifications. In another example, if admission policy includes quotas for special minority groups, candidates are entitled to know what consideration will be given to minority candidates whose quotas are full and whether they will be released back into the general pool to compete against their majority counterparts.
8.6.2 Representations of Diversity

The second set of recommendations targets the representation of candidate diversity. Of greatest concern is the need to replace common practices of identity exclusion, conflation, and over-generalization with inclusionary, accurate, and transparent labeling. As this study has shown, these practices extend to visible as well as invisible minorities, and the time has come when the representation of candidate diversity must extend to everyone, including those whose minority identities consist of sexual orientation, physical appearance (a.k.a. race), religious belief, personal income, family origins, nationality, or language fluency. The challenge is to capture all of this diversity in a way that is respectful to the individual yet available to the organization in a form that is useful for administrative purposes. For example, if admission policy establishes minority group quotas, it becomes necessary to identify candidates according to one or more groups to facilitate candidate tracking and the monitoring of admission quotas. However, it is important to prevent administrative convenience from creating practice that conflates or over-generalizes candidate identities within the admission process.

The conflation of unlike identity characteristics is problematic because it attributes equivalent value to characteristics that candidates experience in markedly different ways. For example, candidates may perceive the conflation of candidate identity based on voluntary characteristics, such as subject specialization, with that based on inherited characteristics, such as gender or race as offensive and debilitating. Equitable admission practice needs to recognize these differences and to accord them respect and protection. Another recommendation is to avoid the over-generalization of multiple identities into a single label, such as visible minorities, because this practice disrespects the array of difference in physical appearance and fails to distinguish among ethnic groups with vastly contrasting cultures. In large urban populations, the “one size fits all” approach to visible minorities also overlooks the diverse demographics that may create non-white majorities, or even white minorities. Finally, it is important to support the possibility that minoritized candidates may affiliate with more than one minority group. Admission guidelines therefore need to offer candidates the option of declaring minority status within multiple categories.
8.6.3 Collection of Personal Information

Many steps are necessary to ensure the equitable collection of candidates’ personal information during the admission process. It is important to use admission documents that are consistent with university policies, and Faculty of Education policies that protect human subjects. In many jurisdictions throughout Canada and the United States, there may also be state-level regulations that govern organizational policies for the collection, disclosure, application, storage, distribution, and destruction of personal information. During personal information form design, the engagement of policy implementers and beneficiaries will create greater policy clarity, inclusiveness, transparency, and harmonization with policy goals. In more general terms, candidates will respond best to admission instructions that provide clear technical instructions for document completion (e.g., font, font size, margin sizes, and network and hotlink platforms), and for electronic transmissions, if any, in response to ongoing changes in IT software. To ensure a high level of clarity, it would be useful to consult with current candidates to ensure that document instructions that are clear, complete, and transparent.

Documents that collect information on minority status also need to take into account the many minority groups with which candidates may identify. Because candidate identities depend on multiple factors such as ancestry, culture, gender, life experiences, and beliefs, the most inclusive way to collect information about minority status is to enable individuals to choose their own minority status labels even if this means making changes to traditional ways of administering minority status information.

8.6.4 Personal Information Assessment

Recommendations for equitable personal information assessment target admission policy documents and admission personnel competence. Initially, it is important to embed all assessment procedures, including qualifications for admission personnel and their trainers if supplementary training is required, within the main body of an admission policy, and to ensure that document language and contents are consistent. Conducting a pilot exercise is a good way to test training document reliability. It is important to make the language and contents within instruments for candidate assessment consistent with those used in admission
policy statements and candidate application forms. In this way, it is possible to avoid conflicts between instructions to candidates about how to provide information and instructions to admission personnel about how to assess that information. To enhance this consistency, it may be helpful to employ third party editors who have not been engaged in the admission process.

The second set of recommendations concerns issues that affect admission personnel competence. Lack of familiarity with admission policy details or personal resistance to some of those details may reduce their support for intended policy outcomes. To ensure high inter-rater reliability, only personnel who are well informed and supportive of the admission policy goals should carry out personal information assessment. To increase the level of support among admission personnel, admission policy training may be advisable. Successful training will only be possible if admission personnel perceive that the trainers are experts in all aspects of admission policy and candidate assessment. If the training sessions take place well in advance of candidate deadlines, personnel will be more likely to absorb the new materials and to follow up on questions that arise after the training is over. Attendance at the training sessions should be a formal requirement for all personnel, regardless of experience or expertise.

To respect the status of seasoned assessors, and to protect the autonomy of less experienced admission personnel, it would be helpful to structure training sessions that take into account these professional differences. To support individual attendance, it is important to recognize the extra work that training places on admission personnel, to consider their ongoing responsibilities, and to provide them with compensation such as work leave, extra pay, or other benefits. Training sessions should encompass only training materials and teaching methods that reflect inclusive language and respect for all minoritized groups. To increase inter-rater reliability, there should be clear instructions on how to use the assessment instruments and plenty of opportunities for novice and experienced assessors to absorb new material at their own pace. To accommodate trainees’ changing needs for information, it would also be useful for trainers to be accessible to admission personnel to answer questions during the interval between the training sessions and application deadlines. Finally, it is
always useful to implement an ongoing process of evaluation that culminates with a formal report at the end of the assessment cycle.

These recommendations for admission policy transparency, representations of candidate diversity, the collection of personal information, and personal information assessment respond closely to the needs of diverse urban school students to find themselves in the faces, voices, and languages of their teachers. Hopefully, this contribution to research, policy, and practice will strengthen the process of teacher candidate diversification and deepen our understanding of equitable teacher education admission policy.
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Appendix A
Faculty of Education Equity Policy (2005)

Introduction

This program is strongly committed to social justice in everything it does. This means that we are committed to the just treatment of each individual member of our community and the communities we serve. It also means that we are especially vigilant to ensure that differences are not treated in ways that produce direct or indirect forms of discrimination. These differences have been named, for example, by the (Provincial) Human Rights code and include: Aboriginal ancestry, race, colour, culture, ethnicity, language, ability, disability, class, age, ancestry, nationality, place of origin, faith, religion, sex, gender, sexual orientation, sex or family status, marital status, gender identity. Although we have named differences by using the terminology of the Human Rights Code, we understand that this terminology is often contested and in flux.

Our commitment to social justice also means that those with whom we work and live who experience individual or systemic discrimination, for whatever reason, are provided with the means to overcome social and physical disadvantages, to the best of our ability. These commitments are captured in two broad principles:

1. Who we are and what we do will reflect the diversity of the communities we serve.
2. Everyone in our community and the communities we serve will be treated equitably.

As an institution we will work to ensure an environment where students, faculty and staff are given the support needed to realize their goals and aspirations. We strive to remove the barriers that prevent historically disadvantaged groups from realizing their full potential. Through continual examination and monitoring of our practices, policies and programs we will aim to ensure that equitable principles prevail. Furthermore, we believe that this has the responsibility to be a voice for issues of equity and diversity in the wider community.

Our two broad equity principles are aimed at fulfilling our responsibility to create the equality of opportunities and outcomes enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the (Provincial) Human Rights Code, the Federal Contractors Equity Program, and the University’s policies and practices related to equity and discrimination.

The Principles Applied to Internal Administration

The sources and nature of the ‘equity and diversity’ issues with which we are grappling are complex and multi-layered. Equity must be evident throughout all institutional practices - across all communities within the program and at every level of engagement (recruitment, Admission/hiring, retention, evaluation/completion, and promotion). Equity practices will be
measured, acknowledged, and rewarded. In practice, ensuring equitable administrative processes requires substantial, accessible resources (human and material). Professional development for all is critical for the implementation of processes which help ensure equity, and this professional development will be supported with time, money, space, and acknowledgement. It should be understood that equitable treatment sometimes involves similar treatment and at other times involves differential treatment in order to bring about an equality of results. To further ensure that social justice prevails in our administrative practices, we aim to:

1. better coordinate the rich equity expertise that already exists (e.g., develop a database of human resources and materials);
2. b) increase our efforts to acknowledge and address systemic discrimination;
3. c) maintain and continue to develop proactive processes to promote equity practices and monitor their success;
4. d) use equity and diversity as criteria for the evaluation and support of our research centers and community programs;
5. e) develop and implement a process for resolving incidents/issues after they have occurred;
6. f) develop and implement monitoring and evaluation processes to verify the application of the guiding principles;
7. g) promote rewards for teaching and continuing research that reflect equitable practice;
8. h) in collaboration with other (home university) offices, strive to implement antiharassment and anti-discrimination policies and practices;
9. i) ensure that the implementation of these goals be incorporated into the portfolio of one of the deans at the program; (and)
10. j) maintain and develop mechanisms to counsel and support individuals in matters of equity and diversity.

The Principles Applied to Research Programs

While the goals of the program’s research is (are) highly varied, touching on a broad spectrum of educational questions in many different contexts, our commitments to equity and diversity imply that faculty, staff and students should acknowledge the implications (that) their research has for social justice goals. To reflect the principles, the program’s research program will aim to accomplish four goals:

1. conduct a significant proportion of research to explore the issues of equity in the diverse educational contexts that we study;
2. give back (knowledge, skills, resources) to the communities who have participated in our research;
3. provide institutional support for faculty, staff and students to help them become better informed about existing resources for conducting and disseminating research which reflects our principles of equity and diversity. For example, the program should aim to make more widely available to faculty, staff and students professional development opportunities in research methods for equity and diversity; (and)
4. acknowledge the implications and limitations of research for diverse contexts and groups.

The Principles Applied To Preservice, Continuing Education and Graduate Instruction

The program admits significant numbers of Pre-service, Graduate and Continuing Education students each year. As such, it is one of the principal sites where education about diversity and equity issues are addressed. Through our teaching the program has immediate and direct effects on the ongoing work of students. To further ensure that social justice prevails in our programs we will aim to:

1. enroll and support a student body that reflects the diversity of the communities we serve through, for example, processes for student recruitment, selection, admission and subsequent support and accommodations;
2. ensure that social justice is promoted in all areas of our curriculum, in our pedagogy, in the climate of our classrooms, and in all aspects of (this site’s) environment; (and)
3. hire and support individuals who have a demonstrated commitment and capacity to realize our social justice goals through their work and community involvement.

The Principles Applied To Our Field Development/Community Outreach Programs

The program faculty, staff and students belong to diverse communities defined in a variety of ways (as described in item 4). We engage in significant amounts of work with members of many different constituencies that have educational responsibilities and interests (schools, places of work, hospitals, community organizations, NGOs, advocacy groups, etc.). While this work often is related to our research in one form or another, it typically has quite practical purposes – the direct or indirect improvement of teaching and learning. Such work takes us beyond our own institution and provides opportunities to fulfill our obligation to promote social justice in a much wider context. Our work with community partners should aim:

1. to respect diversity and the importance of social justice;
2. to promote equitable outcomes for diverse groups; (and)
3. to be based on relationships that are ethical, collaborative, and reciprocal in nature.

Programs and resources within the program that promote these goals deserve special attention and protection. The principles of equity and diversity should be major criteria for assessing the value of research centres. Such significant resources are essential to accomplish our community outreach goals.
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Candidate Handbook (2005)

[Author’s Note: I redacted some names and dates to protect research site anonymity.]

Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) Degree Program
- Primary/Junior Division
- Junior/Intermediate Division
- Intermediate/Senior Division

Admission Requirements & the Selection of Candidates
Admission to the B.Ed. Program is based on acceptable levels of English proficiency, academic standing, and experience background. To be eligible for consideration Candidates must meet our requirements in each of these three areas.

English Proficiency
Candidates must demonstrate an acceptable level of proficiency in oral and written English as described in the Teacher Education English Language Policy. (See pages 17 – 19.)

Academic Standing
Candidates must hold an approved degree from a university whose accreditation is acceptable to the University with at least a "B" range average in 15 full-year courses (or equivalent in half courses). This degree must be conferred not later than the fall convocation in the year of registration in this program. Candidates are advised to hold, or be in the final year of a four-year degree. Candidates with a three-year degree completed at the time of application will be considered, but are at a significant competitive disadvantage. Candidates who have completed fewer than 15 full courses at the time of application will not be considered. A graduate degree can be a competitive advantage.

NOTE 1: For the purpose of applying for admission to the B.Ed. degree program), an “approved degree” must include at least 15 full-year courses (or equivalent) beyond secondary school graduation and can have no more than 10 full year courses (or equivalent in half courses) credited from institutions that are not considered by this University to be accredited degree-granting institutions. Additional information describing guidelines for understanding what is an acceptable degree for application to the B.Ed. program can be found on our Admission website. (See contact information on page 3.)

NOTE 2: Our academic assessment of your average is based on the best 15 full-year courses (or equivalent in half courses) of undergraduate level academic course work. This assessment is based on the official transcripts you submit by our application deadline.
Background Experience

In the Candidate Information Form, you are asked to document three meaningful experiences that you have had to prepare you for teaching. These experiences can take a wide variety of forms. What is most important is your ability to clearly articulate the insights into teaching and learning that you have gained from your experiences.

Selection Criteria

Not all Candidates who satisfy our minimum requirements related to English proficiency, academic standing and experience background can be admitted. Our final selection decisions will be influenced by the number of Candidates and the level of the qualifications that they present for consideration.

NOTE: Last year we received 5,726 applications for 1,233 spaces. As a result we were unable to offer admission to many qualified Candidates. In the selection of candidates for the Teacher Education program, the primary obligation of this program is to students in this province’s schools. We will select those Candidates whom we feel can best promote students' growth and development in accordance with their potential (Report of the Provincial Task Force on Admission to Teacher Education Programs, 19xx). Successful Candidates will be those with the strongest combination of academic standing and personal experience as expressed in the Candidate Information Form.

Other Factors

This program does not have formal quotas for individual teaching subjects. Therefore, for most Candidates the choice of teaching subjects does not have a significant impact on their chances for admission. However, we may consider factors such as faculty resources and practice teaching opportunities available for specific teaching subjects with large numbers of Candidates. As well, Candidates with a four-year degree related to a teaching subject for which there is a high teacher demand can be at an advantage in the competition for admission. Information related to our Admission Policy (see page 4) is also considered.

NOTE 1: A strong academic standing does not compensate for a weak Candidate Information Form. Conversely, a strong Candidate Information Form does not compensate for weak academic standing.

NOTE 2: Your Candidate Information Form will not be read if:
- you have a “C” range academic average, or
- you have completed fewer than 15 full-courses (or equivalent in half courses) at the time of application, or
- you do not satisfy our English proficiency requirement.

NOTE 3: This program will suspend the evaluation of an application as soon as it is determined that any basic admission requirement will not be satisfied.
Internationally Educated Teachers (IET) Admission Category

What is the IET Admission Category?
The IET Admission Category is an option available to internationally educated teachers (who are immigrants to Canada) who wish to apply to the Bachelor of Education Degree — General Studies Program (Primary/Junior, Junior/Intermediate, Intermediate/Senior divisions). Admission to the initial Teacher Education program is very competitive. As a result, every year we are unable to offer admission to many qualified Candidates. The IET admission category is intended to assist new Canadians who have international teaching experience to integrate into the teaching profession in this province. Each year, up to 15 places will be available. Applications from internationally educated teachers who apply under the IET admission category will also be automatically considered for entry into the program using the regular Admission procedure.

Who Can Apply Under the IET Admission Category?
To be eligible to apply under the IET Admission Category of the B.Ed. program Candidates must satisfy all of the following criteria:
1. meet all requirements for entry into the B.Ed. program,
2. have international teaching experience (i.e., have been teachers in their country of origin),
3. have completed a program of study in a country other than Canada that allowed you to seek employment as a teacher in that country, and,
4. have Canadian permanent resident or Canadian citizenship status.

What Instrumentation is Required in Order to Apply as Part of the IET Admission Category?
IET Candidates apply under normal application procedures and must submit all documents required of Candidates. These instrumentation requirements are described in detail throughout this Candidate Handbook. As you prepare your application there are four elements of your instrumentation that relate to the IET Admission category.

1. On the front of the Candidate Information Form there is a check-box for you to indicate that you wish to be considered as part of the IET Admission category.
2. Your Candidate Information Form must include evidence of international teaching experience. At least one of the three experiences that are required in the Candidate Information Form must be an international teaching experience. An acceptable Verification Form must support each experience.
3. Your official university transcripts must include evidence of completion of courses related to Teacher Education. If the courses related to Teacher Education did not take place in a university, then you should also submit official transcripts of these courses. If you have not completed any such courses, you must submit a statement that
describes the basis on which you were allowed to teach. A copy of a document that demonstrates that you were considered to be a teacher in another country must accompany this statement.

4. You must indicate on the application that you have Canadian permanent resident or Canadian citizenship status. All Candidates who are offered admission will be required to submit acceptable instrumentation of their status in Canada.

The Candidate Information Form

The Candidate Information Form is a vital part of the admission selection process. Consequently, Candidates should read the questions and instructions carefully. The Candidate Information Form must be submitted by the December application deadline and must be accompanied by three signed Verification Forms.

• It is necessary to submit a new Candidate Information Form using the version of the form which is current for the year you apply. Neither the Candidate Information Form nor the Verification Forms from a previous application are available to Candidate Information Form readers.

• The appearance of your Candidate Information Form is considered in its evaluation. Type or word-process your Candidate Information Form with a minimum 12-point font so that it is clearly legible to the Candidate Information Form assessors. Do not hand write your Candidate Information Form.

• The PDF version of the Candidate Information Form (and related forms) has been formatted to allow you to enter your information onto the form prior to printing it out on your own computer. It is also acceptable to print out your responses on plain paper as long as this output is trimmed to fit within the space provided for responses on the Candidate Information Form and then attached, neatly and securely to the Candidate Information Form.

• You must submit your responses on the Candidate Information Form. Do not change the format of this form. Do not create your own version of the form. Do not attach pages. A resume is not an acceptable substitute for a completed Candidate Information Form.

Completing the Candidate Information Form

When completing your Candidate Information Form, you should:

• Keep in mind that this program is strongly committed to social justice in everything it does.

• Demonstrate from your experiences that you have gained valuable insights about the nature of teaching/learning and of young children or youth as learners.

• Be as specific as possible in your responses to the questions on the Candidate Information Form. You should try as much as you can to create as clear and precise a picture of your background and you as a potential teacher.
• Try to be yourself and let your personality and your enthusiasm for teaching come across (you should avoid a stiff and pretentious presentation).

• Keep in mind that your communication skills are being evaluated. The way in which you complete your Candidate Information Form reveals something of your potential as a teacher, because it is one significant demonstration of your professionalism and your communication skills or lack thereof. Use full sentences, not point form (except where permitted).

• Try to avoid assumptions concerning the details of your situation. Although the persons assessing your Candidate Information Form (faculty members, teachers, principals, board personnel) are knowledgeable about the teaching profession they do not know you.

Personal Information & Program Selection

The Official Reference number on the front of the Candidate Information Form should be the same as that on your provincial application form. This ensures that your Candidate Information Form is matched with your application. Please ensure that your complete address is on the front of your Candidate Information Form. A set of check-off minority categories related to diversity groups identified in our Admission Policy (see page 4) is provided. If you are a member of one or more of these groups, you are invited to bring this to our attention. At this time, applications are encouraged especially from visible minority group members, persons with disabilities, women in non-traditional subject areas, males interested in primary school teaching, Aboriginal persons and native speakers of French. Please note that:

• “Women in non-traditional subject areas” refers to Intermediate/Senior Physics only.
• “Males interested in primary school teaching” refers to men who are applying to Primary/Junior.

Your program selection must be the same as you have listed on the provincial application form. Please remember to list teaching subjects, if applicable. Remember that you can only apply to one of Primary/Junior, Junior/Intermediate, or Intermediate/Senior.

Sections of the Candidate Information Form

QUESTION 1. “Based on your background and experiences, explain the reasons you have decided to become a teacher of the age group (grades) you have indicated.” In this section of the Candidate Information Form you are introducing yourself as a potential teacher. Your discussion here should anticipate the major themes that you intend to develop in the Candidate Information Form as a whole. When completing Question 1, you should:

• Demonstrate willingness to contribute to students’ growth, success and learning.
• Demonstrate commitment to teaching and student learning with evidence related to yourself and your past activities.
• Articulate a sincere excitement about teaching your chosen age group.
QUESTION 2. “Outline and reflect upon 3 experiences that have contributed to your understanding of teaching and learning.” In this section of the Candidate Information Form you are asked to describe and discuss three personal experiences that you believe have helped prepare you for a career in teaching. You must complete all sub-sections (i.e. provide three experiences). For each experience there is space to describe the experience in point form and space to reflect what you have come to understand about teaching and learning as a result of each experience.

Choose your three experiences carefully. Examples of possible experiences that could be used to demonstrate your understanding of teaching and learning are listed in the preamble to Question 2. While recent, teaching-related and school-based experiences with children and adolescents in the grades in which you hope to teach can help you to prepare a strong Candidate Information Form, other experiences are ALSO valued. Work with groups is often better than work with individuals. With any experience, however, you must demonstrate its relevance to teaching and learning and the insights you gained from it. When completing Question 2, you should:

• Describe the experience with clarity in the space allowed. Be specific about details of the three experiences you describe: the time spent, the age and numbers of people involved, where you were and what you did.

• Demonstrate how your experience will translate into the classroom and/or school environment.

• Demonstrate a breadth of personal understanding of teaching and learning (and the interconnections between the two) supported by evidence or experience.

• Show evidence that you understand the interconnections between teaching and learning, and that you are committed to contributing to positive and socially just teaching/learning environments.

QUESTION 3. “Discuss the importance of diversity in teaching and learning environments. Based on your past experiences, we are particularly interested in understanding the ways in which you see yourself making a contribution to equity in education in your future role as a teacher.” In this section of the Candidate Information Form you are asked to discuss your understanding of issues related to diversity and social justice and the impact that these issues can have on today’s schools and classrooms. When completing Question 3, you should:

• Demonstrate a recognition of various forms of diversity and of demographic change in this province. Show that you understand that all teachers and learners possess a variety of social identities (e.g., in terms of sex, race, socio-economic status, sexuality, religion, region, ethnicity, dis/ability, etc.), that students learn in different ways, and that significant life events/challenges impact on learning.

• Articulate an awareness of your future role as a teacher in creating a learning environment/community/future society that is inclusive and supportive of all its members. Show that you are aware of the kinds of day-to-day and long-term actions teachers take that impact students’ learning environments and life opportunities.
• Demonstrate personal background or experience that would enable you to support students who are members of marginalized/disadvantaged groups. Show that you possess self-knowledge, insights into experiences related to inclusion/exclusion, and are aware of effective strategies to promote equitable outcomes for all learners.

QUESTION 4. “What else would you like us to know about you that is relevant to your goal of becoming a teacher? This is an opportunity for you to describe any particular/exceptional accomplishments, challenges, and/or life experiences that have impacted significantly on you as an aspiring teacher.” All Candidates must complete this section. Add anything else here that you believe is relevant to your potential as a teacher. Be clear about any accomplishments or challenges you have experienced and the impact they have had on your application. When completing Question 4, you should:

• Use specific examples to clearly connect your experiences to personal qualities you have developed and to your vision of an effective teacher.

Verification Forms

A separate Verification Form is required for each of the three experiences listed in Question 2 of the Candidate Information Form. An appropriate verifier for that experience must sign each Verification Form. An appropriate verifier is someone who has supervised you in the activity and who has direct knowledge of you in the activity or who has access to official records of your involvement in the activity.

NOTE: A person who was under the age of 18 at the time an experience took place is not an appropriate verifier. Similarly, a person who has been your student or a junior employee in an experience is not an appropriate verifier.

You must first complete Question 1 of each Verification Form. Next, the respective verifier must complete, date and sign Question 2 of the Verification Form and return it to you in enough time to meet the application deadline. The three Verification Forms should be stapled behind page 4 of the Candidate Information Form.

NOTE: Candidate Information Forms without the three Verification Forms properly completed will NOT be evaluated.

• Verification Forms must NOT be submitted separately from the Candidate Information Form. We will not match them up.

• You can fax the Verification Form to your verifier and have it faxed back to you so that you can include it with your completed Candidate Information Form.

• Reference letters are NOT required, nor are they acceptable substitutes for the Verification Forms; any received will not be used.

• It is necessary to submit new Verification Forms using the version of the form which is current for the year you apply.
• It is your responsibility to ensure that the three Verification Forms are completed and returned to you in time for submission with the Candidate Information Form by the December 1, 2004, 4:30 p.m. deadline.

• Verifiers, or other persons within the same organization, may be contacted by the University to corroborate information.

What To Do If No One Is Available to Sign a Verification Form

You must complete the Verification Form yourself and you must attach to it a declaration sworn before a Notary Public or Commissioner of Oaths. This statement must:

1. explain why it is impossible to have a verifier fill out the Verification Form, and detail the efforts you have made to get the Verification Form filled out by an appropriate person; and

2. affirm that the information contained on the Verification Form is truthful and disclose any areas of doubt (such as dates, times, etc.).

NOTE: The authority of the person administering the oath (e.g., “Commissioner of Oaths for the Province of X”) must be clearly stated. Your declaration must bear the stamp or seal of the Notary Public or Commissioner of Oaths.

• A separate declaration is required for each Verification Form for which you are not able to find an appropriate verifier.

NOTE: This declaration is the only acceptable substitute for not having a verifier complete Question 2 of the Verification Form.

Do not use a single declaration to discuss both the verification of experience for your Candidate Information Form and the submission of overseas academic documents. You must use separate declarations.

How Do I Know That My Candidate Information Form Has Been Received?

We do not send out a receipt for the Candidate Information Form. Instead, you can visit our website at “address withheld”, select “Candidate Information Form Receipt”) to see if we have received your Candidate Information Form. We will list the Official Reference Numbers provided by Candidates on page 1 of the Candidate Information Form. You will need to have provided us with your Official Reference Number on your Candidate Information Form in order to be on the list.

NOTE: If you do not find your Reference Number on this list within 3 weeks of submitting your Candidate Information Form, you should contact our office.

Final Notes About Your Candidate Information Form

• Do not include material or attach instrumentation relevant to your academic evaluation with your Candidate Information Form. Your Candidate Information Form may not be available to the program staff responsible for the academic evaluation
because Candidate Information Forms are sent directly from our office to the Admission Committee.

- Remember to sign and date page 4. If you fail to do so your Candidate Information Form will not be evaluated.
- Once submitted, you cannot amend your Candidate Information Form.
- Keep a photocopy of your completed Candidate Information Form for your records — we will not provide you with one.
- All documents submitted in support of your application (including your Candidate Information Form and Verification Forms) become and remain the property of the University subject to its Policy on Access to Academic Records.
- Your Candidate Information Form must be delivered to the Faculty of Education Registrar’s Office, Teacher Education Admission Unit by December 1, 2004, 4:30 p.m.

NOTE: Candidate Information Forms received via Canada Post with a postmark of December 1, 2005, or earlier, will be accepted as on time, if the provincial application has been received in our office on or before Month 1, 2005.

- DO NOT submit your completed Candidate Information Form by fax or e-mail. Faxed or e-mailed copies of Candidate Information Forms will not be accepted or evaluated.

Candidates who feel that they require further information concerning the Candidate Information Form may wish to contact the Faculty of Education Registrar’s Office, Teacher Education Admission Unit at our website.
## Appendix C

### Candidate Information Form (2005)

**2006-2007 Candidate Information Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Information</th>
<th><strong>Please enter your name exactly as you did on the Provincial Application Form.</strong></th>
<th><strong>(Official) Reference #:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surname:</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006- __ __ __ __ __ __ __</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given Names:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address:</th>
<th>Province:</th>
<th>Postal Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City or Town:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Email:                |                                                                                  |                             |
|-----------------------|                                                                                  |                             |

With reference to the Admission Policy statement on page 4 of the *Candidate Handbook*, please identify yourself, if appropriate, as one or more of the groups listed below. (*Check all that are applicable.*)

- [ ] Member of Visible Minority Group
- [ ] Person with a Disability
- [ ] Woman in Non-Traditional Subject Area (I/S Physics only)
- [ ] Male Interested in Primary School Teaching (P/J Candidates only)

**Program Selection:** Choose and check only one of the Grade levels below. Your entry must parallel your selection on your Provincial Application Form.

- [ ] Grades K to 6 (No Teaching Subject Required)
- [ ] Grades 4 to 10 Teaching Subject (list one)
  1. ______________________
- [ ] Grades 7 to 12 Teaching Subjects (list two)
  1. ______________________
  2. ______________________

**IET Admission Category:**

- [ ] Check this box if you are an internationally educated teacher (IET) and wish to be considered as PART of the IET Admission Category. (See page 10 of *Candidate Handbook* for information about the IET Admission Category.)

---

• *Read all instructions here-in and in the Candidate Handbook before completing your Candidate Information Form. Detailed information about completing the Candidate Information Form can be found on pages 14 – 17 of the Candidate Handbook.*

• Deadline to submit the Candidate Information Form: December 1, 2005 at 4:30 p.m.

  NOTE: *Candidate Information Forms received via Canada Post with a postmark of December 1, 2005, or earlier, will be accepted as on time, only if the provincial application office has received your application on or before December 1, 2005.*

• Candidate Information Forms must be typed or computer generated with a minimum 12 point font.

• Do not change the format of this form. Use only the space provided. Do not add any extra pages or material to your Candidate Information Form — they will be discarded.

• You must provide a response to each of Parts A to D. Respond in relation to the specific instructions in each part.

• *Attach the three Verification Forms behind page 4 of your completed Information Form. Your Candidate Information Form will not be assessed without a Verification Form for each of the required three experiences in QUESTION 2 of this form.*

• All documents submitted in support of your application become and remain the property of the University, subject to official policy for Academic Records. Keep a copy of your completed Candidate Information Form for your records — we will not provide you with one.

• *You must use a Teacher Education Application Form, submitted to the (Provincial Office), in order to apply for the Bachelor of Education and Diploma in Technical Education program. The Candidate Information Form is not sufficient by itself to complete your application.*

• Remember to sign and date page 4 of your Candidate Information Form. Unsigned Candidate Information Forms will not be evaluated.
OFFICE USE ONLY

DATE RECEIVED

I  F

QUESTION 1
Based on your background and experiences, explain the reasons you have decided to become a teacher of the age group (grades) you have indicated.
(Refer to page 15 in the Candidate Handbook before you prepare your response.)

12 rows

QUESTION 2
This section refers to three personal experiences that have contributed to your understanding of teaching and learning. We are interested in a wide range of experiences.

These might be: • classroom/school experiences • supply teaching • teaching overseas • working with people with special needs • work experience • leadership and/or facilitation within cultural groups or clubs • peer tutoring • parenting • experience with civil society (non-governmental • ongoing service to the community • camp counselling organizations, faith-based organizations, etc.) • involvement in healing circles • coaching • other
(Refer to page 15 in the Candidate Handbook before you prepare your response.)

QUESTION 2 1 a) Briefly outline experience #1, including role, responsibilities undertaken, duration. (Use point form.)

8 lines

From (month/year) _____/_______ To (month/year) __________/________ Verifier's Name: _______________________

QUESTION 2 1 b) Reflecting upon this experience, explain the insights you have gained about teaching and learning. How might these understandings be useful to you in your future role as a teacher?

12 lines

QUESTION 2 2 a) Briefly outline experience #2, including role, responsibilities undertaken, duration. (Use point form.)

12 lines

From (month/year) ______/_______ To (month/year) ______/_______ Verifier's Name: _______________________

QUESTION 2 2 b) Reflecting upon this experience, explain the insights you have gained about teaching and learning. How might these understandings be useful to you in your future role as a teacher?

12 lines

QUESTION 2 3 a) Briefly outline experience #3, including role, responsibilities undertaken, duration. (Use point form.)

12 lines

From (month/year) ______/_______ To (month/year) ______/_______ Verifier's Name: _______________________


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION 2 3 b)</th>
<th>Reflecting upon this experience, explain the insights you have gained about teaching and learning. How might these understandings be useful to you in your future role as a teacher?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION 3</td>
<td>This program is strongly committed to social justice in everything it does. This means that we are committed to the just treatment of each individual member of our community and the communities we serve. It also means that we are especially vigilant to ensure that differences are not treated in ways that produce direct or indirect forms of discrimination. Our commitment to social justice also means that those with whom we work and live who experience individual or systemic discrimination, for whatever reason, are provided with the means to overcome social and physical disadvantages, to the best of our ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the importance of diversity in teaching and learning environments. Based on your past experiences, we are particularly interested in understanding the ways in which you see yourself making a contribution to equity in education in your future role as a teacher. (Refer to pages 15-16 in the Teacher Education Student Guide before you prepare your response.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION 4</td>
<td>What else would you like us to know about you that is relevant to your goal of becoming a teacher? (This is an opportunity for you to describe any particular/exceptional accomplishments, challenges, and/or life experiences that have had a significant impact on you as an aspiring teacher.) (Refer to page 16 in the Teacher Education Student Guide before you prepare your response.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s Declaration:</td>
<td>I affirm that I have written this Candidate Information Form myself and that all information provided is based on my personal experiences. I understand that any misrepresentation of information given in any part of this Candidate Information Form may result in the cancellation of my application, admission or registration status, and that details concerning such misrepresentation may be shared with other universities. I have read, and I understand the information provided on the front page of this Candidate Information Form and in the Teacher Education Student Guide .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTICE OF USE:</td>
<td>The information collected in this Information Form will be used by the University (name withheld) to make decisions related to Admission. This information will also be used by the University for statistical, research, and reporting purposes and may be linked to student information databases maintained by the University, in order to develop and maintain policies and programs. Access to and use of this information will be governed by federal law and the University’s policies on research ethics and access to personal information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D
Candidate Information Form Assessment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate’s Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Part A: Reasons why you have decided to become a teacher for this age group/grade

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demonstrates willingness to contribute to students’ growth, success and learning</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Demonstrates commitment to teaching and student learning with evidence related to themselves and past activities</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Articulates a sincere excitement about teaching the chosen age group</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Part B: Three personal experiences that contribute to your understanding of T/L

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Describes the three experiences with clarity and detail in the space allowed</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demonstrates how the experience will translate to the classroom and/or school environment</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates an understanding of teaching and learning and their interconnections, supported by evidence or experience</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shows evidence of an understanding of the interconnections between teaching/learning and a commitment to contributing to a positive and socially-just teaching/learning environment</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demonstrates how the experience will translate to the classroom and/or school environment</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates an understanding of teaching and learning and their interconnections, supported by evidence or experience</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shows evidence of an understanding of the interconnections between teaching/learning and a commitment to contributing to a positive and socially-just teaching/learning environment</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demonstrates how the experience will translate to the classroom and/or school environment</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates an understanding of teaching and learning and their interconnections, supported by evidence or experience</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shows evidence of an understanding of the interconnections between teaching/learning and a commitment to contributing to a positive and socially-just teaching/learning environment</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part C: Discuss the importance of diversity in T/L environments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demonstrates a recognition of various forms of diversity and demographic change in this province and shows understanding that teachers and learners have social identities (e.g., sex, race, socioeconomic status, sexuality, religion, ethnicity, region, dis/ability, etc.)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Demonstrates a recognition that students learn in different ways and that significant life events/challenges impact on learning</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Articulates an awareness of their future role as a teacher in creating a learning environment/community/future society that is inclusive and supportive of all its members</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Demonstrates personal background or experience that would enable the individual to support students who are members of marginalized/disadvantaged groups</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part D: What else would you like us to know that is relevant?

Uses specific examples to clearly connect their experiences to personal qualities, and to their vision of an effective teacher.  

Overall

Uses language and writing conventions that indicate that the person will be a model for communication in the classroom

Additional Comments (optional):
[5 lines]

Final Grading Legend: A = Excellent, B = Good, C = Average, D = Poor, F = Do Not Admit

V2 2006 Readers’ Initials (2)
Real Name
Full Mailing Address

10 July 2006

Dear Real Name,

My name is Virginia Stead, and I am a doctoral student in TPS supervised by Professor Nina Bascia, Ph.D. This letter comes to you, please, as a request for permission to conduct my doctoral thesis research at your site. My project is entitled, “Candidate Experiences of Admission Policy that Diversifies the Selection of Teacher Education Candidates: A Case Study”. I have chosen this focus in hopes of providing new knowledge that will identify solutions to the urban teacher supply crisis (Santiago, 2002) in addition to the following dilemmas: (1) Growing numbers of teachers need to establish relationships of trust with and among students who do not share common ethno-cultural backgrounds (Kezar, 1999). (2) Some programs may perpetuate attitudes and practices that preclude learning among students from traditionally marginalized groups (Gay, 2004).

My proposed methodology is based on a case study of a single, anonymous site. My proposed data collection includes document analysis and interviews with the following: 24 minority members of the 2006 Teacher Education class, four Admission Policymakers, and six 2006 Admission form readers. Given your “[University Policy governing access to student record]s”, I am requesting assistance from the Registrar in providing initial contact with 2006 B.Ed. candidates who self-identified on their Admission form as members of one or more of the following minority groups: (1) Member of a Visible Minority Group, (2) Native Speaker of French, (3) Person with a Disability, (4) Aboriginal Person, (5) Woman in Non-Traditional Subject Area (I/S Physics only), and (6) Male Interested in Primary School Teaching (P/J Candidates only).

Full details of my research proposal are contained in the attached copy of [my 2006 ethics review]. Thank you very much for considering this request. We would be pleased to answer any questions you may have about this project and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours Sincerely,

Ed.D. Candidate
Theory & Policy Studies in Education
OISE/University of Toronto
Tel: 416.960.0225
email: vstead@oise.utoronto.ca

Nina Bascia, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Theory & Policy Studies in Education
OISE/University of Toronto
Tel: 416.923.6641 Ext. 4241
email: nbascia@oise.utoronto.ca

Attachment: Virginia Stead’s 2006 Ethics Review Package
Appendix F
Letter to the Research Site Assistant Dean, Teacher Education

[OISE Letterhead]

Real Name
Full Mailing Address

September 19, 2006

Dear Real Name,

I am a doctoral student in TPS supervised by Professor Nina Bascia, Ph.D. This letter comes to you as a request for assistance, please, in conducting my doctoral thesis, a research project entitled, “Candidate Experiences of Admission Policy that Diversifies the Selection of Teacher Education Candidates: A Case Study”. I have chosen this focus in hopes of providing new knowledge that will identify solutions to the urban teacher supply crisis (Santiago, 2002) in addition to the following dilemmas: (1) Growing numbers of teachers need to establish relationships of trust with and among students who do not share common ethno-cultural backgrounds (Kezar, 1999). (2) Some programs may perpetuate attitudes and practices that preclude learning among students from traditionally marginalized groups (Gay, 2004).

My proposed methodology is based on an anonymous single site case study. My proposed data collection includes instrumentation of current minority ITE students’ application cover letters and Information Forms, as well as key institutional Admission instrumentation. Today, I ask your permission, please, for (1) access to 2006 Admission Form Reader Training Materials, and (2) approval in theory for access to additional sources that may be suggested during interviews with Institutional Policymakers, Admission Form Readers, and Teacher Education Candidates who represent successful minority group Candidates within this year’s class.

Thank you very much for considering our request. We would be pleased to answer any questions you may have about this project and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours Sincerely,

Ed.D. Candidate
Theory & Policy Studies in Education
OISE/University of Toronto
Tel: 416.960.0225
e-mail: vstead@oise.utoronto.ca

Nina Bascia, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Theory & Policy Studies in Education
OISE/University of Toronto
Tel: 416.923.6641 Ext. 4241
e-mail: nbascia@oise.utoronto.ca
Appendix G
University Policies on Equity and Admission (2006)

University Policies Part I: University Equity Policy Foundations (December 31, 2005)

The following policies dealing with equity and diversity have been approved by the senior
governing body of the University and were retrieved from the University website on
November 20, 2008.

1. Academic Appointments (October 30, 2003)
2. Admission to the University (June 27, 1991)
3. Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units (February 10, 2005)
4. Association, Admission and Registration (June 7, 1979)
5. Campus Groups Recognition (May 25, 1993)
6. Child Care Programs (June 26, 2003)
8. Code of Student Conduct (Effective July 1, 2002)
9. Conflict of Interest - Academic Staff (June, 1994)
10. Counseling and Learning Skills Services (December 9, 1987)
13. Freedom of Speech, Statement on Protection of – see Disruption of Meetings (May
    28, 1992)
    (March 31, 1994)
15. Human Rights, Statement on (June 25, 1992)
16. Human Rights Review of International Projects, Agreements and Other International
    Activity (June 3, 1993)
17. Institutional Purpose, Statement of (October 15, 1992)
18. International Cooperation Policy (June 17, 1982)
20. International Students, Statement of Commitment Regarding (Replacing the Policy on
    Foreign Students) (March 30, 2005)
21. Investment, Social and Political Issues with Respect to The University Ombudsman
    (December 14, 1994)
22. Professionals/Managers, Policies for (July 1, 2001)
23. (Program Integration) Integrating (specific programs) within The University
    (December 16, 1994)
25. Religious Observances, Policy on Scheduling of Classes and Examinations and Other
    Accommodations for (June 29, 2005)
University Policies Part II:
University Statement on Equity, Diversity, and Excellence (University, 2006)

[Researcher’s Note: Although this policy was not in effect at the time of data collection, it is included here to demonstrate the influence that the Faculty of Education Equity Policy had on the university community.]

The purpose of this statement is to express the University’s values regarding equity and diversity, and to relate these to the institution’s unwavering commitment to excellence in the pursuit of our academic mission.

Equity and Human Rights

At The University, we strive to be an equitable and inclusive community, rich with diversity, protecting the human rights of all persons, and based upon understanding and mutual respect for the dignity and worth of every person. We seek to ensure to the greatest extent possible that all students and employees enjoy the opportunity to participate as they see fit in the full range of activities that the University offers, and to achieve their full potential as members of the University community.

Our support for equity is grounded in an institution-wide commitment to achieving a working, teaching, and learning environment that is free of discrimination and harassment as defined in the [Provincial] Human Rights Code. In striving to become an equitable community, we will also work to eliminate, reduce or mitigate the adverse effects of any barriers to full participation in University life that we find, including physical, environmental, attitudinal, communication or technological.

Diversity and Inclusiveness

Our teaching, scholarship and other activities take place in the context of a highly diverse society. Reflecting this diversity in our own community is uniquely valuable to the University as it contributes to the diversification of ideas and perspectives and thereby enriches our scholarship, teaching, and other activities. We will proactively seek to increase diversity among our community members, and it is our aim to have a student body, teaching and administrative staffs that mirror the diversity of the pool of potential qualified Candidates for those positions.
Excellence

We believe that excellence flourishes in an environment that embraces the broadest range of people, that helps them achieve their full potential, that facilitates the free expression of diverse perspectives through respectful discourse, and in which high standards are maintained for students and staff alike. An equitable and inclusive working and learning environment creates the conditions for our diverse staff and student body to maximize their creativity and their contributions, thereby supporting excellence in all dimensions of the institution.

Excellence at The University is predicated on core freedoms that are at the heart of every university’s mission --- freedom of speech and expression, academic freedom and freedom of research.

Responsibility

The creation of an equitable community, one that is diverse as well as inclusive and that is respectful and protects the human rights of its members, requires the work of every member of the community, across all of our sites and campuses, including students, teaching staff, administrative staff, visitors, alumni and guests.

For its part, the University will strive to make considerations of equity a part of the processes of setting policies, developing procedures, and making decisions at all levels of the institution. While for governance purposes, responsibility for the Statement resides with the Vice-President of Human Resources and Equity, daily responsibility for ensuring that the values expressed in this Statement live and breathe throughout the University will also rest with the President, the Vice-President and Provost, the Vice-Presidents and Vice-Provosts, and each Principal, Dean, Chair and Manager, within the scope of each person’s role in the University.

The University is committed to its internal policies on issues related to equity, and also operates in compliance with all legislation that bears on equity and human rights. The applicable policies and legislation include: Statement of Institutional Purpose, Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, Policies and Procedures: Sexual Harassment, Employment Equity Policy, Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities, Statement on Protection of Freedom of Speech, a Provincial Human Rights Code, and any current or future guideline or procedure dealing with equity issues.
Appendix H
Letter of Invitation and Informed Consent to Administrators

[OISE Letterhead]

October 2006

Dear Real Name,

I am a doctoral student in the Dept. of Theory & Policy Studies at THIS PROGRAM, under the supervision of Professor Nina Bascia, PhD. As you may already know, my project is entitled, “Candidate Experiences of Admission Policy that Diversifies the Selection of Teacher Education Candidates: A Case Study”. I have chosen this focus in hopes of providing new knowledge that will help identify solutions to the following three dilemmas: (1) Growing numbers of teachers need to establish relationships of trust with and among students who do not share common ethno-cultural backgrounds (Kezar, 1999). (2) Some programs may perpetuate attitudes and practices that preclude learning among students from traditionally marginalized groups (Gay, 2004). (3) Due to high rates of attrition, there is a teacher supply crisis within many increasingly multiethnic, urban school systems (Santiago, 2002).

This project has been approved by the Ethics Review Office of (this university), and the identity of the institution will be anonymous. I will be interviewing 24 minority group members of the 2006 - 2007 Teacher Education class, as well as 4 Admission Policymakers and 6 Admission Form Readers. Attached you will find the list of questions that I would like to ask you during a private, audio-taped interview lasting from 45 - 60 minutes. The interview would take place at (this university) or another location of mutual choice, and within one week of the interview, I would prepare a transcript and send it to you as an email attachment. I would then ask that you return the transcript to me as an email attachment with or without changes, and no later than one week after receiving it.

Through the use of a pseudonym, no reference to your personal contact information or identity would appear in the interview transcript or in any other oral or written communications or publications arising from your interview. Participation as an interviewee is completely voluntary and confidential, and if you decide to participate, you would still have the option to refuse to answer any questions on my list and to withdraw at any time during the interview process. If you do agree to be interviewed, I agree to keep all interview notes, tapes, and transcripts confidential and secure at my home for a period of five years. After five years, I would destroy all information arising from your interview.

Thank you very much for considering this invitation. We look forward to hearing from you.

Ed.D. Candidate                               Professor and Chair
Dept. of Theory & Policy Studies in Education Dept. of Theory & Policy Studies in Education
OISE/University of Toronto                    OISE/University of Toronto
Tel: 41F.960.0225                              Tel: 41F.923.6641 Ext. 4241
Email: vstead@oise.utoronto.ca                Email: nbascia@oise.utoronto.ca

As evidenced by my signature below, I am voluntarily agreeing to participate in an audio-taped interview in conjunction with Virginia Stead’s Ed.D. research project. I also voluntarily agree to the conditions and protections which attach thereto.

Printed Name: ___________________________ Signature: ___________________________
Dated: ___________ Tel: _______________ Email: ___________________________

( ) I would like to receive a summary of the findings of this study.
( ) I am not interested in receiving a summary of the findings of this study.
Appendix I
Letter of Invitation and Informed Consent to Readers

[OISE Letterhead]

October 2006

Dear Real Name,

My name is Virginia Stead, and I am a doctoral student in the Dept. of Theory & Policy Studies at THIS PROGRAM, under the supervision of Professor Nina Bascia, PhD. As you may already know, my project is entitled, “Candidate Experiences of Admission Policy that Diversifies the Selection of Teacher Education Candidates: A Case Study”. I have chosen this focus in hopes of providing new knowledge that will help identify solutions to the following three dilemmas: (1) Growing numbers of teachers need to establish relationships of trust with and among students who do not share common ethno-cultural backgrounds (Kezar, 1999). (2) Some Teacher Education programs may perpetuate attitudes and practices that preclude learning among students from traditionally marginalized groups (Gay, 2004). (3) Due to high rates of attrition, there is a teacher supply crisis within many increasingly multiethnic, urban school systems (Santiago, 2002).

This project has been approved by the Ethics Review Office of [this university], and the identity of the institution will be anonymous. I will be interviewing 24 minority group members of the 2006 - 2007 Initial Teacher Education class, as well as four Admission Policymakers and six Admission Form readers. I will be interviewing 24 minority group members of the 2006 - 2007 Initial Teacher Education class, as well as 4 Admission Policymakers and 6 Admission Form Readers. Attached, you will find the list of questions that I would like to ask you during a private, audio-taped interview lasting from 45 - 60 minutes. The interview would take place at (this university) or another location of mutual choice, and within one week of the interview, I would prepare a transcript and send it to you as an email attachment. I would then ask that you return the transcript to me as an email attachment with or without changes, and no later than one week after receiving it.

Through the use of a pseudonym, no reference to your personal contact information or identity would appear in the interview transcript or in any other oral or written communications or publications arising from your interview. Participation as an interviewee is completely voluntary and confidential, and if you decide to participate, you would still have the option to refuse to answer any questions on my list and to withdraw at any time during the interview process. If you do agree to be interviewed, I agree to keep all interview notes, tapes, and transcripts confidential and secure at my home for a period of five years. After five years, I would destroy all information from your interview.

Thank you very much for considering this invitation. We look forward to hearing from you.

Nina Bascia, Ph.D.  
Ed.D. Candidate  
Professor and Chair  
Dept. of Theory & Policy Studies in Education  
Dept. of Theory & Policy Studies in Education  
OISE/University of Toronto  
OISE/University of Toronto  
Tel: 416.960.0225  
Tel: 416.923.6641 Ext. 4241  
Email: vstead@oise.utoronto.ca  
Email: nbascia@oise.utoronto.ca

As evidenced by my signature below, I am voluntarily agreeing to participate in an audio-taped interview in conjunction with Virginia Stead’s Ed.D. research project. I also voluntarily agree to the conditions and protections which attach thereto.

Printed Name: ___________________________ Signature: ____________________________

Dated: _____________ Tel: _______________ Email: ________________________________

( ) I would like to receive a summary of the findings of this study.
( ) I am not interested in receiving a summary of the findings of this study.
Appendix J
Letter to the Program Registrar

[OISE Letterhead]

September 20, 2006

Dear Real Name,

I am a doctoral student in TPS supervised by Professor Nina Bascia, Ph.D. This letter comes to you as a request for assistance, please, in conducting my doctoral thesis, a research project entitled, “Candidate Experiences of Admission Policy that Diversifies the Selection of Teacher Education Candidates: A Case Study”. I have chosen this focus in hopes of providing new knowledge that will identify solutions to the urban teacher supply crisis (Santiago, 2002) in addition to the following dilemmas: (1) Growing numbers of teachers need to establish relationships of trust with and among students who do not share common ethno-cultural backgrounds (Kezar, 1999). (2) Some programs may perpetuate attitudes and practices that preclude learning among students from traditionally marginalized groups (Gay, 2004).

My proposed methodology is based on a case study of a single site that will not be disclosed in order that the institution in question will remain anonymous. My proposed data collection includes analysis of current minority Teacher Education candidates’ application cover letters and Information Forms, and interviews with the following: 24 minority members of the 2006 - 2007 Teacher Education class, four Admission Policymakers, and six 2006 Admission Form Readers. Given your “[University Policy governing access to student records]”, I need and would greatly appreciate your help in identifying and providing initial contact with minority B.Ed. candidates. In order to create a balanced sample of 24 participants, would you please send the following e-letter to 20 individuals who self-identified in each of the following 6 minority groups on their Information Forms: (1) Member of a Visible Minority Group, (2) Native Speaker of French, (3) Person with a Disability, (4) Aboriginal Person, (5) Woman in Non-Traditional Subject Area (I/S Physics only), and (6) Male Interested in Primary Teaching (P/J only)?

Thank you very much for considering our request. We would be pleased to answer any questions you may have about this project and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours Sincerely,

Ed.D. Candidate
Theory & Policy Studies in Education
OISE/University of Toronto
Tel: 416.960.0225
email: vstead@oise.utoronto.ca

Nina Bascia, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Theory & Policy Studies in Education
OISE/University of Toronto
Tel: 416.923.6641 Ext. 4241
email: nbascia@oise.utoronto.ca
October 16, 2006

Mr./Ms. >>>>>>>>>>

Dear Mr./Ms. >>>>>>>>>>,

Enclosed, please find a letter of invitation from Ms. Virginia Stead, an OISE Doctoral Candidate in the Department of Theory and Policy Studies.

In the interests of maintaining student privacy and confidentiality, this invitation is being sent from the Registrar's Office, rather than directly from the researcher, to students who self-identified on their Candidate Information Form as being in one of the categories with reference to the program’s Equity Policy.

If you would like to participate in this research project, please contact Ms. Stead no later than October 22, 2006 at the email address stated in her letter.

Sincerely,

Real Name
Registrar

Enclosures: (1) Researcher Letter of Project Information
(2) Candidate Letter of Invitation and Informed Consent
Appendix L
Researcher Letter with Project Information

[OISE Letterhead]

October 16, 2006

Dear Real Name,

Thank you for responding to the Registrar’s invitation to participate in my research. I write to invite you to take part in a 30 – 45 minute interview, as part of my doctoral research project entitled, “Candidate experiences of Admission Policy that diversifies the selection of Teacher Education Candidates: A case study”. You are under no obligation to take part in this research, but if you would enjoy the opportunity to discuss your experiences with the B.Ed. application process, I would welcome your participation. Interviews will be scheduled at [the program building], between Monday, November 20th and Friday, December 1st. I only have room for 24 participants and will honour expressions of interest in the order in which I receive them.

For your information, and in keeping with this program’s research ethics policy on the involvement of human subjects, I am enclosing a sample Letter of Invitation and Informed Consent. I will bring copies of this letter to all interviews, for signature prior to engaging in the interviews themselves. As you will see, participant anonymity will be protected through the use of a pseudonym (alias).

If you would like to be a participant in this project, please contact me via email at: vstead@oise.utoronto.ca no later than Tuesday, October 24th. I hope to hear from you soon and am thrilled that your program Registrar, Dr. Real Name, has kindly agreed to make your involvement possible by forwarding this invitation on my behalf.

Thank you and warm wishes,

Ed.D. Candidate (2007)
Educational Administration Program
Department of Theory & Policy Studies, Office 6-130
Web: http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/depts/tps/Students/ea/stead.html
Email: vstead@oise.utoronto.ca
Tel: 416 960 0225

Enclosure: Letter of Invitation and Informed Consent to Candidates (Appendix M)
Appendix M
Letter of Invitation and Informed Consent to Candidates

[OISE Letterhead]
[enclosed in a Letter from the Program Registrar (Appendix K)]

November 2006

Dear Teacher Education Candidate,

I am a doctoral student in the Dept. of Theory & Policy Studies at OISE, University of Toronto, under the supervision of Professor Nina Bascia, PhD. Thank you for responding to your Registrar’s invitation to participate in the research for my EdD thesis. My project is entitled, “Candidate Experiences of Admission Policy that Diversifies the Selection of Teacher Education Candidates: A Case Study”. I have chosen this focus in hopes of providing new knowledge that will help identify solutions to the following three dilemmas: (1) Growing numbers of teachers need to establish relationships of trust with and among students who do not share common ethno-cultural backgrounds (Kezar, 1999). (2) Some Pre-Service programs may perpetuate attitudes and practices that preclude learning among students from traditionally marginalized groups (Gay, 2004). (3) Due to high rates of attrition, there is a teacher supply crisis within many increasingly multiethnic, urban school systems (Santiago, 2002).

This project has been approved by the Ethics Review Office of (this university), and the identity of the institution will be anonymous. I will be conducting 30-45 minute interviews with 24 minority group members of the 2006 - 2007 Initial Teacher Education class, as well as four Admission Policymakers and six Admission Form readers. The interview would take place at (this university) or another location of mutual choice, and within one week of the interview, I would prepare a transcript and send it to you as an email attachment. I would then ask that you return the transcript to me as an email attachment with or without changes, and no later than one week after receiving it. Through the use of a pseudonym, no reference to your personal contact information or identity would appear in the interview transcript or in any other oral or written communications or publications arising from your interview. Participation as an interviewee is completely voluntary and confidential, and if you decide to participate, you would still have the option to refuse to answer any questions on my list and to withdraw at any time during the interview process. If you do agree to be interviewed, I would keep all interview notes, tapes, and transcripts confidential and secure at my home for a period of five years, and then destroy all information arising from your interview.

Yours Sincerely,

Ed.D. Candidate
Dept. of Theory & Policy Studies in Education
OISE/University of Toronto
Tel: 41F.960.0225
Email: vstead@oise.utoronto.ca

Nina Bascia, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Dept. of Theory & Policy Studies in Education
OISE/University of Toronto
Tel: 41F.923.6641 Ext. 4241
Email: nbascia@oise.utoronto.ca

As evidenced by my signature below, I am voluntarily agreeing to participate in an audio-taped interview in conjunction with Virginia Stead’s Ed.D. research project. I also voluntarily agree to the conditions and protections which attach thereto.

Printed Name: _________________________ Signature: _________________________
Dated: ____________________________ Tel: ____________________________ Email: _________________________

( ) I would like to receive a summary of the findings of this study.
( ) I am not interested in receiving a summary of the findings of this study.
Appendix N
Letter Requesting Access to Candidate Information Forms

[OISE Letterhead]

February 15, 2007

Dear Teacher Education Candidate,

Thank you once again for agreeing to be interviewed as part of my Ed.D. research project entitled, “Candidate Experiences of Admission Policy that Diversifies the Selection of Teacher Education Candidates: A Case Study”. I have chosen this focus in hopes of providing new knowledge that will help identify solutions to the following three dilemmas: (1) Growing numbers of teachers need to establish relationships of trust with and among students who do not share common ethno-cultural backgrounds (Kezar, 1999). (2) Some Teacher Education programs may perpetuate attitudes and practices that preclude learning among students from traditionally marginalized groups (Gay, 2004). (3) Due to high rates of attrition, there is a teacher supply crisis within many increasingly multiethnic, urban school systems (Santiago, 2002).

This project has been approved by the Ethics Review Office of the University of Toronto, and the identity of the research site will be anonymous. As you know from my earlier Letter of Invitation and Informed Consent, I have conducted interviews with several minority group members of the 2006 Teacher Education class, as well as with Admission Policymakers and Candidate Information Form readers affiliated with this year’s class. The next step in my project is to gather information from the Admission Materials corresponding to each of the 2006 Teacher Education Candidates, like yourself, with whom I conducted interviews, and participation in this stage of my project is also completely voluntary and confidential.

If you decide to authorize this next step, no reference to your personal contact information or identity would appear in any oral or written communications, or in any publications arising from your Admission Materials. This would be done through the use of a pseudonym. I would keep all copies of your Admission materials and any notes arising there from confidential and secure at my home for a period of five years, after which they would be destroyed.

Thank you very much for considering this invitation. We look forward to hearing from you.

Ed.D. Candidate, Educational Administration Program
Dept. of Theory & Policy Studies in Education
OISE/University of Toronto
Tel: 416.960.0225
Email: vstead@oise.utoronto.ca

Nina Bascia, Ph.D.
Professor
Dept. of Theory & Policy Studies in Education
OISE/University of Toronto
Tel: 416.923.6641 Ext. 4241
Email: nbascia@oise.utoronto.ca

As evidenced by my signature below, I am voluntarily authorizing access to my 2006 Teacher Education Admission materials in conjunction with Virginia Stead’s Ed.D. research project. I also voluntarily agree to the conditions and protections which attach thereto.

Printed Name: ___________________________ Signature: _____________________________
Dated: _______________ Tel: _______________ Email: _____________________________

[ ] I would like to receive a summary of the findings of this study.
[ ] I am not interested in receiving a summary of the findings of this study.
Appendix O
Interview Guide: Administrators

1. What leadership roles have you played in developing Admission Policy for the teacher education program?
   a. How has this policy changed over the past few years? (three)
   b. What led to the changes that you have just described?

2. What can you tell me about the evolution of (this program’s) equity policy?
   a. In what ways has this policy been applied to the teacher education Admission process?
   b. What supports may have enhanced this policy application?
   c. What constraints may have impeded this policy application?
   d. With regard to equity and diversity, what changes would you like to see in the teacher education Admission Policy?

3. In what ways has this program’s equity policy been implemented within the teacher education Admission process?
   a. What supports may have enhanced this policy implementation?
   b. What constraints may have impeded this policy implementation?
   c. What changes would you like to see in the implementation process?
   d. What outcomes might occur as a result of the changes you have just described?

4. How do you think that Admission Policy may be influencing the acceptance of diverse Candidates from traditionally marginalized groups?
   a. How might minoritized candidates in the current pre-service cohort have been supported or privileged?
   b. How might minoritized candidates in the current pre-service cohort have been held back or disadvantaged?
   c. What evidence informs the instances that you have just described?
   d. What other kinds of information would be helpful to you in evaluating the level of teacher candidate diversity?

5. What other thoughts do you have about diversifying Admission to the teacher education program?
Appendix P
Interview Guide: Information Form Readers

1. How did you become involved as an Candidate Information Form reader?
   a. As a reader, what responsibilities have you had?
   b. What influenced your being given the responsibilities you have just described?
   c. In light of your responsibilities as a reader, what training have you received prior to the reading process?
   d. What support were you given during the reading process?
   e. What other kinds of training or support would have changed the quality of your experience as an Admission Form reader?

2. What evidence of this program’s equity policy have you noticed within the teacher education Admission process?
   a. What supports may have enhanced this policy implementation?
   b. What constraints may have impeded this policy implementation?

3. What can you tell me about the purpose of the Candidate Information Form?
   a. How would you describe the current Candidate Information Form?
   b. In what ways does the Candidate Information Form reflect a commitment to equity within the Admission process?
   c. How does the Candidate Information Form address issues of Candidate diversity?

4. How would you describe your experience as an Candidate Information Form reader?
   a. In what ways did the training that you received influence your experience?
   b. How would you describe the ways in which you were supported by those (other than yourself) responsible for the Admission Form reading process?
   c. What issues were problematic for you as a Candidate Information Form Reader?

5. In what ways does the Candidate Information Form reading process influence the admission of minority teacher education candidates?
   a. In what ways is candidate diversity supported by the current process?
   b. In what ways is candidate diversity constrained by the current process?

6. What other thoughts do you have about diversifying Admission to the teacher education program?
Appendix Q
Interview Guide: Minority Teacher Candidates

1. How did you learn about this teacher education program?
   a. What reasons did you have for applying to this program?
   b. What did you know about this program’s equity policy when you applied for admission?

2. I invited you to join me in this project because you voluntarily identified yourself as a minority Candidate on your Admission Form. Tell me about how you decided to make that decision.
   a. What difference did you hope that being a minority Candidate might make?
   b. How did you take advantage of being a minority Candidate during the Admission process?
   c. Did the Admission process play out in ways that you expected?
   d. (if yes) What were some aspects of the process that you anticipated?
   e. Did you encounter any surprises during the Admission process?
   f. (if yes) Tell me about some of the surprises that you encountered.

3. Generally speaking, were there ways in which the Admission process may have provided support or extra privileges for minoritized candidates?
   a. (if yes) Were you one of the Candidates who were supported by some elements of the Admission process?
   b. (if yes) How would you describe the benefit(s) that you received?
   c. (if yes) What strategies did you use to take advantage of these benefits?

4. Generally speaking, were there ways in which the Admission process may have held back or disadvantaged minoritized candidates?
   a. (if yes) Were you one of the Candidates who were negatively impacted by aspects of the Admission process?
   b. (if yes) How would you describe the barrier(s) that you encountered?
   c. (if yes) What strategies did you use to overcome these constraints?
5. How would you describe the diversity within your teacher education class?
   
a. How does this level of diversity differ from your expectations about how diverse your class would be?
   
b. In what ways might having a more diverse candidate pool influence the quality of the Admission process?
   
c. In light of these possible influences, how would you change the Admission process?
   
d. What difference would you expect these changes to make to the quality of the Admission process?

6. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the ways in which you or other minoritized candidates experienced the Admission process?