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ABSTRACT

Institutional ethnography is the ontology and methodology that supports this investigation into the problematic of college teachers, officially known as professors, having more and more of their teaching energy being devoted to supporting the interests of market economics rather than the interests of students, college teachers, society, and the environment. I take the standpoint of college teachers and use interviews from college teachers who were about to use course outlines for the first time along with my own insider perspective as the entry point into an investigation of the social relations involved with college course outline work. I place my informants’ experiences of teaching without course outlines in analytical contrast to the general way that another college orchestrates college teachers’ work through the course outline construct. I do this by producing an extended Turner-style (2003) mapping of the local and extra-local web-like textual power that mediates college teachers’ work at one particular community college. I argue that there are four nesting
layers to the ruling relations power over college teachers’ work with students. The first layer emphasizes the ideological work that college employees do to support global-finance capital. The second describes the managerial work done to set up the operational/production planning of teacher, course, class, and course outline work. The third reveals how faculty members are complicit in doing textual work to set up their own ruling. The fourth identifies the performance work that faculty members do to execute the textual rules of their prescriptive course outline commodity work. Additionally, I used a textual and discourse analysis of four union negotiation-related documents to reveal the way that texts interlock concepts from one to another to shrink teachers’ professional autonomy. I find market economic ruling relations power embedded in a web of texts, work sequences, and work discourse connected to college course outlines. This power has the effect of deskillling college professors by both increasing the supervision and standardization of their work and decreasing opportunities for academic freedom. My textual mapping identifies places where opportunities for effective teaching and learning had been deleted and could be reclaimed.
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Chapter 1

ESTABLISHING THE STANDPOINT, PROBLEMATIC, AND FOCUS OF THE INVESTIGATION

The Standpoint

In this thesis, I use the word professor because it is the official title connected to the actual job description in the Academic Employees Collective Agreement (2005, 2009) for Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology college teachers. In this thesis, I use the word teacher more often than professor, both as a synonym for professor and a way to acknowledge the work that professors within colleges actually do and the general teaching issues they have in common with all who teach.

My research explores a problematic I have experienced over the 29 years that I was a community college professor in one of the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. I found that, over time, more and more of my work energy went towards the support of a market economic version of education and less and less toward student and teacher educational interests, democratic empowerment, and social and environmental justice issues. Fortunately, institutional ethnography lets me explore how and where such things as minimum conditions for effective teaching and learning unravel within a college setting. The pages that follow will explore college teachers’ experiences with ruling relations as they connect with community college course outlines and their influence on college teachers’ ability to teach well and develop as teachers. To do this, I will focus on the social relations involved in the production and implementation of course outlines.
As a point of entry, I will use my experiences with course outlines and those of a group of college teachers about to use course outlines with their program curriculum for the first time.

When I first started teaching at the college and for the first few years, college professors’ work was much less taken up with supporting and mimicking market economic behaviour. Class sizes were smaller, and there was more continuity to my teaching because I taught students enrolled in particular programs over each of the three semesters that they studied communications. There was simply more emphasis on students’ interests. I enjoyed more work satisfaction because I got to know the students whom I taught. The effects of the end of Keynesian economics benefitted my growth as a teacher.

I benefitted from the institutional autonomy that my college still experienced in the eighties. At that time, as Dennison (1986) indicated,

> College employees found great favour with institutional autonomy because they would have more professional discretion than their secondary school colleagues and even more professional latitude than they would have received as junior members of a university department. They would have the opportunity to be creative and innovative; they would have the freedom to shape their professional lives and their institutions. (p. 185)

I enjoyed this freedom as well as the mainly collegial management style that the college used, which exhibited the characteristics that Dennison (1986) refers to in the collegial model where

> students, instructors, administrators, and board members were portrayed as forming a “collegiums” of equal participation in the running of the college. “Those most directly influenced by a decision should have the right to make that decision,” “administrators are here to serve the faculty and the students,” “participation in itself is an essential part of the educational process” were very much part of the rhetoric and reality of some Canadian colleges. (p. 198)

Over several decades as a community college professor, I experienced several shifts in the organization of college courses and course outline work. These changes suppressed diversity in
curriculum offerings, academic freedom, and students’ interests while helping college courses change so that courses became a better fit as monocultural cogs in assisting corporate gain and creating college teachers and students more supportive of market economics.

**The Problematic**

What are the economic, historical, political, cultural, and social relations adjustments that set up a local context that allows so many college employees to believe that every faculty member must work from the same course outline and do exactly the same thing, course segment to course segment, despite the fact that the faculty and student population is so diverse? How is it that the course outlines have increasingly become instruments used to standardize college teachers’ work? This is the problematic I intend to explore in the chapters that follow.

**The Focus of the Investigation**

I use D. E. Smith’s (1987, 1990a, 1990b, 1999, 2005, 2006, 2009; D. E. Smith & G. W. Smith, 1990) institutional ethnography ontology and methodology to investigate Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology professors’ work processes and social relations with respect to college course outline production and implementation, historical changes in the College system, and public policy changes. This study will be done from the standpoint of college teachers.

Within the area of the ontology and methodology of institutional ethnography the work of teachers has been addressed through Stock’s (2000) thesis on teachers’ work in producing report cards, McCoy’s (1999) work on the way the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology were transformed through accounting during the restructuring of higher education, N. Jackson’s (1995) work concerning competency-based reforms in British Columbia, Kerr’s (2006) work concerning the effects of ruling relations on secondary teachers, Barrett and Meaghan’s (1990) work concerning equity and community colleges, and D. E. Smith and G. W. Smith’s (1990) work
on DACUM style curriculum. As far as I can discern, no work has been done on the role that ruling relations have played in shaping college professors’ work through the production and implementation of course outline work.

This study is needed because I believe that Ontario’s college course outlines can act as samples of contested sites in the conflict between an earth-oriented democracy and global market economic democracy and in that sense provide a means of access to investigating the social relations that college professors are hooked into in the way that Turner (2003) investigated the ruling relations involved in land development.

These questions will be explored:

1. What are the historical changes that have occurred with respect to the work that college professors do to prepare and implement course outlines?

2. Who are the other actors involved in shaping the course outline work? What do they do?

3. What are the chains and concerting of action, text, and talk involved in course outline work?

4. What are the local and extra-local historical changes in institutional standard practices, professional philosophies, union agreements, provincial and federal legislation, regulation, and policy directives that have shaped college professors’ local course outline work?

5. How have the media, corporate culture, international organizations, and technological developments shaped professors’ course outline work?

6. What does a map of the social relations involved in the construction of college professors’ course outline work look like?
7. Does the work that college professors do to create and implement course outlines hold the possibility of addressing radical participatory democratic growth, social and environmental justice, and the everyday concerns of professors and students?

To answer these questions this thesis will explain how institutional ethnography as a methodology and ontology is relevant to the work of this thesis, describe my methodology, examine the parts of a sample course outline for the ruling relations within the text, map the work processes involved in the production of course outlines and related course outline work over the course of four semesters, and examine the interlocking textual influences that union-related documents have on college teachers’ course outline work. Naturally, I will close with concluding remarks and identification of future research.

The next chapter will provide a background to the ontology and methodology used in this thesis: institutional ethnography.
Chapter 2

WHAT IS INSTITUTIONAL ETHNOGRAPHY?

The ontological and methodological base of my research is institutional ethnography as initiated and developed by D. E. Smith, as revealed in several of her publications from 1987 to 2006. Those who have further developed the methodology, such as Campbell and Gregor (2004), McCoy (1999), G. W. Smith (2006), and Turner (2003, 2006), have also supported my research. In this chapter, I will summarize the aspects of institutional ethnography that most apply to this study of the social relations connected to college teachers’ course outline work.

Institutional Ethnography as an Ontology and Methodology

D. E. Smith’s institutional ethnography particularly suits the way my mind works. I like to survey the whole landscape of a problem and think about why and how things happen the way they do. Being a Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology professor became increasingly more difficult while I was gaining more years of experience, taking on increasing challenges, and getting more education. I began to try to figure out why when the work of teaching college students should be getting easier for me, it wasn’t. (My main challenges were not with the students. They were with the increasing constrictions that managers placed on my teaching.) That D. E. Smith has already developed an ontology and methodology that allows me to begin to figure out through a doctoral thesis why Ontario’s college professors’ jobs are getting more challenging in certain ways, as time goes on, is a development convenient and pleasing to me.

Several topics are relevant to understanding institutional ethnography, so before I begin to write about the specifics of institutional ethnography, I would like to explain the meaning of the
ontology of the social, ruling relations, the social construction of the everyday, the role of
glanguage, the objectification of knowledge, and the materialist method according to those who
write and research using institutional ethnography. Next I will introduce institutional ethnography
as a research focus, explain its emphasis on the concept of a problematic, its procedures, its use of
textual analysis, its understanding of work knowledge, and its emphasis on mapping social
relations.

**Institutional Ethnography’s Ontology of the Social**

For D. E. Smith (2005) institutional ethnography differs from mainstream sociology
because, while “mainstream sociological theory establishes the knower’s discursive position as
transcending the everyday worlds of people’s experiences,” institutional ethnography does not
(p. 50). D. E. Smith sees institutional ethnography not just as an alternative methodology, but
more importantly, as an alternative sociology with an alternative theory of reality (pp. 50-52).
Within institutional ethnography’s research ontology “people remain as subjects, the knowers, or
potential knowers of what institutional ethnography discovers” (pp. 52-53). D. E. Smith models
her work on that of Marx and Engels who developed their theories and concepts based on
people’s actual doings and relationships (p. 56). “For Marx, the concepts of political economy
are not to be taken as the givens of social science. They express the social relations that have
emerged historically” (p. 57).

**Ruling Relations**

Because the focus of D. E. Smith’s methodology is on ruling relations, it is important to
understand what the term “ruling relations” means to her. In *Writing the Social* D. E. Smith
(1999) writes about her concern with seeing political economic relations taking precedence over
everyday relations that are necessary to support them. She quotes Marx to emphasize this point:
‘These material states of dependence, as opposed to the personal states, are also characterized by the fact that individuals are now controlled only by abstractions [money and commodities], whereas earlier they depended on one another.’ (Marx, 1973, p. 163-4). . . . Before capitalism, relations of dependence were between particular individuals: kinsfolk, feudal lord and serf, and so forth. (p. 77)

As capitalism evolves, “knowledge, judgment, and will are less and less properties of the individual subject and more and more of objectified organization” (Smith, D. E., 1999, p. 78). The concept of ruling relations has to do with forms of social consciousness that do not directly arise in local conditions of real people (p. 78). Texts often do the work of setting up the relations intended by the ruling. Capitalism is dependent upon “creating an independent system of relations mediated by money and commodities” (Smith, D. E., 1990b, p. 7). The ruling relations standpoint “objectifies society, social relations, and what people do. . . . It is a standpoint producing a consciousness of society as if she who reads and speaks can stand outside it” (Smith, D. E., 1999, p. 33).

**Social Construction of the Everyday**

D. E. Smith (1987) explains that she finds the typical ways that sociology emphasizes connecting people and activities with formal categories as a means to predict behaviour to be a way to exclude people who do not fit into the categories and a means to avoid addressing the determinate forms of social relations that people are caught up in. An inquiry that focuses on the everyday allows for an examination of the social relations that maintain social differences (pp. 132-134). D. E. Smith (1999) is interested in analyzing to make observable the way extra-local theories, concepts, categories, ideology, and beliefs influence everyday local activities and the way the extra-local social impacts concert, coordinate, and sequence local activities in favour of ruling relations (p. 7). She wants to develop a sociology that explains how, through our everyday
activities, we are all embedded in and contributors to the socially organized powers that make up ruling relations (p. 8).

The Role of Language in Constructing Social Relations

In *Writing the Social*, D. E. Smith (1999) emphasizes the idea that the development of self is an ongoing social act interconnected with language and meaning (p. 112).

In Mead’s view, language, rather than simply expressing meaning, controls it. It is a mechanism capable of creating new objects because it selects meanings developing in a social process and brings them into the shared and social space that symbolic communication creates. (p. 114)

D. E. Smith (1999) draws on observations as “‘specimens’ in which we can find practices of referring to objects as moments in a social act” (p. 114). “Pointing brings the other’s gaze into alignment with her/his own. There becomes an object. It is not yet an object for them before its alignment” (p. 115).

Naming objects is a three-way relation; not just subject-object, but subject-object-subject. It is a three-way relationship that constitutes objects as social or that constitutes objects as such. . . . Referring has . . . social grammar, a definite socially organized sequence of practices which is learned as a whole bundle. (p. 117)

For instance, a child needs to have a parent acknowledge what she sees so that the object “becomes” for both (p. 117). The object becomes independent in the social organization of referring; “practices of referring that fail . . . are incomplete” (p. 118).

D. E. Smith (1999) finds other scholars useful in explaining the role that language plays in social relations. She states,

I am helped by Bakhtin’s differentiation between utterances in and of direct encounters between people and those mediated by texts. The latter he calls ‘secondary speech genres’ (Bakhtin 1986). . . . For Bakhtin, speech genres ‘originate’ in ‘spheres of activity’ . . . . The meanings of words have already been given determination as they have been used in multiple local settings; they enter local utterances trailing meaning from the past. . . . [Speech genres carry] terminology, syntactic conventions, stylistics, and so on — carry and regenerate the social organization of groups, large-scale organizations, discourse, indeed,
all forms of social life in which people together are concerting their activities in some specialized way. (pp. 134-143)

D. E. Smith (1999) explains that there is an “intimate connection between learning an occupation and learning a language” (p. 144). To emphasize this she refers to the “study of the practices and social organization of pickpockets . . . (Maurer 1964) and how the language of thievery . . . organizes a thief’s activities and his (or her) working relations with others” (p. 144). These kinds of examinations of spheres of activity emphasize “how utterances generated by the relevant speech genre organize consciousness in courses of action” (p. 145). She reminds us to note the social connections of organizing and concerting sequences of action:

The social organization of those spheres of activity we call a discourse. The peculiarity of a discourse is the standardization of methods of producing utterances across multiple texts claiming membership in it; indeed, membership is claimed in part by the recognizable standardization of the methods by which such texts have been produced. (p. 145)

The theme of monologism, a theme emphasized in Shiva’s (1993) Monocultures of the Mind, is also a concern of D. E. Smith (1999) who states that “the notion of an imposed monologism suggests a regulatory device” [italics in original] (p. 139). She is interested in the way that words are used to align individual consciousness, in other words, to organize: “The organizing work language will do, its selecting, ordering, assembling operations, is transferred from setting to setting” (p. 142).

Discourse and objectified organization acquire their transcendence of local historicities in such inscriptive processes. Ideological practices are an important form of inscription. They begin within the transcendent schemata of discourse or formal organization. An interpretive schema is used to assemble and order a set of particulars – descriptions or instances of actualities. These aim at and can be interpreted by the schema used to assemble them. The particulars become indices of an underlying pattern, corresponding to the schema, in terms of which they make sense. The ordering of events, objects, etc. is thus pre-informed by the schema of discourse or formal organization. This is the ideological process at the boundaries of discourse or formal organization. It is of considerable significance in the exercise of power by the ruling apparatus. (Smith, D. E., 1990b, p. 217)
Textual practices reveal the way the organizations are set up to advantage certain groups and disadvantage others. D. E. Smith (1990b) suggests that within textually constructed standardized practices within organizations is an opportunity to investigate “relations between the local social order and the larger social structure as practices in language that can be directly investigated” (p. 220).

**Objectification of Knowledge**

“The social organization of capital itself is an objectification of value” (Smith, D. E., 1999, p. 82). Within *Conceptual Practices of Power* D. E. Smith (1990a) emphasizes that historically social sciences have claimed that a detachment between the researcher and what was researched was a means to ensure objectivity in the production of knowledge, and yet this detachment did nothing to ensure that the knowledge revealed concerned the what and how of social relations (p. 32). She suggests that beginning from a feminist standpoint that acknowledges a local site can produce “a product of inquiry that can be relied on” (p. 33). Knowing is always connected to a distinctive subject, but knowledge “calls for attention to the disappearing subject” and at the same time exists only in the activities of a particular subject; this is the way our objectified world is created (p. 66).

Ruling relations depend on the objectification of knowledge as a means to set up the coordination of activities (Smith, D. E., 1990a, p. 67). In the same way that a commodity becomes separated from its maker yet mediates people’s behaviour, so the fact becomes separated from the knower yet mediates the consciousness of those who know it in common (Smith, D. E., 1990a, pp. 67-69). The fact may have a restricted circulation in terms of certain groups but has sameness, and, when stripped of the subjectivity of those who initiate a factual account, can be manipulated (Smith, D. E., 1990a, p. 69). It is in the produced displacement of the individual in objectified
knowledge that ruling relations gain advantage through a socially coordinated consciousness (Smith, D. E., 1990a, p. 70).

**Materialist Method**

D. E. Smith (1990a), as indicated in *Conceptual Practices of Power*, favours a sociology that emphasizes a materialist method where the local and historical presence of the subjects of inquiry is preserved to reveal the what and how of their ideological engagement with capitalism and the way that capitalism and its effects have come to supersede the agency of the individual (p. 46). D. E. Smith is interested in finding a way to account for the way that producers of commodities become separated from their products; for example, the way that technological developments have more to do with capitalistic intent than to do with the people who construct them or utilize them or the way facts appear without acknowledgement of a knower (pp. 47-53). D. E. Smith explains it this way:

> The inner connection between social relation and concept that Marx posited works both ways: if concepts express social relations, social relations may also be systematically expressed conceptually, and a ground for theory as an explication of actual relations is provided. (p. 48)

D. E. Smith (1987) sees a need to inquire into the way everyday activities support the construction of ideology. Similarly, Patricia Hill-Collins (1991) also recognizes that “many African-American women have grasped this connection between what one does and how one thinks” (p. 25).

**Institutional Ethnography as Research**

D. E. Smith’s (1987) *The Everyday World as Problematic* explains that institutional ethnographic study begins in a particular setting with a particularly situated subject and experience and moves to generalized and generalizing relations within the apparatus of ruling and the economy. Institutional ethnography focuses on the idea that its inquiry is one of discovering ““how
things work, ‘how they are put together’” and is a project faithful to the actualities of socially organized relations (p. 147). This approach has to do with “aiming to find the objective correlates of what had seemed a private experience of oppression” (p. 154). Validity questions relate to referencing back to those issues and processes and finding out if it really does work that way (p. 160). “Institutional ethnography explores the social relations people bring into being in and through practice” (p. 160). It “does not involve substituting the analysis, the perspectives and views of the subjects, for investigation by the sociologist” (p. 161). D. E. Smith indicates that the ideological categories and concepts of the institution influence the social practice of the participants working within it. Accountability is derived through locating local practices and connecting them with the extra-local “organization of the ruling apparatus” (p. 161).

Indeed, the institutional process itself can be seen as a dialectic between what members do intending the categories and concepts of institutional ideology and the analytic and descriptive practices of those categories and concepts deployed in accomplishing the observability of what is done, has happened, is going on, and so forth. (p. 161)

Institutional ethnography reveals the way institutional ideologies create conceptual boundaries with respect to what is “made observable-reportable within the textual mode” and which “work processes of actual individuals are specifically obscured” (p. 161). The institutional ethnographic investigation must examine connections beyond “the conceptual boundaries defining the institutional domain” because often the work processes that are not part of the “accounting” practices but are necessary to the institution are “those that articulate a given institutional process to other social relations” (p. 177).

**Problematic**

Campbell and Gregor (2004) suggest that institutional ethnography inquiry should begin with a problematic. For them the problematic is something disturbing in the experiences of the
everyday that cannot be explained by the logic of what is happening in the everyday (p. 46).

Investigation of the problematic will explore the disjuncture between two different realities, “knowing something from a ruling versus an experiential perspective” (p. 48). D. E. Smith (2005) indicates that this problematic “takes the everyday world as an unfinished arena of discovery in which the lines of social relations are present to be explored beyond it” (p. 39). Researchers need “to notice and name the relations in the research setting” (Campbell & Gregor, 2004, p. 46). As researchers explore the problematic, they must identify their relation to the inquiry. They take sides, either as insiders or on the side of the informants. Researchers must be concerned that the investigation of the puzzles that the inquiry of the problematic has to do with makes a difference in the everyday lives of those informing the inquiry (Campbell & Gregor, 2004, pp. 46-48).

Procedures

D. E. Smith (1987) sees institutional ethnography as having three procedures:

First, there is the analysis of the ideological procedures used to render its work organization accountable. These ideological procedures are constituents of the social relations articulating the work process to the institutional function. Second, . . . a notion of work enabling us to engage with the ways in which people are actually involved in the production of their everyday world, examined with respect to how that world is organized by and sustains the institutional process. It is these that ideology analyzes, interprets, and hence renders accountable within the institutional context. Finally the concept of the social relation analyzes the concerting of these work processes as social courses of action. Work is articulated to such concerted sequences of action, performed by more than one and perhaps sometimes by a multiplicity of individuals not necessarily known to one another. The knitting of the work processes in social relations is by no means always a conscious effect. What becomes conscious and planful is structured by the ideological processes that are constituents of the social relations. (pp. 166-167)

Textual Analysis

D. E. Smith’s (1987) Everyday presents the idea of texts and the way they are written as being a means to organize social relations. She indicates that “sociological methods of writing texts produce accounts relating ourselves as readers to those of whom they speak in a relation of
ruling” (p. 140). Textual relations have just as powerful effect on organizing our lives as money and commodities do (Smith, D. E., 1999, p. 80).

In *Writing the Social*, D. E. Smith (1999) wants to reveal how texts create a bridge between the everyday/every night local living and ruling relations in such a way that there is a double-faced nature to standardized texts that support relations of ruling across time and space based on their reading (pp. 7-10). She emphasizes a textual analysis with a focus on unveiling the extra-local influences of relations of ruling that the main business of capitalism has on the everyday lives of those engaged in local institutional practices. The methodology emphasizes the importance of an “I” and “we,” within the struggle of establishing an insider perspective and standpoint, as a means to explicate how capitalistic relations of ruling are taken up by local participants. This examination is done to open up opportunities to adjust the imbalance of ruling relations power.

D. E. Smith (1990a) indicates that the version of reality that texts produce is based on a lived actuality but relate to two stages: the social aspects involved in its production and the social aspects involved in its reading and interpretation (p. 71).

“Textual realities are the ground of our contemporary consciousness of the world beyond the immediately known” (Smith, D. E., 1990a, p. 83). They are a necessary part of the operation of organizations but can be used by those in ruling relations to enforce a version of the world that favours keeping them in a position of power (Smith, D. E., 1990a, pp. 83-84). The types of textual presentations that favour the apparatus of ruling “constitute shared, identical, and perspectiveless objects and environments, locked into decision processes through the schemata, categories, and concepts that organize them” (Smith, D. E., 1990a, p. 84).
**Work Knowledge**

Institutional ethnography relies on peoples’ work knowledge, that is, informants’ “expert and exclusive knowledge of what they do and of the contexts and conditions that complement their work” (Smith, D. E., 2005, p. 149). Whether a researchers’ knowledge of a particular setting is built up through interviews and/or participant observation, the goal of institutional ethnographic research of a work setting is to unveil the social organization of a particular “political-administrative regime” (Smith, D. E., 2005, p. 151). D. E. Smith (2005) suggests that there are two aspects to institutional ethnographic work knowledge: the first concerns an individual’s “experience of and in their own work, what they do, how they do it, including what they think and feel; a second is the implicit or explicit coordination of his or her work with the work of others” (p. 151). Institutional ethnographers are to pay attention to the texts that organize and coordinate people’s work (p. 151).

In institutional ethnography, the meaning of the concept of work is considered generous because it is not just referring to paid work. This idea of work extends “to anything done by people that takes time and effort, that they mean to do, that is done under definite conditions and with whatever means and tools, and that they have to think about. It means much more than what is done on the job” (Smith, D. E., 2005, pp. 151-152). A close examination of invisible work is important because very often it is the invisible and often unpaid work that sustains the paid work in society and capitalism (Smith, D. E., 2005, p. 152).

Institutional ethnographic researchers are interested in an examination of work as it relates to the concept of social relations and applies to “sequences of action in which [work] is embedded and which implicate other people, other experience, and other work in the institutional process on which the research is focused” [italics in original] (Smith D. E., 2005, p. 158). Institutional
ethnographers pay attention to the way one person’s work complements and interlocks with another’s in a particular institutional process (Smith, D. E., 2005, pp. 158-160). An institutional “ethnography is to be interpreted as an explication and expansion of the work knowledges people have of the social terrain it claims to describe” (Smith, D. E., 2005, p. 161). This work allows the institutional ethnographer “to reach further into the social relations and organizations of institutions as they are connected with the larger relations of ruling and the economy” (Smith, D. E., 2005, p. 163).

Maps of Social Relations

D. E. Smith (1999) wants people to create maps of social relations based on actual local activity. “And unlike maps, of lands, seas, and sea coasts, these have to be maps of relations in motion, the dynamic of which generates changes in how we are related, what we experience, and what we do and can do” (pp. 129-130). There needs to be focus on “how to find, represent, and name the features and dynamic of the social” with an emphasis on revealing the moments of hooking into ruling relations (p. 130).

Institutional ethnographic researchers have identified particularly significant points in their maps. D. E. Smith (2005) points out that “Pence (2001) introduces the notion of a ‘processing interchange,’ [a point within a multiple person work process where] a text enters and is processed . . . [and may be] passed on as modified or checked, or a new text built from the resources of the original is produced and passed on” (p. 171). These processing interchanges identify how those connected to these texts are to be recognized and how they perform (Smith, D. E., 2005, p. 171). Examining how people read and activate texts allows researchers to investigate institutional order. McCoy (1999) highlighted the idea that the term “activated” means “read” (p. 219). D. E. Smith (2005) agrees: “In reading, in activating the text, the readers’ consciousness is coordinated with the
words of the text. . . Within the text-reader conversation . . the reader becomes, in a sense, the text’s agent” (p. 108).

Turner’s (2003, 2006) seminal mapping work on municipal planning, where she sought to understand “how municipal planning organizes land development and sidelines residents’ and other environmental interventions” (2006, p. 139), provided me with useful direction, concepts, and techniques. Turner (2006) “mapped a coordinated complex of institutional sequences of work and texts into which multiple actors . . . are drawn in to participate” (p. 140). This kind of mapping reveals how “complex sequences . . . coordinate individuals’ diverse consciousnesses and activities into institutional action” [italics in original] (p. 140). She developed many useful graphical mapping techniques to reveal the details of an institutional process. For example, actors working on texts appear as circles, texts appear as squares or rectangles, talk appears as talk bubbles, arrows indicate actors connected to work. Broken line boxes represent texts that are “not physically present in the local work setting” being focused on, but “are made present by the work that people do in talk and texts as individuals refer to them” [italics in original] (p. 144). The result of the extensive mapping that Turner produced is “an institutional field of action that is organized and reproduced in these multiple coordinated work processes. . . . [The mapping] shows key consequential moments” (p. 146). Key to her investigation is identifying the role of the “legislated legal development agreement [that] preauthorizes” what can and cannot be done during the municipal planning process for a subdivision and “coordinates and shapes institutional relations” [italics in original] (p. 150). She shows how “appropriately worded and formatted texts shape and order the talk-text practices” that she investigates to put together the “institutional functional complex” (p. 151).
I moved from an understanding of institutional ethnography as a methodological ontology to working on applying it to the focus of my research: college teachers’ working experiences with course outlines. The next section will explain how I went about my research.
In the following pages, I describe how I connected institutional ethnography to my research on the social relations connected to college teachers’ experiences with course outline work.

The first section of this chapter will describe the research setting, focus of data gathering, formal and informal procedures, and participants. The second section will discuss how I conducted and processed the interviews, mapped an extended course outline work process, and revealed ruling relations within union negotiation texts. The third and last section, explains how I analyzed the different kinds of data that I used in this thesis.

Throughout my research, I paid particular attention to my problematic: How is it that course outlines have increasingly become instruments used to standardize college teachers’ work?

Research Setting

This research focuses on Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology professors’ experiences with course outlines and what influences why and how they are used. I do not specifically identify which college my informants are from, as a means to maintain their anonymity. I specifically identify the college that is the setting for my map of course outline work processes and their influences as being Sir Sandford Fleming College, Ontario, Canada, because that is the college where I worked for 29 years and the one that I know best in terms of course outlines. The informants, college teachers who were interviewed for this project, were interviewed
in a coffee shop of their choice. This was done so that the interviewing would be done in a place where any informant could walk away from the interview should one so desire. None did.

**Focus of Data Gathering**

I used my everyday experiences of teaching and learning both within and outside the college system to focus on three areas of data gathering: (a) I conducted interviews with some college teachers who were in the process of using course outlines for the first time, and I analyzed their transcripts alongside an actual course outline; (b) I mapped the course-outline-related actors, texts, and work sequences involved in four academic semesters; and (c) I analyzed texts related to union negotiations as they influenced college teachers’ course outline work.

**Formal and Informal Procedures**

In institutional ethnography, it is important to first establish the problematic and disconnect of an investigation. I did so by using autoethnography focused on my own experiences and knowledge of the production and implementation of college course outlines. Autoethnography is a method congruent with institutional ethnography as indicated in D. E. Smith’s (1987) *The Everyday is Problematic* and Diamond’s (2006) work. Ellis and Bochner (2000) see autoethnography beginning in a researcher’s personal life. The researcher focuses on something she or he has lived through. In trying to understand the experience, the researcher pays attention to her/his “physical feelings, thoughts, and emotions” (p. 737). I used the autoethnography approach to establish an insider participant-observer informer’s self-reflexive process of discovery with respect to the focus of the study.

Originally, I thought that the central piece of data gathering would be ten semi-structured interviews of one to two hours with college teachers. I was definitely taking the college teachers’ standpoint in this investigation. Actually, although the interviews played an important part in the
research, using my knowledge and experiences of course outlines to make a Turner-style (2003) mapping of the social relations connected to course outline work became the main source of data for this thesis. I would say, in retrospect, that I was finding that my “route of access was determined by the course of confrontation, which in turn was determined . . . by the analysis and the data” (Smith, G. W., 2006, p. 61). For me, the more I thought about where the influences on college teachers’ course outline work began, the more my mapping expanded. Transcript excerpts from interviews with college teacher informants who were about to use course outlines with their program for the first time provided me with timely data that identified ruling relations elements within a typical course outline in a way that I might never have appreciated to the same degree had the opportunity to interview this rare group of college teachers not come up. Because the teaching work of my informants was about to become drawn into the ruling relations complexity of course outline production and implementation, I paid closer attention to the details that shaped that work than I might have without having been reminded of the idea that college teachers can actually teach without course outlines. Additionally, I found that a textual analysis of college teacher union-related documents rounded out the study of textual ruling relations power over college teachers’ work. I had not anticipated that these documents would be important to my research when I first began the project.

**Participants**

**Inclusion Criteria**

I planned to interview ten current or former Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology teachers as a means to gain natural conversation about their lived experiences related to constructing and implementing course outlines. The number of people to be interviewed was small because institutional ethnographic research is not about an ideal prescribed research sample
size in the tradition of sociology or psychology, as a means to make inferences about a particular segment of the population. Institutional ethnography seeks to uncover how something actually happens and uses several types of analyses to reveal that it does happen that way. I originally planned to interview a wide range of college teachers based on length of time teaching at the college, employment status (including full-time, part-time, and partial-load teachers), and teaching discipline. At the time of writing up the ethics protocol, I had not really come to terms with how institutional ethnography works. Eventually, I realized that I did not need to interview different people who had a wide range of college teaching experience. I needed to be true to the standpoint that I began with and map the lines of interference with college teachers’ ability to teach well. In fact, for the interviews for this thesis, I conducted semi-structured interviews with college teachers I was acquainted with. In the original ethical protocol for this research I stated that I would interview ten college teachers; I did not interview ten. The University of Toronto Office of Research Ethics did approve the number of informants that I actually interviewed. Some readers might be able to identify the group of people I interviewed if I were to indicate the exact number of informants I interviewed. Therefore, I will not state exactly how many people I interviewed.

I had no restrictions with respect to gender, age, sexual orientation, ethnicity, race, ability, or religion in terms of the teachers I recruited.

Neither personal nor identifying information was sought or written up.

Exclusion Criteria

I planned to include only college teachers with at least three months of teaching experience. In fact, all the informants had decades of college teaching experience.
Recruitment

My informants were recruited from acquaintances who have taught at a College of Applied Arts and Technology at one time or another. I accessed their addresses and telephone numbers from city telephone books.

I contacted the informants by sending letters of introduction. In that letter, I told prospective informants that I was interested in having them assist me in my doctoral studies, by allowing me to interview them about their knowledge and experience with constructing and implementing course outlines. I told them that the study would be carried out under the supervision of my thesis supervisor, Jamie-Lynn Magnusson, and that the data was being collected for the purposes of a doctoral thesis and perhaps subsequent research articles. I told them the title and purpose of the research. Most important, the introduction letter provided them with the information they would need to make an informed decision regarding whether or not they wished to participate in the study. I followed up the letter with a telephone call to each of their homes a week after the letter of introduction should have been received. In the telephone call, I asked if they had any questions about the study, answered their queries, and then reminded them to email me to indicate whether they would like to participate. When I received an email of interest from a participant, I telephoned the participant to arrange a mutually convenient date, time, and place of the interview. The interview was arranged to be held in the coffee shop of the informant’s choice. At the end of the phone call, I told each informant that I would send to his or her home a letter of consent reminding him or her of when and where the interview would take place.

Compensation

The letter of introduction and the letter of consent both stated that all informants would receive a bookstore gift certificate of $40.00 in compensation for the interview. These letters also
stated that if informants decided to withdraw from the interview before the interview began, they would not receive the compensation, but if they withdrew at any point during the interview, I would still give them the compensation. None of my informants withdrew from the interview.

**Benefits**

This research had two areas of benefit. College teacher participants had the opportunity to relax and tell stories about their experiences teaching with and without course outlines. Because of the nature of the conversation, some teachers became more aware of and less willing to support barriers involved in course outline work that did not support their ability to teach well. The hoped for scholarly community benefits are as follows: The results of the study will be made available to the higher education scholarly community through a presentation at the Ontario Institute for the Study of Education, the production of this thesis, and a possible publication in a related scholarly journal. The description of the details of the map of the social relations involved in course outline work from the standpoint of college teachers may advance knowledge of markers and processes involved in the textual production of ruling relations. Such knowledge may allow managers and policy makers to have a basis from which to recommend changes to course outline work, which could improve the lives of college teachers and their ability to teach.

**Process Used to Obtain Informed Consent**

I worked through several stages to obtain informed consent.

1. I sent a letter of introduction to the homes of all prospective teacher informants. This letter described the nature of their possible participation in the study. It also contained information to help prospective participants decide whether or not to participate in the project and understand the contents of the letter of consent. The letter named the title of my project and provided contact information for my supervisor and me. The letter
told the prospective informants about the purpose of the interview, the questions that I
would ask, the length and location of the interview, and that the interview would be
audiotaped and transcribed. This letter also told the prospective informants that their
participation was completely voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time. It
stated that at no time would they be judged or evaluated, at no time would they be at
risk or harm, at no time would any value judgment be placed on any of their
responses. It stated that they could refuse to answer any question that they were not
comfortable with. It also stated that their audiotape and transcript would be kept in a
locked filing cabinet in my home. The letter stated that their responses would be kept
confidential as no names or identifying information would be used in the study,
reports, publications, or presentations. The letter also indicated that the data from the
interview would be destroyed five years after the completion of the study.

2. I followed up the letter of introduction with a telephone call to prospective
participants a week after they had received the letter. I asked them if they had any
questions about the research and, at the end of the call, I asked them to email me to
indicate whether or not they would like to participate.

3. For those who emailed me that they would like to participate in the study, I followed
up their email with another telephone call to arrange the interview at a time and place
convenient to them. When the time and place was arranged, I told them that I would
mail them a letter of informed consent. I did.

4. At the beginning of the interview, I orally reviewed the informed consent protocol
with all participants, had them sign the letter of consent, made a copy for myself and
gave them the original.
Debriefing

Within the informed consent letter and my verbal introduction to the interview, I indicated that participants could request and obtain a copy of a summary of the results of the study by ticking off a box. Participants could receive the summary by regular mail or email. One participant asked to receive the summary.

Participant Withdrawal

Participants were informed of their withdrawal rights in three ways: the letter of introduction, the document of consent, and my oral explanation of participants’ rights, which I gave at the beginning of the interview. Participants were told that they had the right to withdraw from the project at any time, the right to refuse to answer any question or questions, and the right to terminate the interview at any time. They were told that they could assert these rights at any time without consequence, penalty, or judgment. Participants were told that they were to keep the letter of introduction and informed consent for their own records.

I had planned that if any data had been collected before the point an informant wished to withdraw, that data would be given to the informant and/or destroyed, whichever the informant preferred. No participants withdrew.

Confidentiality

Only my thesis supervisor and I had access to participant data to maintain its confidentiality. I never used the participants’ real names or specific identifying information in the identification and organization of the audiotapes, transcription, analysis, writing, or presentation of this research. I will never use identifying information in any publication of this research. I used pseudonyms for each informant’s institution when I transcribed and coded each different interview. While writing and presenting this research I have left out and/or changed details that might reveal
the identities of particular informants or their colleges, to maintain the anonymity of the informants, while maintaining the substance of the content of the research. I will do the same should I publish any of this research. Throughout the research, I kept all personal research data, audiotapes, transcripts, and text materials associated with my informants and their colleges filed individually and kept in a locked filing cabinet in my home. Five years after the completion of the study or before, I will delete the transcript information from my computer and destroy the written transcripts.

Risks

Participants were not at risk at any point in the interview. Both the letter of introduction and the letter of consent stated that the information provided in the interview would be no more sensitive than what the informants would encounter in everyday interactions. That is the way it turned out.

The vulnerability and risk level for the participants of this study was planned to be and turned out to be low. Although I know the college teacher informants as acquaintances, because I am a retired College of Applied Arts and Technology teacher, I held no position of power or privilege in connection with any of them. Because of this, there was no risk to any of them in participating in the interviews. They did not provide sensitive data. I invited participants who are highly educated professionals able to make rational and informed decisions about participation.

Conducting and Processing the Interviews

To the coffee shop chosen by the informant, I took two tape recorders and extra batteries for both. Having two recordings of the interviews ended up being fortunate because in many situations in the coffee shops, when the background noise distorted the clarity of one audio recording, I could switch my transcription listening to the other audio recorder and find clarity. I
transcribed the interviews myself and in the transcription included all the verbal hesitations, interruptions, and noises from my informants that I heard on the tape.

I was interviewing these college teachers to find out about their experiences with and understandings of course outlines. My main questions were these: “When you first began working at the college, what did you do to get course outlines ready? How did course outlines connect with your day-to-day teaching at the beginning of your career? How did the work processes connected to course outline work change for you over the course of your career?” Although these teachers had never used course outlines with the particular program they were teaching at the time, they could talk about how the curriculum preparation and implementation for their program differed from the formal course outline teaching and learning work that was about to be imposed on them.

I transcribed one of my informants’ interviews early in the research process, shortly after the interview, because some of what that informant spoke about fit in well with my mapping chapter. I did not transcribe the other interviews for several months because, while I was working on the other chapters, I could not imagine what I would do with the rest of the interview data. Once I had the other mapping chapters in good shape, it occurred to me that I must include a sample course outline in this thesis and that using one of my old ones, with excerpts from the informants’ interviews, would allow me to reveal the extent to which the ruling relations embedded in the texts of various parts of the course outline constrains college teachers’ work. It took me several attempts at organizing this chapter, but once I decided to work from the bottom parts of the outline to the top and to move from a discussion of the least important elements to the most important course outline parts, the data from the interviews fit well with the main parts of the sample course outline.

Because I had already constructed a Turner-style (2003) mapping of the actors, work, talk, and texts involved in four semesters’ orchestration of course-outline-related work, I became aware
of which parts of the course outline could have the most and the least disruptive influences on my informants’ style of teaching. For example, I could see from what my informants told me about their supervisor trying to tell them what their course policies should be that standardized course policies (usually the last part of most formal course outlines) acted as minor inconveniences compared to the potential impact of the details of the first part of the course outline. In contrast, the course number that appears at the beginning of the course outline had the potential to fragment the holistic way that my informants taught because it carried the textual authority to break into separate standardized units the fluid and diverse subjects that they had been teaching. The dean-approved date line could mean that their curriculum (which they did not normally plan in advance more than a week) would have to be written out by semester in detail and approved in advance of their teaching it by the dean (who knew little about how to teach their program material or their students).

As the data and analysis revealed other texts and reflected other scholars’ work, I incorporated them into the chapter.

**Figuring Out How to Map an Extended Work Process**

After reading D. E. Smith’s works and Turner’s thesis, then attending a weekend workshop with Susan Turner and a weeklong one with Dorothy E. Smith, I was able to begin mapping the course outline actors, work, talk, and texts, covering four semesters, to uncover the social relations that influence college teachers’ course outline work. I worked through several iterations of this map to reach the point where I was satisfied with it. At first, I wrote out what happened as I remembered it. While writing the course outline mapping story, I made a legend of the details I was incorporating into the narrative (see Figure 3.1).
This legend included such details as colour coding the actors engaged with and connected to course outline work, the texts they worked on, and the significance of the talk they engaged in. I created the legend so that it would be easier to see who influenced what and what actually happened. While I was word processing the narrative mapping of the course outline and production implementation, I added footnotes to remind me of connecting references to follow up later (see Figure 3.2).
Once that was finished, I transposed what I had written into a series of hand-drawn, colour-coded maps or figures. I followed Turner’s (2003) legend that used, for example, circles for work, boxes for texts, and talk bubbles for, of course, talk. Each figure represented a cluster of actors, work, talk, and/or texts involved in moving the course outline production process along. Next, I figured out how to represent my hand-drawn figures, using the extra features of Microsoft Word. Changes or additions to this version of the figures did not always require redoing the entire figure by hand. As the data and analysis reflected other scholars’ work, I incorporated it into my working draft. As I was reminded of other influencing texts, actors, and talk, I added them to the figures, the data, and the analysis.

I loosely followed the working legend that went with the colour-coded narrative version of the description of the work processes connected to course outline production. As I translated the narrative into a series of figures that more closely aligned with Turner’s (2003) style of mapping, I simplified how I represented actors, texts, and work. I did that for three reasons. First, I needed the
mapping to be more manageable in terms of the limits of my technical skills on Microsoft Word and the colour choices that it offered. Second, I realized that some of the distinctions that I had created in the narrative did not actually exist. Third, I just could not manage the complexity of mapping out some important distinctions, the difference in treatment between full-time faculty and part-time and partial-load faculty, for instance.

I had great difficulty seeing a summary of these figures, but once my supervisor suggested that the over 80-page mapping chapter be broken into smaller chapters, I could then see how there were stages in the course outline work processes that nested one inside the other. Working with further colour-coded representations of these maps, on extended lengths of paper taped to a wall and then the computer, helped me “name” these stages.

**Revealing Ruling Relations in Union Negotiation Texts**

Early on in my research journey, I was advised by a colleague to read the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology *Workload Taskforce Report* (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009). I did. I paid particular attention to the parts of this report that had to do with evaluation, course outlines, and collegiality. My attention was based on the themes emerging in my thesis work, my previous college teaching experience, and disputes I had had with supervisors over course outlines and evaluation in courses I had taught. Because of these evaluation disputes, I had already read the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) very closely with regard to a college professor’s and a college manager’s responsibility for students, courses, and evaluation. My understanding of institutional ethnography allowed me to see erosion in professional autonomy for college teachers from the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* to the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology’s *Workload Taskforce Report*. Because both college employees and management were in the midst of
negotiations for a new contract as I began my research, I located and read both management’s offer and the union proposal regarding evaluation. I was surprised to see a connection in the discourse concerning evaluation, course outlines, and collegiality amongst the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Workload Taskforce Report, the management’s proposal, and the union’s proposal. I read, underlined, and reread all three of these documents. I wrote notes about the discourse concepts and reread relevant sections of D. E. Smith’s work until I had a workable chapter of a textual analysis of the interlocking ruling relations discourse I found in these documents.

**Analyzing Different Kinds of Data**

As I began my research, I stated in the ethics protocol that I would use texts from the public domain that included those from the Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities website, specifically the Essential Employability Skills section; excerpts from a common college business communications text; information from the Ontario College Quality Assurance Service website, and Fleming College public multi-year plans, which included marketing plans and technology plans. All were a means to support my research. I did use most of these, with the exception of the Ontario College Quality Assurance Service website documents. As I got into my project, I was drawn to the texts that seemed to me to have the most direct influence over college teachers’ everyday teaching work. The Ontario College Quality Assurance Service website documents did not come up in my informants’ conversations, so I did not include them. These documents could play a role in later related research.

The data from the informants’ transcripts, my autoethnography, maps of the social relations of course outline work, and college teacher union-related texts made me aware of other texts that influenced community college course outline work. As Kerr (2006) has written, testimonies of teacher-participants create “a starting point for selecting documentary texts for follow up analysis”
As a result I selected more texts. I analyzed the way that the texts interlocked one with another and the way that they orchestrated managers’, support staff members’, and teachers’ work. The use of data and connecting analysis took the following shape in the thesis.

In Chapter 4, I used three main sources of data for analysis: a sample course outline that I had written a significant portion of was presented as an actual text to be analyzed part-by-part alongside excerpts from my informants’ interviews and my own knowledge of and experiences with course outlines. This combination allowed me to reveal the ruling relations power inherent in different parts of a typical course outline and how the ruling relations power of the course outline text parts gained strength because of their nesting arrangement and connections to other regulatory texts.

In Chapters 5 to 8 I mapped out the social relations of college course outline work processes over four semesters. My analysis of texts referred to in the mapping varied in analysis intensity depending on the power inherent in the texts. Some texts were simply named as pieces that moved the process along, and others were referred to briefly because they were generically powerful. Still others were given much analytical space because of their importance as higher order regulatory texts. In several chapters, I referred to Foucault’s (1979) *Discipline and Punish*, but I was not using his ontology. Rather, I was referring to the particular practice of surveillance explicated by him, which fits well with a materialist ontology.

In Chapter 5, for example, I referred to generically powerful texts: the college funding formula, a college recruitment video, and a student college application to college. I concluded that although the details of these kinds of texts may vary from one college to the next, especially across different jurisdictions, they generally orchestrate the same kinds of activities in the colleges and jurisdictions where they are used. The generic function of these texts is hooked into a more
powerful text: the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) mission and articles. Because I saw the OECD mission and articles presenting specific examples of higher order regulatory discourse for the ideological frame within which college employees’ work nests, in Chapter 5 I focused a close analytical lens on the selected OECD texts that created an “us and other” consciousness influence on college teachers’ work.

Chapter 6 looks at the involvement of texts in Fleming College’s organization of courses, classes, and teachers’ course outline work. This chapter is concerned with the way that college teachers’ material world is organized. Most of the texts, such as the calendar, work in generically powerful ways. Many of them are invested with their power because of the higher order regulatory social relations frame set out in the Academic Employees Collective Agreement (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005). This chapter analyses how local and extra-local texts and college employee work organize the how and what of college teachers’ work, with or without course outlines, even before teachers are assigned a course and class. The map shows how the college administration of the production of the calendar, courses, classes, and course outlines organizes the material world of college teachers’ work. This is the college organizational frame within which college teachers’ course and class preparation nests.

Chapter 7 uses five work process maps to reveal the texts and work involved in college support staff and teachers’ preparation for college courses and classes. The maps reveal the ruling relations complicity work within which college teachers’ standardized class and course teaching nests. This chapter shows how college teachers become involved in setting up how their mental and physical energy will be exerted.
Chapter 8 uses three work process figures to map the text and work that orchestrate the performance of college teachers’ standardized course outline production, prescriptive teaching and assessment work, and the involvement of students in this work.

The mapping data permits me to reveal the layers of ruling relations, one nested inside another, that promote both a market economic friendly expansion of the standardization and commodification of college teachers’ work and an earth democracy unfriendly contraction of diversity and professional judgment within college teachers’ work. Figure 3.3 illustrates how the figures of course outline
work processes (presented in more detail in subsequent chapters) can be understood to nest within layers of ruling relations work.

Chapter 9 presents union documents and union-negotiation documents to show how a discourse was developed and promoted through several texts to the final union contract that supported the further restriction of college teachers’ work.

At no time did I use private or confidential documents from either my participants or the college.

**Conclusion**

Institutional ethnography with its emphasis on unveiling the problematic in the way that capitalistic-oriented ruling relations organize our everyday life provides a means to investigate the work college professors do to construct course outlines.

The next chapter presents excerpts from interviews with informant college teachers who were about to use course outlines with their program for the first time. This chapter shows how the course outline text constricts their work and hence the work of many other college teachers.
Chapter 4

THE COURSE OUTLINE: A REGULATORY DEVICE

This chapter uses institutional ethnography’s textual analysis tools to examine the network of textual ruling relations within college course outlines that circumscribe Ontario college teachers’ work. I will do this by showing how the construction and implementation of college course outlines and the subsequent teaching that the course outline orchestrates support market economic values and the suppression of any other value systems such as the earth democratic values that Shiva (2005) emphasizes.

In this chapter, I will focus on my experiences with course outlines and the experiences of a small group of college teachers who, because of having been in a marginalized area of a college, have not been required to use course outlines with their program’s students until the time of my interviews with them. At this point, they found themselves being forced to use them. The story of this chapter focuses on how these teachers talk about their concerns about having to subordinate their teaching practices to accommodate having their teaching work mediated by the authority of the online course outline text template and how my reflections on working with different elements of the course outline and different college teaching situations helped me understand their position. I will use a copy of one of my old course outlines as a means to provide a real textual context to

---

2 An earlier version of this chapter was presented at the Society for the Study of Social Problems, Institutional Ethnography section, August 2011, Las Vegas, Nevada.

3 Although I personally wrote a great deal of this outline, between my first writing and use of it and my last use of it, another teacher worked with it and taught the course. As a result, I am not absolutely sure which parts I actually wrote or what text I was responsible for choosing, cutting, and pasting into the outline.
apply their comments to, even though they would be working with a slightly different course outline and template at a different college. While revealing my informants’ conflicted reactions to various course outline parts, I will also describe my own involvement in the production of these various course outline parts as a means to reveal some of the social relations shifts that can happen depending on whether and how course outlines are used.

The course outline can be organized so that it becomes a series of enclosures that restrict the what and how of college teachers’ work. When teachers who have never had to use a course outline before for their particular program talk about its forced implementation on their work, what is made visible is all the ways the course outline text can coordinate working arrangements that benefit a capitalist consciousness and suppress alternative worldviews.

Typical community college course outlines may contain introductory parts, which include such things as course name and course number; middle material, which contains learning outcomes, learning sequence, and evaluation; and concluding material, which may include course resources and course policies. Typical community college course outlines may or may not follow the order used in the sample course outline referred to in this chapter and may or may not include all these details or may include more details. The extent to which teachers must adhere to the course outline elements described here varies from college to college, department to department, program to program, and supervisor to supervisor. I am going to begin with the last item that appears on a Fleming College online course outline\textsuperscript{4} (see Appendix A) and work my way up.

\textsuperscript{4}The course outline excerpts used in Tables 4.1-4.3 and Figures 4.1-4.5 are taken from a Sir Sandford Fleming College “Speaking Effectively to Groups,” Winter 2008 course outline. Reproduced with permission.
Course Policies

Although the title “course policies” is not used in this course outline, the last section of many college course outlines (as seen in Figure 4.1 below) has to do with the ways students might get out of the course and the penalties related to student punctuality, attendance, submission of assignments, and plagiarism. Many of these policies hook teachers’ work into the college’s standardized institutional rhythms more than into the natural diversity of teacher and student learning. The following excerpt of course policies5 is taken from a course outline that I wrote, in part, for a course called Speaking Effectively to Groups. I did not write the course policies, because at the time of my working with this course outline, course policies were agreed upon by the entire communications department that I was associated with, an agreement that I was complicit in. In this case, I copied and pasted the policies wording from another already written up course outline into mine.

Figure 4.1. Sample Course Outline: Course Policies

Prior Learning Assessment and Recognition

PLAR uses tools to help learners reflect on, identify, articulate and demonstrate past learning which has been acquired through study, work and other life experiences and which is not recognized through formal transfer of credit mechanisms.

PLAR Assessment Options:

These include authentic assessment activities designed by faculty. Learners may also be encouraged and supported to design an individual documentation package that would meet the learning requirements of the course.

PLAR options and contact for this course:

Exemptions contact for this course:

5 All contacts names other than mine have been left out of this course outline reproduction.
**Academic Responsibilities:**

*Mutually, faculty and learners will support and adhere to college Academic Regulations and Student Rights and Responsibilities. In addition, the following guidelines have been developed to support the learning process.*

In order to meet all Learning Outcomes, the Oral Presentation assignment must be attempted in order to complete the course.

**LATE POLICY**

You must submit/present all written/oral assignments on their assigned dates unless you make specific arrangements in writing/voice mail/e-mail with your professor at least one day prior to the due date in question. In the case of any emergency, make arrangements (in writing, if necessary) immediately upon your return.

Your professor will make special arrangements for valid reasons only. In the case of illness, you may be required to provide a medical note. Other extenuating circumstances will be discussed on an individual basis.

A penalty of 10% per day will be applied to an assignment not submitted by the original or extended due date. An assignment more than three days late will receive a grade of zero ("0"). No assignment will be accepted after the last day of classes without prior arrangement with your professor.

**ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

The College views very seriously any form of academic dishonesty, such as plagiarism, submission of work for which credit has already been received; cheating, impersonation; falsification or fabrication of data; the acquisition of confidential materials, e.g., examination papers; misrepresentation of facts; altering transcripts or other official documents.

**PLAGIARISM**

In essence, plagiarism is the submission for credit of work taken without due documentation from an existing source. One form of plagiarism involves direct incorporation, without proper credit, of phrases, passages of text, images, or data of any kind from an existing source. A second form involves using data or information without proper credit (even though the incorporated information is paraphrased or otherwise not in direct form).

Much time this semester will be spent discussing, identifying and avoiding plagiarism. Because of the seriousness of a breach of Academic Integrity, you are strongly encouraged to seek clarification during the classes devoted to this topic prior to the submission of your work.

A plagiarized assignment will receive a grade of zero.
Use the excellent site by Diana Hacker (http://www.dianahacker.com/resdoc/) to review the mechanics of citing sources.

Know the course and college rules about plagiarism Section 6.6.0 of Fleming’s Academic Regulations.

Other Iterations of Course Policies

The wording in course policies is much the same for all course outlines within the communications department I worked in as a result of a department agreement. Much of the detail written down with regard to the late policy is in response to the fact that most faculty carry well over 100 students a semester and have difficulty keeping track of student work when some students don’t follow the recommended due dates for submitting their assignments and doing their tests.

When I wrote course policies on my own, I would insist that students let me know in advance, if possible, if they must miss a due date. The notification would allow them to submit the assignment or do the test when they were able to; otherwise, the assignment or test would not be marked, essentially getting zero. I tried to have enough assignments and tests so that missing one would not cause a student to fail the course. I rationalized this extreme, imposed penalty by saying to myself and my students that such deadlines exist “in the real world.” Interestingly, I had few appeals of these policies at this time.

While I always included course policies related to assignment due dates and test punctuality when I taught postsecondary courses, I tended to have few fixed course policies written in advance for students when I taught in the English as a Second Language department. There we tended to work with students’ needs and knowledge. Student behaviour that might have been penalized in a postsecondary course tended not to be in this program because if students were late, missed a test, or suggested assignment due date, there was often a legitimate reason for doing so,
which might, for example, have included needing to learn about the culture of promptness that they were immersed in. Additionally, I happily worked alongside other teachers who had different test-taking and assignment policies than I did, and we weren’t bothered by our differences regarding course policies.

During most of the last decade of teaching at the college, standard course policies were developed by department members, often during department meetings. No matter what penalties were developed, situations always arose that didn’t quite fit the hard and fast rules of the course policies, and teachers would use their professional judgment to deal with the situation or the student would appeal the situation. At this time, faculties were told by managers that it was important that course policies be consistent. This request for course policy consistency allowed a neoliberal version of standardized course policies to dominate.

After returning to postsecondary teaching after taking time off to do doctoral courses in education and reflecting on my experiences teaching English as a Second Language, I was less interested in supporting the penalties of course construction that had to do with constructing opportunities for failure and for constructing winners and losers. It was difficult to be both a Fleming College “team player” and develop course policies that aligned with a more progressive vision of teaching and learning. Because of my background, I could sympathize with the struggle that my informants were having with the course policies that were being imposed on them.

**The Imposition of Course Policies**

My informants worked within a small department that for most of its existence had run programs with a curricular orientation that was very flexible to students’ needs and interests. At the time of my research, their supervisor was insisting that the teachers, for the very first time,
compose and use course outlines. This supervisor was also taking the lead on the nature of the course policies, as this interview excerpt from one of my informants reveals.

Informant: Well, yes. . . . It looks like. It looks like that also may come to pass. She gave us student guidelines and then the teacher rules of conduct, I guess. Student rules of conduct. [Teacher] rules of conduct. . . .

She said we don’t have to get to the point where we actually lock a door after ten minutes, but we would, like students. She would like students to understand that they have to be in at a certain time. Uh, you know, just different things like that. . . .

She still. The director is still working toward that kind of a structured classroom.

This excerpt makes visible the way that the imposition of course policies through the imposition of the course outline creates a way in for supervisors to insert more control over the course policies that were once worked out amongst teachers and students. It makes visible the work that managers do to suppress diversity in course policies, construct a standardized version of course policies, and construct a standardized approach toward students that, in this case, doesn’t align with what the teachers of the program want to do.

**Student Assessment/Evaluation**

The course outline template has several sections where text is already written and tables exist to be filled in. The student assessment section is one of them. This section is presented so that every teacher who fills in the details of a course outline will read the assessment section in the same way. In this way, college teachers become “active in producing the general out of the particular” (Smith, D. E., 2005, p. 225). For instance, every college teacher, while looking at the assessment part of the course outline template, will read that every college course must identify several things for students to do while enrolled in the course and those activities must be given marks that can be converted to a percentage that can be added up to equal 100. This is the dominant discourse of college student assessment and evaluation. This template does not permit
teachers and/or students to use other methods to assess student learning, benchmarks, or pass/incomplete, for instance. As well, this template ties students’ learning and teachers’ teaching of the course snugly within the institutional 15-week semester even though students may have difficulty getting all the work that the course assigns to them done within that time span or may be able to proficiently complete it in less time. The course policies in this example course outline also emphasize the delineations of the institutionally circumscribed time to learn.

The following table (see Table 4.1) provides an example of a typical online course outline student assessment plan taken from a Speaking Effectively to Groups course that I have taught.

### Table 4.1. Sample Course Outline: Student Course Assessment Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Plan:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item/Date</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 12-15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 2-15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 2-15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Assessment Comments:**
Presentations will be marked for these four areas: content, structure, style, and techniques.

**Ways to Get Hooked into the Dominant Assessment Discourse**

Teachers can have a variety of connections to the authority of the dominant discourse of college assessment. For instance, I have developed my own student evaluation plan, as exhibited in the above course outline excerpt. In these situations, I would be writing most of the course content
details and would have control over the development of the course, so I would try to have elements in the course description connect with what I hoped the students would learn and how I planned to evaluate their learning. When appropriate, I would consult with other relevant teachers about the nature of the course work, but I still used marks that totaled 100 percent and used 50 percent as the dividing line between student course failure and success.

I have also taught courses where I worked with other faculty to develop sometimes similar, sometimes identical, assignments; assignment evaluation rubrics; tests; and the distribution of the 100 percent weighting for the evaluation for the course. I found that all the compromising that was done tended to restrict my own teaching style to a varying extent.

Near the end of my time at the college, for many courses I was supposed to use the percentage system of course evaluation, assignments, and tests that had already been written by someone else. When the course fit with my teaching worldview, it was educational for me. When the course did not fit with my teaching style, it was quite jarring because I was hooked into the 100 percent mark distribution system.

The most learning-enhancing form of student evaluation and assessment I experienced happened when I taught English as a Second Language. In this context, the assessment/evaluation activities that teachers used were not published in advance. Evaluation tools were developed as the class progressed and were based on what had been emphasized in various class lessons. For the most part, we made up our own individual tests and assignments to go with the subjects that we taught. We all used comprehensive, multi-part, and somewhat standardized pre- and post-testing at semester’s beginning and end. In between, we developed our own assessment and evaluation tools. Students did not get a percentage mark at semester’s end; they got a description of their proficiency levels, strengths, and weaknesses.
An Imposed Student Evaluation Schema

My informants work within a department where teachers devise their own student evaluation methods within courses, and students move from one class level to another, depending on their proficiency development with the program material. This movement of students from one class or course level to another within the institutional time of an academic semester does not fit with the course outline construct. For them, the course outline template that was being imposed on them did not fit with how they actually evaluated their students. They did not use marks to evaluate student progress, yet the course outline template forced this method of evaluation as this excerpt reveals.

Researcher: So, so does your director . . . think that you should be producing, adapting [your program] to fit this style of a course outline?
Informant: I think so.
Researcher: So that’s basically what she’s asking you to do?
Informant: Yes, yes, yes. She is.
Researcher: And it would then, it would go on [online]? And then is she also encouraging you then to have students get marks, you know, a 50, a 60?
Informant: Yes, yes. That was where we left things. . . . I don’t think anyone. I don’t think the teachers. I don’t think [we] felt that the director clearly understood that [our program] was not a [program] where you give marks. She, she really didn’t understand that. . . . And I think that’s where she’s going. . . .
And I think that I’m going to have to just simply make it very clear and simply state. [Our program] does not permit us to give marks. And that’s the way [our] program is.

When a course outline is first written for a course, the marks discourse of this evaluation/assessment portion of the course outline coordinates how teachers think about their work and their students’ learning. The work of teaching and learning becomes mediated by the concept of marks through the evaluation section of the course outline text into the work of both teachers and students. The switch to using marks is no small matter. If used, students will be able to be compared, and student course failure will have been constructed for the first time for this program. Teachers will be able to punish through marks. Supervisors will be able to see course
marks online for the first time. Relations amongst teachers and students and teachers and supervisors will fit with a capitalistic production orientation. New teachers will have no idea what has been lost in the shift. Once these teachers use marks to evaluate their students, the previous different form of student assessment will have been eclipsed and monocultural percentage evaluation will have been achieved. “The terms under which what people do becomes institutionally accountable” (Smith, D. E., 2005, p. 113) will have come into effect. As I have explained with regard to my experiences with the online course outline, once hooked into its regulation, it is difficult to diverge. The assessment/evaluation schema exerts the power of a text-reader conversation.

The constancy of the text is also key to the effect of institutional standardization across multiple local sites of peoples’ work. It produces for any institutional participant reading the text a standardizing vocabulary, subject-object structure, entities, subjects and their interrelations, and so forth. They are the same for all readers, and as readers talk or otherwise act to coordinate across situations in relation to the text, it regulates the discourse effective among them. Sure, they may use other speech genres, some of which resist the institutional, but even resistance adopts the standardizing agenda, if only as a foil. (Smith, D. E., 2005, p. 108)

Each section of the course outline, although perhaps somewhat different for each college, creates this textual constancy. The resources section that is discussed next is no different.

**Resources**

Resource selection for a course can become problematic once a course is given a name and number allowing it then to be worked into the general college operations system. Once that happens that aspect of a program curriculum can become fixed and centrally controllable. One of the central controls that can come into play is that one course number can mean one course outline.
This means that if a course has one teacher, as, for example, happens with this course outline excerpt from my Speaking Effectively to Groups course outline, the teacher can choose her or his own course resources. Here is what this section of my sample course outline looks like (see Figure 4.2). I had taught this course several times with several different texts but chose to indicate that I would use handouts this time so that I could respond to the in-the-moment needs of my students.

**Figure 4.2. Sample Course Outline: Course Resources**

**Learning Resources:**

Handouts will be supplied for this course.

If, on the other hand, the course has several sections and several teachers, some college managers can insist that all the course sections must use the same course outline and, hence, use the same course resources. This can be difficult if the resources do not align with an individual teacher’s teaching background, style, or value system or the needs and interests of the students. This can happen when a teacher interested in critical pedagogy is forced to use a text that contains images like those that follow (see Figure 4.3), images with concepts that can be worked into multiple-choice tests that all teachers and students can be forced to use by management decree.
The centralized control of resources happened to me rather late in my career and came as quite a shock because at the beginning of my career I had complete freedom to choose resources appropriate to my background, my student group, and subject matter. When I taught English as a Second Language, I did not work with a course outline and, hence, did not need to publish in advance of teaching what resources I would use during the course. Since the college had a good bookstore, good sets of class books, a good library, a good photocopier, and a good outside community library, I was able to respond to the in-the-moment needs of my students. For instance, on a Friday when I was booked to be with the students in the language lab, I would often create a cloze exercise based on the lyrics of a popular song that would often have a connection to something that came up in the previous week’s classes. The words that I would periodically leave out would often have to do with the sounds and pronunciation that students had difficulty with.
throughout the week. I would be addressing a variety of issues depending on the backgrounds of my students because, for example, students with Japanese as their first language have different listening and pronunciation difficulties when learning English than French and Arabic students. I would base some of my next week’s group and individual listening and pronunciation lessons on what students could and could not hear in their Friday listening exercise.

Because of my background, I understood the concerns raised by my informants regarding the change in how subject and program resources are viewed.

Informant: So the director . . . never really saw it [the monthly report written to document what the teachers taught and how it benefitted the students] . . . I would think that there were many times when the coordinator never saw it. We were left alone, completely. And there were benefits and there were disadvantages to that because you had no support, and you had to find everything. You had to locate it and decide what you were going to do. . . . You would be lucky if you could find out how much money you had to spend for books. . . . They sure as heck would not be looking at [details of what was taught and resources used].
Researcher: OK. So they never did. Never asked. Never were interested in the specifics of what you were doing. The supervisors.
Informant: Nope. Never.

In this case, my informant is referring to the two decades leading up to the time when their supervisor decided that the teachers needed to put their curriculum into a college online course outline. While many years passed where their supervisors were uninterested in their teaching and teaching resources, the availability of an online course outline created shells that allowed supervisors to insist on standardized resources if they wanted. Here I am using the term “shell,” as D. E. Smith (2005) does, “to describe terms that need filling to complete their sense” (p. 201).

Another shell that exists within the course outline template is the part of the course outline template that exists for teachers to fill in what they would do in the course day by day and week by week.
Day-to-Day Course Details for the Semester

Experiences With and Without a Set-in-Advance Learning Sequence

I taught many courses where I wrote all the day-to-day details of the course outline. When I first started teaching at the college and for many years, all professors wrote these details for their own courses. At the end of my career, despite having learned much more about curriculum, I hardly ever had the chance to write up my own course outline independently. At this time, course outlines were written by the lecturing and/or lead teacher, sometimes with all other members of the teaching team or select members of the teaching team.

In the middle of my career, for a time, professors would share lectures for courses, even when their actual course seminars and labs might differ and the learning sequence sections of the course outlines might differ from teacher to teacher. In this situation, we would work together on having the same lecture topics and tests scheduled in the shared lecture theatre. At that time, we did not have the same tests and/or assignments. Later when the course number meant one course outline would be used for all sections of the course, some teachers developed the course outline details as a group. This method of course curriculum development made me uncomfortable. I avoided it when I could.

Only in my last few years of working at the college did I teach courses where the entire course outline had been written by someone else. It was quite enjoyable and developmental for me when the course fit with my worldview. When the course did not fit with my worldview, it was quite painful.

When I changed from teaching postsecondary communications classes to a variety of postsecondary programs to teaching English as a Second Language, I used a few of the traditional course outline parts, such as a semester plan of themes for the program written in advance of the
semester’s start. At this time, teachers in this English as a Second Language department created each day’s lessons based on what had gone on in previous classes, the theme of the week, the interests and needs of the students, and anything new they had learned about teaching English as a second language. They recorded what they taught in a daybook, which stood as a record of what actually happened in their classes. Teachers coming back from English as a second language conferences would immediately embed what they had learned into their classes. At this time, supervisors had little interest in the day-to-day details of teaching English as a second language. This curriculum arrangement left room for much teacher autonomy and reciprocity amongst teachers, students, classes, and the community. Often current events became part of the daily curriculum. This kind of spontaneity did not exist for me in the last few years of my postsecondary teaching, particularly because of the textual rule of the course outline and the way my supervisors read its rule and applied its ruling.

What follows is an excerpt from my Speaking Effectively to Groups course outline that represents the day-to-day course details. This was always the part of the course outline that would take me the longest to prepare. I would arrange and rearrange three sets of post-it notes on my kitchen table until I came up with a plan that I liked based on my previous experiences and the students I expected might be in the class. Once the plan was firm, I would type it into the online course outline template. Once the course outline was approved, I would tape this portion of the outline on the wall in front of my desk. I would follow my already prepared curriculum to prepare the details of each next class. This part of the course outline, which I participated in writing, became the ruling textual mediation between my students and me.

After teaching English as a Second Language, where no fixed-in-advance “learning sequence” was used, I was well aware that I was required to make lots of decisions about how the
course should develop without having met any of the students. Because there were no other options for developing a postsecondary course, I just did it this way. Here (see Table 4.2) is what the learning sequence for my sample course outline looked like.

Table 4.2 Sample Course Outline: Learning Sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wks/Hrs Units</th>
<th>Topics, Resources, Learning Activities</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 14 &amp; 16 Jan.</td>
<td>Understanding and using effective nonverbal communication. Learning to give constructive feedback. Giving introductory presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Introductory presentation, 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3 21 &amp; 23 Jan.</td>
<td>Analyzing the audience. Using visual aids. Introductory presentations continued.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Introductory presentation, 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4 28 &amp; 30 Jan.</td>
<td>Understanding how to prepare and present narrative presentations. Presenting narrative presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Narrative presentation, 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5 4 &amp; 6 Feb.</td>
<td>Understanding how to prepare and present process informational presentations. Giving process informational presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Process informational presentation, 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6 11 &amp; 13 Feb.</td>
<td>Understanding how to prepare and present compare/contrast informational presentations. Giving compare/contrast informational presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Compare and contrast informational presentation, 10%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessment column doesn’t add up to 100% because it doesn’t include evaluation for students being moderator (5%) and for self and peer feedback (15%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Preparing for and delivering persuasive presentations. Practice persuasive presentations</th>
<th>1-7</th>
<th>Checking comprehension of critical persuasive presentation factors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 Feb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>Independent Study Week.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 Feb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9</td>
<td>Giving persuasive presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Persuasive presentation, 20%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &amp; 5 March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10</td>
<td>Roles, responsibilities, and possible topics involved in group symposium presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Checking comprehension of critical group presentation factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 &amp; 12 March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 11</td>
<td>Roles and responsibilities connected with job interviews: the interviewee and interviewer.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Checking comprehension of critical interview factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 &amp; 19 March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 12</td>
<td>Giving group symposium presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Group presentation, 20%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 &amp; 26 March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 13</td>
<td>Giving group symposium presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Group presentation, 20%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March &amp; 2 April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 14</td>
<td>Being an effective interviewer and interviewee.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Job ad, covering letter, resume, interviewer role, interviewee role, 20%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 &amp; 9 April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 15</td>
<td>Being an effective interviewer and interviewee.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Job ad, covering letter, resume, interviewer role, interviewee role, 20%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 &amp; 16 April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Sequence Additional Comments:**
Teaching Without a Prescribed Learning Sequence

My informants had their own background experiences with respect to how they had planned and implemented the day-to-day curriculum for their students. Their background experiences informed their concerns about altering the way they developed their day-to-day curriculum to fit the online course outline template.

Informant: So,. . . I took what some other people had done and modified it according to what I thought and according to what the students seemed to need and according to what the composition of the students were. . . .

And the college had nothing to do with it really. They just hired us, and told us to go ahead and do whatever we did. . . .

And that’s very difficult and has been difficult for other, for people outside [our program] to understand. . . .

Often it is, uh, what people criticize: our lack of formality, our quote unquote, lack of structure. They don’t see where we’re going. . . . It helped me hone in exactly where I need to go with [our program], and . . . it’s just not a program that can be structured because it’s about, uh, aiding . . . [the students], and that takes into consideration, to some degree, their schedules, uh, their . . . , uh, their trauma. . . .

Stress. That means that you just cannot be negligent about them as a person. They are . . . the primary part of the [program] course[s]. Their emotions. Their feelings. . . .

Their, their problems are all part of [the program]. These things are often used as a stepping-stone to another class at times.

These comments helped me see how easy it would be for an online course outline template and text to orchestrate teachers’ work and suppress the actual needs of actual students.

My informants’ comments also helped me see that the linear learning sequence set out in advance would not align with many Indigenous traditions. As Keller (2009) emphasizes, “wheels and circles have always been used to teach about the ways of the universe. There is nothing linear about the Indigenous worldview, because linearity is seen as an illusion” (p. 137).

My informants had similar concerns about their program’s curriculum not fitting with the learning outcomes section of the online course outline because they had never displayed their learning this way before.
Learning Outcomes

All Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology course outlines contain learning outcomes. As this college system has aged, this section of the course outline has become more complex and more controlling. In this section, I will write about the evolution of three types of learning outcomes that appear in contemporary college course outlines: those that are course specific, those that are program or vocationally specific, and those that are called Essential Employability Skills learning outcomes.

Various Experiences with Learning Outcomes

When I began teaching at the college, this section of the course outline was called “Learning Objectives.” At that time, we did not adhere so closely to the habit of having this section of the course outline be the same for all who taught the same course with a common name to various classes of students in various programs. Because of the allowed variation in learning objectives and course outlines in general, we were able to construct both the learning objectives and the day-to-day details of the course outline to meet what we perceived in advance to be the needs of the students we expected to meet in the class when the course began. Later, this section of the course outline became identical for all those teaching the various program-related sections of the same course. Once this habit was developed, the learning objectives or learning outcomes were often constructed in department meetings. I found, by attending various college sponsored curriculum workshops, that I was good at constructing learning objectives and/or learning outcomes.

Some teachers found ways to work around the constraints of the learning outcomes in the way they constructed their course outline and the way that they taught their course. For instance,
near the end of my career, when I found it difficult to find a course that allowed me the professional autonomy that I had previously enjoyed, I chose to teach a course already developed by someone that I admired. This course was outside my area of expertise and comfort zone, but it focused on critical pedagogy, a subject area that I wanted to learn how to teach. The teacher who had developed the course was away on sabbatical, so after talking to him about it, I was on my own. In this situation, the already written up course outline and manual that went with it were invaluable to me as a green teacher with this subject matter. Even though each specific course learning outcome he had written began with a behavioural verb as they were supposed to, I could read through those verbs and learning outcomes into the spirit of what he intended for the course. His course description and course title made me aware that this was not meant to be a learning-that-can-be-measured kind of course. I ignored the Core Competencies and Essential Employability Skills section of the learning outcomes section of this course and focused on what I perceived to be the spirit of the course.

In the last decade or so of my career at the college, pressure from the Ontario Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities increased for faculty to add other non-course specific learning outcomes to the course outline. At Fleming College, the Essential Employability Skills that were mandated by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities were combined with Fleming’s version of Core Competencies. College faculty course outline writers would include these Core Competencies and Essential Employability Skills learning outcomes when they applied in some way to their particular course.

Not long after the Core Competencies and Essential Employability Skills learning outcomes were to be incorporated into course outlines, Fleming College established a bank of program vocational learning outcomes, which course writers were encouraged to access and
include in the learning outcomes of course outlines as they wrote them for the first time. In a sense, college teachers were being asked to use prescribed language to organize their teaching similar to the way, as Stock (2000) describes, that elementary school teachers are asked to use prescribed language when writing report cards. Stock stresses that the computer-created report cards developed in 1997-1998 by the Ontario Ministry of Education were “part of extensive revisions in curriculum content and design and methods of assessment designed to secure accountability and uniformity throughout the province” (p. 123). Standardized college learning outcomes used in standardized courses achieve the same result. Both these ways of organizing teaching suppress the diversity that exists within the students and teachers.

At Fleming, the program vocational learning outcomes teachers put into course outlines were often the same ones that were listed on the Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities website within the program standards section. I looked at a few courses outlines from the winter 2008 semester and found one course with 37 additional learning outcomes available for viewing through the blue clickable vocational outcomes link on the course outline. These learning outcomes were there in addition to the 13 standardized vocational program learning outcomes connected to the school where the course was housed. When the 7 Core Competencies and Essential Employability Skills learning outcomes are added to the 10 course-specific learning outcomes, this 45-hour, 15-week course had 67 learning outcomes. This extreme example of the intrusion of learning outcomes into a college course illustrates the way college teachers can become more oriented to teach to the course learning objectives than to the students. This way of orchestrating teaching and learning is an example of the organization of objectified education. I question how realistic it is for the teachers of this course to have all the students actually achieve all the learning outcomes that apply to the students in the programs that they are assigned to teach.
The overwhelming focus on vocational learning outcomes does make it difficult for any one teacher to include any social or environmental justice learning goals.

Anyone who reads a paper version of an online course outline that includes the blue “Vocational Outcomes” heading can only read the blue words “Vocational Outcomes”. Anyone who has access to a particular online course outline for a particular course can double click on those blue words and have access to any or many of the standardized vocational program learning outcomes that the author(s) of the course wants to link up with a particular course outline. The provincial extra-local textual ruling within the course outline is only a click away.

Even though I became quite adept at crafting learning outcomes and connecting day-to-day course outline topics, resources, learning activities, and assessments to planned-in-advance course outlines, I was well aware that this was not the best way to organize or use teachers’ energy. I can now connect this awareness with the idea of “disjunctures between the artificial realities of institutions and the actualities of people’s lives” (Smith D. E., 2005, p. 187). When I taught English as a Second Language in the middle of my career, I was able to avoid the artificial rulings of the course outline and its learning outcomes. At that time, we worked with themes that would last a week or two. Each theme would have some general suggested learning goals attached, related to general student proficiency level, with respect to vocabulary, conversation, grammar, and so on. We used these as a guideline and adapted them to suit the classes that we met. Other specific learning goals would be part of each day’s lesson and would be based on the interests and needs of the students as demonstrated through the activities in previous classes. In this way, all my teaching energy was oriented toward students’ needs and interests with little extra-local textual mediation.

The Speaking Effectively to Groups course outline that I am using as a reference in this paper contains Core Competencies and Essential Employability Skills because the Ontario
Ministry of Training, Colleges, and Universities mandates that college course outlines should. The Ministry has a section on its website that states as much and lists all of the Essential Employability Skills and the learning outcomes that go with them (Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities, 2009). There are 11. These kinds of outcomes will be listed in most college course outlines because of that. For me, they seemed too vague to be of any use to the curriculum of any course I might teach. Nevertheless, I referred to the inventory of Core Competencies and Essential Employability Skills and cut and pasted those that had some connection to any course I was teaching. I placed them before the course learning outcomes because that is what I was supposed to do. I have always had difficulty with them because they are so vague that they are almost meaningless. As written, because they have no context, they could apply to kindergarten class through graduate level classes. In that way, they carry the mark of an authoritarian document, as D. E. Smith (1990b) tells us, in that the Essential Employability Skills outcomes have no context or solid perspective. These outcomes do perform the function of keeping college teachers focused on teaching things that can be directly connected to vocational matters, and this kind of focus allows for the privileging of market economic friendly curricula and the suppression of social and environmental justice curricula.

Essentially, there are three levels of extra-local influence within this part of the course outline: (a) the blue Vocational Outcomes links to the provincial Ministry of Training, Colleges, and Universities website and its standardized program learning outcomes; (b) the Essential Employability Skills learning outcomes connect with the corporate need to focus college learning on vocational learning so that vocational learning eclipses any other type of learning that might interfere with capital accumulation; and (c) the course specific learning outcomes are connected to
behavioural vocabulary that allows for learning that can be measured to dominate and suppress any other kind of learning, which again privileges capital.

Here is an example of the learning outcomes section (see Figure 4.4) from my course outline.

**Figure 4.4. Sample Course Outline: Learning Outcomes**

This course contributes to the following learning outcomes or essential knowledge and skills required by learners as defined by Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities program standards, employers, industry and professional organizations.

**Vocational Outcomes**

**Core Competencies and Essential Employability Skills**

*The student has reliably demonstrated the ability to:*

1. Communicate clearly, concisely, and correctly in the written, spoken, and visual form that fulfills the purpose and meets the needs of the audience.
2. Analyze, evaluate, and apply relevant information to solve problems and make effective decisions.
3. Create novel ideas/practices to enhance personal/professional success; adapt current ideas/practices in response to emerging needs.
4. Locate, select, organize, and document information using appropriate technology and information systems; use educational, presentation, and information technologies to learn, collaborate, and communicate.
5. Establish and maintain positive relationships in ways that contribute to the achievement of goals.
6. Manage oneself and one's resources to achieve goals.

**Aim:**
This course provides the student with a theoretical understanding and a practical application of the basic skills needed to prepare and give effective presentations, as an individual and as a group member.

**Learning Outcomes:**

*Upon successful completion of this course the learner will be able to:*

1. Understand and be able to control presentation anxiety.
2. Use appropriate nonverbal communication to support an oral presentation.
3. Use appropriate visual aids to support an oral presentation.
4. Provide effective self and peer feedback of oral presentations.
5. Work effectively with a group to deliver a successful group presentation.
6. Conduct an effective interview and be an effective interview candidate.
7. Give effective informational and persuasive presentations.

Additional Learning Outcomes Comments:

Although the learning outcomes section of this course outline takes up an entire page, when I began to teach a course like this, I would work from the learning sequences plan and the reactions of my students to the course materials, as they understand them. Few college teachers and students give attention to the multi-layered learning outcomes section of the course outline while the course is in progress.

Imposed Learning Outcomes

These interview excerpts and paraphrases reveal the difficulties my informants were having trying to understand how the way they teach could ever fit with the learning outcome organization of the course outline.

Researcher: What have you got underneath your notes?
Informant: Oh, I think we’ve gone through them already.
Researcher: No, I meant [pointing to the paper underneath the handwritten notes].

My informant had brought two course outlines with her to our interview. Her supervisor had given her course outlines that had some similarity to the material taught in her program. She commented that the example course outlines were very structured. The learning outcomes were “very clear” with one learning outcome being taught in one week and another the following week. My informant said that teaching and learning did not happen in such a linear fashion with her students. She referred to a skill listed as a learning outcome in the sample course outline she had to show me
and said that she would introduce this skill in the beginning of the year, but return to it throughout the year, because the students had forgotten or because there was more complexity to teach about it.

Researcher: You can’t just say you’ve taught it and everybody learned it.
Informant: Oh, and it’s finished.
Researcher: And it’s finished . . .
Informant: No, no . . . it’s not possible . . . . You can teach it at different levels and different degrees of difficulty. So, you know, you might be able to use . . . just, you know, to begin the first week or the month, but then you can teach it in a very different way at the end of the year, with a different degree of difficulty and . . . with a different aspect to it.

If you look at the following Learning Sequence excerpt (see Table 4.3) from the sample course outline I presented in the previous pages, you will see that there is a spot for listing the learning outcomes connected to a particular week’s curriculum.

Table 4.3. Learning Sequence Excerpt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Sequence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wks/Hrs Units</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In my example, I took the liberty of listing the numbers for all the learning outcomes in each week’s cell because I knew that we were really going to be working with the curriculum in a holistic way. I did not want to put the students or me in a position of having to police and prohibit what we could elaborate about on any particular day just because it was not listed as the learning outcome of the week. For example, very often the students and I would talk about how to
recognize and control presentation anxiety in the weeks beyond week one. As well, nonverbal communication and visual aids were further developed as the semester progressed, not just taught and learned in the weeks listed on the learning sequence of the course outline.

My informants have revealed that their teaching and learning styles do not lend themselves to having learning fragmented into outcomes that are to be achieved in specific weeks. It is clear from their comments and the learning sequence excerpt that I have included above (see Table 4.3) that the course outline schema, from the expression of learning outcomes to the display of the learning sequence, encourages a text-reader response in teachers and supervisors that suppresses holistic teaching and learning by privileging fragmented and prescriptive teaching and learning.

Extra-local authoritarian mediation of the standardization of my informants’ work could be written into the course outlines from the regulatory texts of the course outline learning outcomes that come from the Ministry to the regulatory standardization inherent in the week-by-week fragmentation of the teaching/learning that the course outline template’s learning sequence orchestrates. My informants’ supervisors would expect my informants to use all levels of learning outcomes used in this sample course outline when they would write their first course outlines.

All of these learning outcomes begin with active, or transitive, verbs providing examples of how my informants should write their learning outcomes. This form of presenting curricular plans is connected, as N. Jackson (1995) has shown, with

the basic principles of behaviourism required to achieve a thoroughly systematic form of curriculum management. Only those elements of achievement that can be externalized or objectified for the purposes of observation and measurement are technically eligible to be used as learning objectives. . . . This requirement is particularly critical if the systems approach is to be extended beyond the planning and design phase of instruction into the evaluation phase as well, where measureable outcomes are essential. . . . The series of competency steps which culminate in measureable outcomes constitute critical ground on which any further aspects of a curriculum management system may be laid. They achieve the essential step of making instruction answerable to individuals other than instructors,
thus laying the cornerstone for programs that can be seen as ‘responsive’ to external policy makers. (p. 177)

D. E. Smith and G. W. Smith (1990) emphasize that college curricula based on behaviour-focused learning outcomes permit college student learning to be more oriented to building skill inventories for employers than careers for students (p. 193). Certainly, all the levels of the learning outcomes described above, with their behavioural focus, achieve this aim.

My informants’ struggles with the learning outcome aspect of the course outline reveals the way that this portion of the course outline forces their instruction to be answerable to others. As Kuehn (2010) notes, learning outcomes or competencies that are harmonized with the curricula in the system makes it more difficult for teachers to use the content that is reflective of their unique community as their primary resource (p. 72). For example, since Indigenous languages are process- and verb-based (Lovelace, 2013), a college learning outcome orientation to an Indigenous language course could interfere with the way an Indigenous teacher would want to teach a language course.

This learning outcome orientation does allow, as Magnusson (2005) has noted, the Ontario government to “monitor the quality of higher education by setting up a centralized system of quality control and by reporting on performance and outcomes” (p. 129). The McGuinty Ontario government through the Rae Review set up the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario to do this exact work (p. 129).

The portion above the learning outcomes section of the course outline presents the course outline’s introductory items. These carry even more power than the previous sections.
**Introductory Items**

The course title is the first item that appears on the course outline. The course title is attached to the course number. College faculty must have each new course approved by various supervisors. Once approved, the course is given a number by the registrar. The course number allows operations support staff and instructional technology support staff to put the course into the computerized system that loads the names and numbers of the students who have enrolled in full-time programs into the classes listed for the particular program semester they have enrolled.

Here is an excerpt of the introductory items (see Figure 4.5) that appear at the beginning of the course outline under discussion.

**Figure 4.5. Sample Course Outline: Introductory Items**

**SPEAKING EFFECTIVELY TO GROUPS**

**Course Outline**
Course Number: COMM31

**2008 Winter**
Sir Sandford Fleming College

Program: Various
School of Interdisciplinary Studies

Course Format: In Person
Hours:

Faculty: Mary Dunn Office: 602C
Office Hours: As posted

Availability:
Email: mdunn@flemingc.on.ca

Coordinator: General Education Coordinator Office:
Email:

Dean:
Email:
Additional Comments:

**Dean Approved:** 2008/01/04

**Note to Students:**
We urge you to retain this Course Outline for future reference. Course Outlines may assist with portfolio development, credit transfer, PLAR, advanced standing, and accreditation with professional associations.

**Course Description:**

This course focuses on presentation skills necessary in the workplace. Students will learn how to research for a presentation, organize it, use visual aids, and handle public-speaking 'jitters'. They will learn how to prepare and give an interview, an informational, persuasive and group presentation.

**Past Experiences with Introductory Items**

While course titles are very specific now, when I first started teaching at the college, I taught courses that were titled by level: Communications I, II, III, IV, for example. At that time, courses were program specific, so although the course level of many courses might be the same, the faculty wrote their course outline for the students of that particular Communications I class. Communications I course outlines for the nursing program students were very different from Communications I course outlines for corrections students.

Later, but before online course outlines dominated course outline construction, I wrote communications course outlines and taught courses that had similar, yet unique, content to those of other courses with the same identifying code. At this time, these communications courses were assigned to a variety of teachers, but the classes contained students from several different programs. The program mix within the classes happened as managers attempted to load classes to standardized class numbers for each teacher as a means to increase efficiency. Of course, this move to standardize class size also reduced diversity in the sizes of classes. Small classes were
considered to have no value and were progressively eliminated. This is not an insignificant loss. Shiva (1993) reminds us in *Monocultures of the Mind* about the importance of maintaining the small as a means to maintain diversity (p. 19). Although her focus is on the tropical forest and damage that scientific forestry has had on it, there are similarities between the problems with the scientific management of the tropical forests and the scientific management of college teaching and learning. The factory production model for forestry suppresses diversity in the forests, as it does in education. “In place of cultural and biological pluralism, the factory produces non-sustainable monocultures in nature and society. There is no place for the small, no value for the insignificant. Organic diversity gives way to fragmented atomism and uniformity” (p. 19).

In my last few years at the college, I taught courses that were identified by identical specific numbers, names, and course outlines. As online course outlines were created, managers decreed that each course number should have one standard course outline no matter how many different class sections took the course, no matter how many different teachers taught the course, no matter the difference in program mix amongst the classes. Generally, these courses were grouped by school divisions and attempts were made to keep class sizes up and consistent. Each first semester communications course would then have a common title, number, and course outline according to the school with which it was associated.

Amongst some faculty, attempts were made to create attractive course titles. I found, for instance, when I submitted a detailed course outline to be accepted as a new course that the supervisor wanted me to make the course title more “sexy.”

While I was teaching English as a Second Language, first to immigrants and refugees, then to international students, my courses were not administratively identified by course titles or numbers. Initially, the English as a Second Language coordinator identified the courses I would
teach: courses that had gross subject divisions and many overlaps, such as vocabulary, idioms, listening, pronunciation, writing, reading, communicative grammar, and conversation. When I taught advanced international students, the other teacher and I divided the broad subjects between us. Because we had few people to answer to in terms of how we divided our program hours, the arrangement of the subjects to the teaching/learning timetable could be fluid. For instance, vocabulary and idioms could be listed as one subject grouping on the timetable one semester and as separate subjects another semester.

For many years, the English as a Second Language was a marginalized department within the college. Because it was marginalized, teachers within the program could arrange subjects differently than teachers in postsecondary studies. At this time, the English as a Second Language coordinator and teachers figured out class groupings and the arrangement of subject hours assigned to students and teachers on their own. Everyone involved understood that, within limits, the class size could increase as the English proficiency of the student groupings increased. The organization of curricula was about as de-centralized as it could be within a large institution. This organization of curricula responded to the needs of both the teachers and the students in the moment, unmediated by fixed course outlines. Teachers produced new curriculum every day, based on what had happened in the class previously.

In the case of English as a Second Language curriculum, ruling relations begin with the imposition of course titles, numbers, and descriptions. After returning from a sabbatical, I was asked to do some curriculum work for the college as it tried to revive its Intensive International English as a Second Language program. A lot of work had already been done. The courses and levels had been named, the course numbers were about to be assigned by the registrar, the course descriptions had been written. I was assigned to write another big chunk of the online outlines that
would include the week-by-week learning sequence and assessment section. I did it. All the while, I was aware of what was being lost as this method of central organizing of curriculum was being constructed. I was also aware of the controls and supervision that were being built into this course outline organized form of English as a Second Language curriculum. It was the first time I had ever written course outline curriculum for courses that I did not feel I would want to teach, even though I was doing learning design work, which I normally loved to do. I had become complicit in the fragmentation of what should have been and used to be holistic curriculum. I was complicit in the standardization of the English as a Second Language curriculum; in the hooking up of the curriculum into an apparatus of ruling; and in the means by which managers would gain control over the organization of the English as a Second Language classes, curriculum, and teachers. Worse, I was complicit in the alienation of teachers from their work and in the increase in the textual ruling of those teachers’ work. I was relieved when the program was cancelled after one year.

**Ruling Aspects of Introductory Details**

Once my informants’ program becomes organized by course outlines, the imposition of course outline introductory details will mean that for the first time these teachers’ everyday work will be objects of textual rule. For the first time, these teachers will have to have a supervisor authorize their teaching plans, plans which will have to take the form of course outlines; they will have to fragment their curriculum into fixed course commodities; they will have to lock their students into these fixed course commodities. The mandated course outlines will shift how these teachers know their work of teaching and their students. The imposed course outline will cause them to shift their knowing of the work of teaching more away from being based in experience and more toward being orchestrated by the ruling relations embedded in the course outline texts.
Conclusion

My informants have interesting general comments about their struggles as they are forced to fit their curriculum into an online course outline template. A reading of their words reveals, to reword D. E. Smith (2005) slightly, “how [their] orderly and familiar local world is suddenly disrupted by interventions that come from outside, that have no logic within [their] daily routines” (p. 39).

When I asked one informant what she expected would happen to her program in the next semester, she said that she wasn’t sure what would happen, but that there had been a meeting with their supervisor about course outlines. This informant stated that the supervisor knew “absolutely nothing” about how they taught the students in their program and “had never set foot in their” classrooms. Consequently, this informant “had no confidence” that the college managers “really cared” about the content of their program or its students and teachers. Nevertheless, the supervisor “seemed to be the one who was keen on . . . the course outlines.” More than one informant reported that the supervisor said that course outlines were needed to make the program better. One informant said that their supervisor wanted them to have course outlines so that their program would be “the same as all the other programs at the college. . . . Somehow to them [supervisors] [a program] is more real if it has course outlines” and even more real if they are “in black and white on the computer.” This informant said that having to use course outlines made her “very nervous” because she thought they might be restricting.

Researcher: Did [the supervisor] indicate why specifically? You know, you’ve gone on all this time with the way you were doing things. So, why suddenly?
Informant: Interesting.
Researcher: Did she decide that course outlines needed to be part of what you . . .
Informant: She wanted . . . to bring it . . . more in line with all college courses.
Researcher: OK. Then that was, that was her rationale?
Informant: Yes, oh, yes, so it’s really trying to keep bringing her back to, but we’re not a . . . [program] . . . We’re a . . . [program], and . . . very different. . . .

Fragmenting and enclosing my informants’ program into standardized course commodities would seriously interfere with the local de-centralized and holistic way they teach. Their professional autonomy would be restricted by the course outline rules. These course outline restrictions would erode the reality that grounds their alternative and without-course-outlines way of teaching. These comments reveal D. E. Smith’s (2005) idea of disjuncture between the everyday reality of the informants’ working world and the building of an artificial institutional reality.

The same issues that Shiva (1993) raises, regarding the suppression of local knowledge of plants, applies to the suppression of the unique and local ways of teaching that my informants engage. As Shiva puts it:

The dominant system also makes alternatives disappear by erasing and destroying the reality which they attempt to represent. . . . Dominant scientific knowledge breeds monocultures of the mind by making space for local alternatives disappear. . . . Dominant knowledge also destroys the very conditions for alternatives to exist. (p. 12)

Although my informants may not have realized it at the time of being interviewed, the imposition of the course outline with its course numbers, course titles, learning outcomes, learning sequence, evaluation, and course policies would make the space for their alternative and unique local way of teaching disappear through the power of the course outline to fragment and standardize their work. I know this because I have seen it happen before, and I even activated the fragmentation work when I did my later English as a Second Language course outline development work.
I asked one of my informants if she knew what she was going to do in the following September when they would have to construct course outlines for their program. Here is how she responded:

Informant: Yes, I do. I, I, I’m going to create a course outline that is going to actually simply look at... with the understanding that these are gonna be, these will not be set in stone, you know, there are times when students will fluctuate... So, you know, I’m doing this for the director. And I’m doing this because, you know what, maybe if I get a chance to start writing it out, uh, it’ll help me to see things more clearly. I think it is really more to the advantage of the teachers, and this really, as far as I know is not going to be given to the students right away. This course outline will be for us...

Researcher: For the teacher?
Informant: For now. For the teachers.
Researcher: What will the supervisor do with it?
Informant: She will keep it. It will be. Well, I don’t know. She’ll probably use it to ask us, well, you know, “What have you accomplished so far?” I’ll say, “Well, don’t look at what I’ve accomplished. You might want to look at what the students have accomplished,” you know... So I anticipate that there’s going to be a lot more work. I anticipate that there will be a lot more, quote unquote, interference...

Micro-managing. And I anticipate that there will be [more] work that I will have to do bringing directors, coordinators up to speed with exactly what [our program] is.

The informant talk reveals these teachers’ struggles to be heard, how they are not heard, and how they cope with the inevitability of the imposition of this course outline text on their work.

In this chapter, by describing my experiences with various course outline elements and including informant interview excerpts, I have explained how the imposition of the textual rule of online course outlines can “do the work of institutional power” (Howard, Risman, & Sprague, 2005, p. xii) so that the work of this group of local college teachers gets organized by the course outline discourse and schema, forcing the extra local onto the teachers’ lived experiences. The primary experiences of these teachers have been reduced to the universal and the monocultural authoritarian course outline text that has the ability to organize standardized teaching. As the above
analysis shows, this does not happen all in one step. The course outlines “produce out of the particularities of [teachers’] everyday living the standardization characteristic of institutions” (Smith, D. E., 2005, p. 36). Course outlines both transmit information and activate work as actual parts in how teachers work. They enable teachers’ work to be subordinated to the control of managers and activate the shift in the social organization of knowledge regarding how these courses and programs may be taught. The taken-for-granted work that so many college teachers do when they write course outlines and use them to guide their teaching work contains several levels of textual mediation that circumscribes and orchestrates their social relations and production of knowledge in favour of capitalism, as I will reveal in the following chapters. The formal organization of marketable college courses and the online course outline schema construct the particularities of the course outline discourse and the objectified organization that make up the ideological practices of college curricula constructed to favour market economic interests.

The next few chapters map out the course-outline-related actors, text, talk, and work processes done over four semesters within a sample community college to show the web of power that objectifies college teachers and their work. The first chapter in this series of mapping chapters reveals the ideological setting within which the work connected to the production and implementation of course outlines resides.
In the previous chapter, I explained how various texts within and external to a typical standardized online course outline influence college teachers’ work in a way that decreases teachers’ autonomy, increases the objectification of their work, and increases the extra-local controls over their work. I now will use a further development of D. E. Smith’s institutional ethnography and Turner’s (2003) institutional ethnographic mapping to reveal how market economics contributes to the suppression of student and teacher educational interests, and opportunities for diverse and alternative educational processes and content such as Shiva’s (2005) earth democracy worldview. Various texts such as Ontario’s higher education budget, its college funding system, and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) mission and articles are external to college teachers’ work, but influence it. Market economics as described in OECD documents frame how colleges are administered, an administration that decreases teachers’ autonomy, increases the objectification of their work, and increases the extra-local controls over their work.

---

I presented earlier versions of this work at two conferences: (a) The Society for the Study of Social Problems, Institutional Ethnography section, August 2010, Atlanta, Georgia and (b) The Canadian Federation for Humanities and Social Sciences, Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education section, May 2011, Fredericton, New Brunswick.
In Figure 5.1 and the figures in Chapters 6-8, I have put together a map of the work processes used within one Ontario College of Applied Arts and Technology that represents the work sequences, text, talk, and actors that both orchestrate the institutional process of deleting diversity in teachers’ course outline and teaching work, as well as ensuring the maintenance of the standardization of this work, a standardization that privileges the domination of market economic ideology. My maps begin just before the 2006 fall semester was about to begin and conclude at the end of the 2007 fall semester. The maps reveal the kinds of constraints that my informants will have their teaching work further drawn into once they produce course outlines for their program. I have not used my informant’s college for this mapping, because the particulars of the work could reveal their identities. I have used Fleming College because I am familiar with it and because it organizes college teachers’ work in a way similar to that of my informants’ college.

The Marketing of College Work

Just before a fall semester begins, college employees engage in routine activities. The following description, mapping (see Figure 5.1), and analysis emphasize the ideological constraints on college employees’ and college students’ work.

Data

All staff presentation. In early September or late August, just before the fall semester was to start, and while I would be finalizing the set of course outlines that would guide my teaching of courses for the upcoming semester, I used to take a break from my in-front-of-a-computer course outline construction to sit in a large lecture theatre to hear one of the all-staff-start-of-the-academic-year campus presentations. Generally, at these presentations (and the fall of 2006 was no different) various senior administrators speak about what they feel is important to highlight with respect to the upcoming academic year. Generally, the marketing director showcases the latest high
school student recruitment video to be used by the recent college graduate recruiters who will be recruiting students from various high schools to particular programs at Fleming College once the high schools begin their academic year.

Figure 5.1. The Marketing of College Work

Human Capital Theory, Economic Growth Theory

Transnational organizations such as the OECD

All staff campus presentation by senior administrators: president, strategic enrolment manager (aka registrar) and the marketing director. Presentations happen in the large lecture theatres at the main campuses.

Talk about enrolment targets for this semester and future semesters and enrolment competition with other colleges

Ontario College funding formula

College graduate recruiters recruit high school students into particular college programs using information from calendar

Support staff work

The marketing director introduces latest high school recruitment video and college graduate recruiters.

Faculty work

Latest high school recruitment video

Students from various high schools decide to enrol in a college program and fill out the application document

Student application to College

Global Competitive Capitalism, Market Economics, Neoliberalism, Global Monopoly-finance Capital

Time: beginning of academic year, fall 2006

Circle: Work done by college employees.

Talk: Talk produced by college employees.

Box: Texts physically present in the setting.

Dashed Box: Texts that are not physically present in the setting influence work done in the setting.
**College enrolment target.** At the same all-staff meeting, the president usually speaks about the college enrolment targets for that particular semester and the following year’s semesters and how his college compares with other colleges in the Ontario college system, regarding enrolment figures and Fleming College’s proportion of the provincial funding formula. Sometimes the president will address the fact that because of the provincial college funding formula, the college always needs to grow. Often the strategic enrolment manager will present the college’s strategic enrolment plan that addresses how the administrators envision how the college plans to grow.

**Ongoing work processes.** After that all-staff meeting, staff go back to their regular duties. Faculty finish course outlines or prepare introductory class activities. Support staff members continue to enrol students. Administrators and support staff begin work on plans for the next semester.

**Graduate student recruitment work.** Throughout the fall and after being introduced to different colleges by various college graduate recruiters, high school students choose particular college programs by filling out online application forms. The choices that students make for college enrolment become data for the Ontario College Application Services. This organization sends application data to each college. A college like Fleming can use this information as a stage in their targeted enrolment growth plan.

As my analysis section below explains, the work done by various college employees to bring students into the college teachers’ classrooms reveals ideological influences.

**Analysis**

**All staff presentations support market economics.** The activities of senior college administrators reflect the values of the dominant political economy that “goes by many names –
the market economy, globalized economy, corporate globalization, and capitalism” (Shiva, 2005, p. 13), neoliberalism (Magnusson, 2005, p. 133), or “global monopoly-finance capital” [italics in original] (Foster, McChesney, & Jonna, 2011, p. 34). This economy is supported by such theories as human capital theory and economic growth theory. The college funding system reinforces the acceptability of unlimited enrolment growth. This happens while politicians complain about the expense of the growing college enrolments and while the Ontario college system has reached maturity and should be given a funding formula that doesn’t support treating students as scarce commodities.

This move to marketing to get students to enrol in a particular college and particular college programs hooks college work activity into competition amongst Ontario colleges. In the late 1960s, when the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology system first began, each college had its own catchment area, making marketing departments unnecessary. Later, colleges did not have to work within catchment areas. It is with the shift in emphasis toward institutions’ marketing to gain students for a particular college that the work of subordinating student and teacher interests to institutional interests is enabled, and where the unlimited enrolment growth discourse becomes privileged. This emphasis on marketing to get students illustrates how market forces have penetrated services like education to the extent that some graduates from college programs become hooked into the work of recruiting the next year’s batch of college students rather than pursuing careers connected to the programs from which they graduated.

This behaviour reflects what Dennison (1986) has noticed:

Canadian educational institutions and agencies, including colleges, act as though the consumers of education are a scarce commodity and a small market over which many and assorted agencies of education should compete. . . . The fact is that the interests of educational institutions and agencies have taken precedence over the interests of learners. (p. 174)
It is interesting to note that college marketing is oriented to promote a college and a program, not particular faculty and what he or she might teach. Teachers’ names do not appear in marketing material in connection with the courses they teach. The marketing campaign sells programs, sells careers, seldom learning that is connected with real teachers. This method of marketing is one of the ways that college teachers’ work becomes appropriated and objectified. The privileging of curricula for programs and for careers suppresses curricula oriented to the unique aspects of the subject, discipline, faculty member, and individual student. The privileging of vocational education also suppresses curricula oriented to the local community, social justice, and the well-being of the earth. Part of this suppression is constructed through the privileging of vocational courses over general education and generic courses. The privileging of college education for careers hooks college employees’ work into activities that support market economics while obscuring the economies that Shiva (2005) indicates are more critical: nature’s economy and the sustenance economy (p. 14). Here is how Shiva explains these economies:

While the exchange of goods and services has always been a characteristic of human societies, the elevation of the market to the highest organizing principle of society has lead to the neglect of the other two vital economies. When exclusive attention is given to the growth of the market, living processes become invisible externalities. The requirements of nature, not backed up by suitable purchasing power, cannot be registered or fulfilled by the market economy. Not only does this focus on the market hide the existence of nature’s economy and the sustenance economy, it hides the harm that market growth causes. (pp. 14-15)

Treating college teachers’ work as commodities is one of those harms.

**Enrolment growth concept has disconnect.** The pronouncements that college administrators make about enrolment growth and its connection with the colleges’ funding system orient most college work efforts. The funding system for the colleges
is calculated to ensure equity among the institutions but also produce adequate planning at various levels in the system. The mechanism, in reality an allocation formula applied to the total provincial grant for colleges, takes into consideration several institutional factors but puts particular premium on program and enrolment growth. The formula, as a result, places individual institutions in the position of promoting their own growth in relation to the system if they are to retain their share of provincial grants. (Dennison, 1986, pp. 97-98)

Although this formula made some sense for the early years of the college system when the colleges were growing due to natural demands, now that the system has matured, a different funding mechanism would be more appropriate to prevent forced growth and unhealthy competition amongst colleges. The Ontario college funding system mimics the market economic system within which the province and the nation are nested.

Ironically, forced growth is not a practice that aligns well with education. As Dennison (1986) indicates, if colleges are to respond to the individual learning needs of students, then becoming big will not work and economies-of-scale arguments do not apply. This is because production and return on capital are arguably not the objectives of colleges, nor can they be when the development of individuals is what they are about (p. 152). Meagan (1995) writes about a contrast to the previous orientation to college education:

Similar to the twenty-five provincial institutions in Ontario, Seneca College is perceived by faculty to be managed along the lines of an industrial, military model with administrators being preoccupied with pecuniary efficiency and maximizing student enrolment (Skolnik, 1985:7). This author of a report on the province’s community colleges suggests that faculty view administrators as having an “excessive preoccupation with efficiency, almost to the exclusion of any other social or educational values” (Skolnik, 1985:9). (Meagan, 1995, p. 14)

Wolf (2002) notes that politicians frequently say that more postsecondary education stimulates economic growth; in contrast, the World Bank finds no relevant connection between education levels and economic growth (p. 39). Wolf also states that
there is no evidence that education spills over to raise productivity in a general, economy-wide way. . . . [and] it is all too easy for developed as well as developing countries to sacrifice quality to quantity – a process more likely to reduce growth than encourage it. (p. 54)

Despite the cautions that Dennison (1986) and Wolf (2002) make, my college had enrolment growth as a strategic priority in its 2005-2010 Strategic Plan and continues to highlight enrolment growth as a goal in the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan. College strategic plans for enrolment growth are encouraged by texts from the Ontario government that act as D. E. Smith’s (2005) higher order regulatory frames (p. 227). For instance, an Ontario Budget (Ontario Ministry of Finance, 2005) for postsecondary education states that a historic multi-year investment is being put into postsecondary education:

The province expects that this investment will yield the largest improvements in 40 years. It is an essential investment – one that will translate into a competitive advantage, economic growth, and a higher standard of living for Ontario. The brains and know-how of a skilled workforce are the competitive edge of the 21st century. Ontario requires a postsecondary education and training system that is among the best in the world. (p. 11)

This budget focuses on the purpose of postsecondary education being about competition, having a “best in the world” kind of educational system that produces “economic growth” and a “higher standard of living for Ontario.” While these concepts support market economics, they also support an “us and other” worldview, rather then a cooperative one. Having postsecondary education oriented to building a workforce so that Ontario can have a competitive advantage amongst other provinces and/or countries perpetuates an elite versus others worldview. No part of this budget is about education for peace and cooperation amongst provinces and countries. No part of this postsecondary budget is about education that promotes care for the environment. The market economic system that Ontario budgets are nested within frame what is included and excluded in its priorities.
Market economic discourse frames college employees’ work. Being in the lecture theatre to listen to the enrolment growth and marketing discourse becomes part of the work of being a college faculty and support staff. These discourses frame the priorities of the work that all college employees do whether or not college employees endorse market economic values. These discourses frame the college employees’ work in the sense that D. E. Smith (2005) writes about: “Frames have shape but are empty; what fills them must conform to their shape” (p. 201).

Students get hooked into market economic system. Students are drawn into the ruling relations of a market economic oriented college system once they apply to a college program and get an application number. Their applications set in motion the mostly vocational programs and the competitive market economic worldview orientation of Ontario’s college courses and college activities.

College Ideology Imitates OECD Ideology

The competitive market economic college funding activities imitate the mission and founding documents of some of the transnational organizations that shape college work. For example, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has a mission and convention articles that country members are obligated to mimic. Although the OECD has no legislative authority over member countries, it uses policy committees to conduct peer reviews, an activity that Wolfe (2008) identifies as surveillance, which involves “sharing and evaluating information, [a process that results in] developing a common understanding of how the world works” (p. 29). “The OECD contribution lies in influencing policy by identifying norms and principles for negotiations that take place in the many other international organizations that use its ideas, especially the G8 and the WTO” (p. 41). The OECD’s mission and its convention contain articles and texts that act, as D. E. Smith (2005) tells us, as higher
order regulatory frames (p. 227). These frames organize how those who work for the OECD should view the world and produce work for it. Additionally, these OECD texts set up text-reader conversations and interlocking hierarchies of texts as described by D. E. Smith amongst the OECD and lower order national, provincial, and college organizations.

The 2013 version of the OECD mission, as it appears in the “About the OECD” section of the OECD website, begins with this sentence: “The mission of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is to promote policies that will improve the economic and social well-being of people around the world.” This sentence implies that the OECD aims to work on social justice issues, but the problem is that the entire mission ignores the connection between the well-being of the environment and the “well-being of people around the world.” A portion of the last paragraph of the OECD mission clarifies some of the priorities of the OECD:

As the OECD turns 50, we are focusing on helping governments in our member countries and elsewhere . . . :

• First and foremost, governments need to restore confidence in markets and the institutions and companies that make them function. That will require improved regulation and more effective governance at all levels of political and business life.
• Secondly, governments must re-establish healthy public finances as a basis for future sustainable economic growth

I read the OECD’s first priority to mean that the OECD is concerned with restoring markets, not addressing climate, environmental, or social justice issues. I read the second priority to mean “healthy public finances” are not so much for a healthy society or environment but for “sustainable economic growth.” According to many economists and scholars (Jackson, T., 2011; Lovelace, 2013; Shiva, 2005), privileging economic growth is preventing us from improving our environmental and social justice problems.

The founding convention and articles of the OECD can be found by going to the History section of the About the OECD section of the OECD website. Article 1.(a) states that the aim of
the OECD is “to achieve the highest sustainable economic growth and employment and a rising standard of living for its Member countries, while maintaining financial stability, and thus to contribute to the development of the world economy.” This article states that the OECD members are concerned with developing non-member countries’ economies, but only under conditions that allow OECD member countries to obtain the higher living standards. In this way, the mission and opening article of the OECD Convention create a regulatory frame that supports the further development of worldwide inequity and sets up a dualistic “us” and “other” relationship with member and non-member countries. As well, the eclipsing of the greater importance of social and environmental systems to a market economic growth system means that market economic systems are privileged and social and environmental ones are automatically suppressed. Article 2.(b) indicates that members will “in the scientific and technological field, promote the development of their resources, encourage research and promote vocational training.” This article indicates that the OECD has no interest in education in the broad sense of overseeing a balance of social, environmental, and economic common good. Rather this article acts as another regulatory frame from which interest in education can be only connected to paid work. All of Article 3, particularly (c), stating “co-operate closely and where appropriate take co-ordinated action,” provide instructions for the means by which members become committed to the concerting of activities that organize educational work that becomes an element of the market economic growth model.

Unlike the life work of scholars concerned that the future of the environment and its species is being harmed by market economic growth (Jackson, T., 2011; Lovelace, 2013; Nickerson, 2009; Shiva, 2005), the articles of the OECD place no priority on caring for the environment and its species, something necessary for a safe future for both. When the OECD articles eclipse priority care for the environment and for all humans and species, space opens for
the privileging of members’ technological advancements and member countries’ economic growth. This orientation enables an elite group to amass a greater and greater percentage of world wealth. This orientation perpetuates “patriarchal capitalism” (Vaughan, 2009, p. 47), the means by which the male elite maintain their interests.

The OECD is not setting up these social relations in a vacuum. D. E. Smith and G. W. Smith (1990) explain that the waning influence of Keynesian economics with its national orientation gave way to the internationalization of capital and an internationalization of labour. “National economies became subordinated to the play of international financial forces and nation states competed with one another to secure capital investment” (p. 185).

**Conclusion**

I have argued here that Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, through their marketing, funding, growth strategy, connections with business and industry, and general operations, are hooked into activities mimicking the social relations described in the OECD’s mission and articles. Marx and Engels (1844/1976) recognized this mimicking pattern of social relations amongst the internal labor relations of a nation to its external relations with other countries:

> Through the division of labour inside various branches there develops various divisions among the individuals co-operating in definite kinds of labour. The relative position of these individual groups is determined by the methods employed in agriculture, industry, and commerce (patriarchalism, slavery, estates, classes). These same conditions are to be seen (given a more developed intercourse) in the relations of different nations to one another. (p. 43)

The market economic ideological social relations set up in the texts of the OECD reflect the orchestration of market domination of us through the social relations within and amongst nations,
provinces, and colleges; within Ontario’s higher education budget; within the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology strategic plans; and within the labour of college students and employees.

In this chapter, I have expanded on D. E. Smith’s, and Turner’s institutional ethnographic research to reveal how several texts, extra local to college teachers’ work, frame their everyday experiences. I have argued that Ontario’s community college teachers’ work, particularly their course outline work, nests within a market economic ideological setting held together by texts concerned with economic growth. I have presented a specific contemporary example connected to higher education that illustrates the division of labour that Marx and Engels (1844/1976) describe in the previous quote. While I have identified generally how market economic texts influence college teachers’ work, more work needs to be done to untangle the frame and its effects in order to inform and free college teachers to teach in a way that responds to the needs and interests of students, teachers, society, and the environment.

The next chapter will describe how a market economic version of college courses gets organized to support standardized course outline work.
Chapter 6

THE TEXTS AND PRODUCTION PROCESSES THAT BRING CLASSES AND COURSES TO COLLEGE TEACHERS

The students who attend my informants’ program do not work through a regular college application process to enrol. Despite that, when their program’s curriculum becomes enclosed by the course outline, the once de-centralized teaching and learning of this program will be subject to the kind of college infrastructural controls described in this chapter. Once the teachers in my informants’ program produce course outlines for their program, they can be drawn (before the classes begin) into the sequences of work, talk, and texts that are extra local to the actual teaching and learning of the program. They can also be drawn into the work processes that maintain the production of standardized classes, course organization, and course outlines.

In this chapter, I use Fleming College and the communications courses that I taught there, and am most familiar with, as examples to describe and analyze the elements that make up the production processes of bringing course work dictates to college teachers. At Fleming College, during a typical winter semester, while college teachers teach the students enrolled in various programs and courses, several streams of sequenced activities are going on within the college that influence the nature of the curriculum constraints that teachers will face the following fall semester. In this chapter, I map (see Figures 6.1-6.3), describe, and analyze how various interlocking texts, which include the enrolment prediction documents, the calendar, the Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities Program and Certificate Standards, Fleming College Strategic Plan 2005-2010 (see Appendix B), The Academic Employees Collective
Agreement (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005), and Fleming College’s Workload Preference Listing spreadsheet, shape the organization of courses and the course outlines that guide teachers’ and students’ work. My informants’ teaching/learning work might be drawn into such an operational infrastructural web once they commit their curriculum work to the online course outline.

The Calendar

This section maps (see Figure 6.1), describes, and analyzes how the production of the college calendar can contribute to the fragmentation of college curricula.
Data

Several months before the fall semester, the marketing director oversees the creation and production of the calendar that provides the details regarding each program the college offers, the courses required to graduate from each program, and which semesters the programs are proposed to be offered. Program and subject faculty coordinators edit and supply information regarding descriptions of courses and programs that go into the calendar. Faculty use the information from the calendar to fill in slots in new online course outlines so that details such as course title, number, and description match. The calendar also provides other information regarding each course offered within the program, such as the number of hours a week the course is offered and how the course is offered (for example, face-to-face, hybrid, online). It also offers academic regulations regarding things like plagiarism, information that some academic departments put into their course outlines in the course policies section. Realistically, the number of hours, and how the course is proposed to be offered, may change between the time the calendar is released and the time the course is actually offered. According to the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005), Article 6.01, management has the authority to make adjustments to how and if a particular course or entire program is offered.

Analysis

The college’s calendar helps objectify the work that faculty do. Months ahead of when students and teachers are connected in real time (and perhaps place), program coordinators are writing up and editing calendar marketing information about their programs. The format of the calendar, with each program having a standardized number of standardized courses, creates a text-reader context that deans and faculty reproduce without knowing if the course arrangements
will suit the needs and interests of the students who will be in the program at the beginning of the semester.

**Student College Applications Activate College Enrolment Prediction Text**

This section maps (see Figure 6.2), describes, and analyzes how student applications activate a college enrolment prediction text.

---

**Data**

Student college applications are processed at the interchange of the Ontario College Applications Services. Several months before the fall semester starts, and using the Ontario Application Services data, the records and admissions staff members create an email attachment document of program enrolment predictions grouped by school. This document is sent to deans, operations support staff, and program coordinators.
Analysis

An enrolment prediction document is sent to a number of college employees several times over the course of each semester. This is done to enable college employees to understand the extent to which full-time students are committing to college programs and the extent to which the college is meeting its overall enrolment targets. When I was a coordinator of the General Arts and Science program, I became complicit in objectifying students as I looked at their enrolment but saw only the extent to which my program was achieving its projected enrolment target.

Enrolment Prediction Text Activates Workload Preference Listing

This section maps (see Figure 6.3), describes, and analyzes how the enrolment prediction text activates the Workload Preference Listing.
Operations support staff use course regulations that college managers provide: program enrolment prediction data, previous fall semester program enrolment numbers, and calendar course information to create a text called Workload Preference Listing, a spreadsheet that is organized by school. In the Workload Preference Listing, each course, whether it has two sections or 40 sections, will be described operationally in the same way. For example, all first semester business communications course sections will have one large face-to-face lecture, one smaller computer lab class, and one smaller seminar class. All Community Development and Health second semester communications courses will have one online lecture, one computer lab class, and one seminar class. Variation in face-to-face course delivery within schools is not considered even though some faculty may prefer an alternative arrangement of class hours. Having courses described operationally the same way streamlines the work of managers, operations support staff, and timetablers. College managers gained authority over what and how college teachers teach in a 1994 Arbitration award (Meagan, 1995, p. 14). The authority that college managers have allows Fleming College managers to offer almost all first semester communications courses with a mass lecture hour amongst the three course hours offered even though faculty have stated for years that the mass lecture is an inappropriate course delivery method for both college students and the course subject matter. The authority of college managers also allows Fleming managers to maintain a high average class size. In 2006/2007, Fleming’s class size averaged 38.2 while the system average was 29 and while both managers and faculty agreed that an optimum class size was 20 (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009, pp. 9, 17-18).

The *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) has a higher order regulatory (Smith, D. E., 2005, p.187) role amongst the other texts that influence the shape of college teaching and learning, specifically teachers’ course
outline work. It specifies who has the authority to do what with regard to course arrangements. Article 6.01 indicates that college managers have the final say regarding course arrangements:

**Management Functions**

It is the exclusive function of the Colleges to:

(i) maintain order discipline, and efficiency;

(ii) hire, discharge, transfer, classify, assign, appoint, promote, demote, lay off, recall and suspend or otherwise discipline employees subject to the right to lodge a grievance in the manner and extent provided in this agreement;

(iii) manage the College and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, the right to plan, direct, and control operations, facilities, programs, courses, systems and procedures, direct its personnel, determine complement, organization, methods and number, location and classification of personnel required from time to time, the number and location of campuses and facilities, services to be performed, the scheduling of assignments and work, the extension, limitation, curtailment, or cessation of operations and all other rights and responsibilities not specifically modified elsewhere in this Agreement.

According to the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005), Article 11.02 A 1 (a), managers are to discuss with faculty the details of the course arrangements that faculty will teach. Managers are also influenced by texts produced by program advisory meetings, curricula regulations that come from the Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities, and texts regarding curricula that come from the Fleming College Centre for Learning and Teaching curricula and course designers. All three of these groups and the texts that they produce influence the course arrangement decisions that college managers make that determine the course regulations that are written into the Workload Preference Listing spreadsheet that operations support staff produce.
Chapter Analysis

Several groups, some unknown to each other, work to contribute to regulatory texts that circumscribe what can and can not go into the course arrangement texts and course outlines from which faculty of the fall semester will work.

Curriculum Standardization

The standardization of courses and the content of the courses that make up the programs listed in the calendar are shaped by College Diploma and Certificate Program Standards texts from the Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (2010). On the Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities website an overview of these standards is presented. This excerpt captures the direction of that text about program standards:

Employers, industry, and professional associations, and program graduates currently working in the field are all involved in the development and review process [of program standards], as are representatives of the colleges themselves. This way, students can be assured that the programs are relevant to the needs of employers and that the skills they acquire during their program will be appropriate. (para. 3)

Within this web text there is a clear emphasis on constructing curricula that is in the interests of employers and that is concerned with meeting standard goals. This emphasis suppresses teachers’ opportunity to offer curriculum that responds to the diverse interests and abilities of their actual students and/or an understanding of the interests of the environment that is not dominated by market economic interests.

The concept of program standardization privileges a market-based monoculture of the mind as Shiva (1993) writes: “Monocultures of the mind make diversity disappear from perception, and consequently from the world” (p. 5). The processes that Shiva writes about relate to agriculture and forestry, but apply as well to education. She notes that eliminating diversity and alternatives, and the space and conditions needed for them to appear, allowed for the
introduction of monocultures; that monocultures are connected to more centralized control and less decentralized decision-making; that “uniformity and centralization [make] for social and ecological vulnerability and breakdown; [and] that uniformity and diversity are not just patterns of land use, they are ways of thinking and ways of living” (p. 6). To Shiva diversity is important. It “is an alternative to monoculture, homogeneity, and uniformity” (p. 7). Monocultures expand because they have to do with politics, power, and control (p. 7). Alternatively, “only a system based on diversity respects the rights of all species and is sustainable” (p. 8).

Shiva (1993) points out that local and diverse knowledge systems connected to forestry and agriculture are based on the life-supporting capacities of forestry and agriculture while the scientific management of forestry and agriculture is concerned only with their industrial and commercial use (pp. 14-17). She also notes that the dominant knowledge system is intimately connected with modern science, the market connections that see diversity as valueless, and the preferred monoculture version of a tree or grain as the one to be valued due to its “productivity” and “high yield.” Alternatives that are not useful from a market perspective are annihilated (p. 27).

These concepts connected with monocultures of the mind and the processes enacted that Shiva (1993) writes about can be found in the privileging of course standardization and in the creation and maintenance of the work, talk, and texts that allow monoculture course work to continue.

**Strategic Growth Plan**

Students who have picked a Fleming program become objectified as numbers in college program enrolment predictions. At this interchange (the point where actual students’ applications are converted to enrolment predictions) the online decision that students make in choosing a
particular program gets calculated and becomes an element in the marketing growth plan of the college. Fleming College Strategic Plan 2005-2010 listed “Growing with Positive Results” as its fourth priority, with a specific goal of 2 to 3 percent each year (p. 9). The 2010-2015 Strategic Plan embeds these students’ decisions further into the college growth plan in that it describes “an integrated growth plan that addresses the entire enrolment cycle, from marketing and admissions to retention and support” (Strategic Priority 4.2). It is at this point that the students become objectified and institutionally valued more as pieces in a part of the marketing and enrolment retention plan than as unique individuals. The early image of college “students” referred to in the first part of Dennison’s (1986) book fades. Two identities emerge: the potential college applicant is seen first as a customer and consumer to be solicited and then once enrolled as a learner to be retained.

**Efficient Course Organization**

If the deans have very little background experience or education in adult education, it becomes easy for them to privilege accounting “efficiency” over effective teaching and learning conditions as they make decisions regarding course arrangements. It becomes easy for college managers to live the management style, which Meagan (1995) describes “as both a theoretical and practical technology of rationality [that] is geared to pragmatism, efficiency and control. The world is viewed as chaotic and in need of order; social life in this closed system is presented as that which must be ordered and controlled” (p. 18).

The wording of the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) places the work that managers and college professors do in conflict with each other. According to the Class Definition of “Professors,” they are to develop “an effective learning environment for students” (p. 147). Article 6.01 says that managers are to
“maintain order, discipline and efficiency” (p. 5). Nowhere in the description of management functions does it say that managers are to develop an effective teaching environment for professors, which would be a logical connection to the college professors’ job description.

Little has changed with respect to the relationship between postsecondary professors and those who manage them since Veblen (1918/1957) wrote *Higher Learning in America*, except that control over teachers’ work continues to tighten. Then higher education executives did not have *their* work standardized; did not have a code of ethics beyond enforcing the blacklist; and arranged for their institution to always grow, for faculty’s work to be centrally controlled and standardized, and for faculty to be disciplined if they did not “conform to the resulting schedule of uniformity and mediocrity” (p. 204). He also noticed that it was American’s popular interest in business principles that shaped the interest within postsecondary institutions with “academic accountancy, and combines with it to further a so-called ‘practical’ bias in all the work of the schools” (p. 165).

The wording of the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) acts as a ruling text giving college managers the authority through the “order, discipline, and efficiency” discourse to develop an post-industrial market orientation to their conflicted relationship with faculty through a Foucaultian (1977) *Discipline and Punish* technology style of power.8 A concern with “discipline” allows managers to view “individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise” (p. 170). As well, college managers are placed in the position of being guards in the college curricular panopticon. While they are being written, the course outlines that faculty construct can be viewed at any time by

---

8 Here I am not using Foucault’s ontology. I am referring to the particular practice of surveillance explicated by him (and elaborated in Chapter 8), which fits well with a materialist ontology.
managers and coordinators. Faculty can be imprisoned in the course outline standardization by the ruling relation authority of the Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities’ regulating texts on College Diploma and Certificate Standards and the Academic Employees Collective Agreement.

The “efficiency” discourse involves a Monocultures of the Mind (Shiva, 1993) style of power. People can become dispensable.

The diversity must be weeded out, and the uniform monocultures – of plants and people – must now be externally managed because they are no longer self-regulated and self-governed. Those that do not fit into the uniformity must be declared unfit. Symbiosis must give way to competition, domination, and dispensability. There is no survival possible for the forest or its people when they become feedstock for industry. The survival of the tropical forests depends on the survival of human societies modeled on the principles of the forest. These lessons for survival do not come from text of ‘scientific forestry’. They lie hidden in the lives and beliefs of the forest peoples of the world. (p. 19)

Shiva (1993) explains that ‘scientific management’ sees the spontaneous diversity in the natural world as abnormal and creates the conditions that permit man-made order and uniformity to achieve industrial and commercial goals. “Nature’s wealth characterized by diversity is destroyed to create commercial wealth characterized by uniformity” (p. 23). Likewise, college employees have become caught up in the scientific management organization of college education.

**Contradictions Within the Production Model of Education**

The work habits of creating courses organized operationally all the same way connects with values in the Fleming College’s Strategic Plan 2005-2010 more than it does with earth democratic ones. The strategic plan provides the language to create the conditions that are favourable to the characteristics of market economics. Its fourth value goes as follows:
Waste nothing – not time, talent, or resources

In both long-term planning and daily actions, Fleming employees seek to reduce waste. Through these actions, we focus our time, talents, and resources on student success and on living by our values. [bold in the original] (p. 3)

This value, once expressed as a text within the strategic plan, permits the activation of work to reduce diversity and small classes within course offerings. Space has been created, through this “reduce waste” discourse, that permits uniformity to dominate, even though another value within the strategic plan refers to diversity. Here is the second value:

Value people and community

We support and develop faculty, staff, and administrative leaders as employees and as individuals. We focus on creating a healthy, open and diverse college community for our students and employees. We value our communities and work with partners to contribute to community success. [bold in the original] (p. 3)

The diversity concept in the strategic plan (Fleming College Strategic Plan 2005-2010) allows for diversity in student and employee recruitment and, therefore, hooks into the strategic goal of enrolment growth. The “waste nothing” concept allows for the construction of monoculture curricula and course organization that aids the market economic focus of the industrialization of college education.

Baran and Sweezy (2012) have indicated that monopoly capitalism supports conditions where human activity concerned with reducing “waste” has the opposite effect:

It is only under monopoly capitalism, however, that the connection between wants and needs is fatally severed; that the satisfaction of wants tends to bear a diminishing relationship to the requirements of human welfare; that with a large and growing share of total human effort directed toward waste and destruction, bourgeois rationality turns its opposite and becomes the organizational principle of regression. (p. 42)
Many scholars emphasize the inappropriateness of standardized production models being used to organize any kind of educational endeavor and suggest alternative approaches. For instance, Franklin (1990) stresses that holistic technologies work best with a growth model conception of scale, while prescription technologies align with production models. People working with the growth model recognize this:

Size is a natural result of growth, but growth itself cannot be commandeered; it can only be nurtured and encouraged by providing a suitable environment. Growth occurs; it is not made. Within the growth model, all that human intervention can do is to discover the best conditions for growth and then try to meet them. In any given environment, the growing organism develops at its own rate. . . . If there ever was a growth process, if ever there was a holistic process, a process that can not be divided into rigid predetermined steps, it is education. (pp. 27-29)

Swenarchuk (2006) indicates that these two approaches have often been debated with respect to education. The growth model is an approach that works with assumptions from agriculture and uses holistic technologies. It views students as unique seeds needing unique attention with regard to their maturation. The other approach sees education as a production process needing prescriptive technologies and schools producing “marketable outputs” in service of business. This approach favours “quality control, testing, evaluation, and market research” (p. 31). Swenarchuk opposes the second model because its business orientation places more emphasis on generating products than ensuring that the process is not harmful to the people involved and because the production model favours economic and efficiency values over all others (p. 31).

Dennison (1986), writing specifically about Canada’s community colleges, emphasizes that we now have sufficient experience with large educational institutions and systems to suggest that economies of scale are often offset by less obvious but no less real costs of administration, control, and co-ordination. . . . Colleges are labour-intensive institutions. . . . The principles of mass production [do not] apply to the provision of a variety of services to a diversity of learners. (p. 152)
Conclusion

I am arguing here that despite the research that indicates that education works best when it follows a growth model and uses holistic technologies, production models and prescriptive technologies are being increasingly used to organize college courses and course outlines. These forms of technology foster a consciousness of compliance, allowing the dominance of neoliberal global market economic values and at the same time the suppression of diversity-based earth democratic values. Teachers do notice the difference between the two ways of supervising curriculum and work. As one of my informants put it: “And you didn’t get any feedback at that time. And it’s . . . really gone now from one end to the other because we didn’t get any feedback, and now we’re being micro-managed.”

Once my informants succumb to all the course outline production processes that hook them into having their program’s classes and courses organized by the dominant college production process, they will no longer be in control of the arrangement of their classes and their curriculum. Other people and texts will control these aspects of their working lives. Their everyday world will be affected by a major shift in how they can work. Once they provided a service; now they will become an element in their college’s class/course production and marketing process. Their students would then become more consumers of courses and learners to be retained than students. Marx (1939/1973) wrote about the impact that a production process has on all those involved with it:

Hunger is hunger, but the hunger gratified by cooked meat eaten with a knife and fork is a different hunger from that which bolts down raw meat with the aid of a hand, nail, and tooth. Production thus produces not only the object but also the manner of consumption, not only objectively but also subjectively. Production thus creates the consumer. . . . Production not only supplies a material for the need, but it also supplies a need for the material. As soon as consumption emerges from its initial state of natural crudity and immediacy – and if it remained at that stage, this would be because production itself had been arrested there – it becomes itself mediated as a drive by the object. The need which consumption feels for the object is created by the perception of it. The object of art – like
every other product – creates a public which is sensitive to art and enjoys beauty. Production thus not only creates an object for the subject, but also a subject for the object. Thus production produces consumption (1) by creating the material for it; (2) by determining the manner of consumption; and (3) by creating the products, initially posited by it as objects, in the form of a need felt by the consumer. It thus produces the object of consumption, the manner of consumption and the motive of consumption. Consumption likewise produces the producer’s inclination by beckoning to him [sic] as an aim-determining need. (p. 92)

This quote connects with my informants as their service of teaching becomes objectified in the form of fragmented courses. As their work becomes transformed to fit into the calendar/class/course institutional production process, how they can teach and how their students can learn becomes transformed. This is how the transformations in college business accounting practices that McCoy (1999) identifies can affect college teachers’ work. This is how the reform of the public sector to imitate the market features of the private sector that Magnusson (2005, p. 126) writes about can transform the everyday teaching lives of particular college teachers.

This chapter has mapped out, described, and analyzed the network of texts and actors that organize the way teaching work is presented to college teachers. The next section looks at the work of teachers choosing courses and resources to teach and the texts and actors that constrain their choices.
Chapter 7

THE TEXTS THAT PREPARE COLLEGE TEACHERS TO PARTICIPATE IN THEIR OWN RULING

In Chapter 4 I identified, described, and analyzed how a typical college course outline rules and standardizes college teachers’ work. In Chapter 5, I presented and analyzed the ideological setting within which college employees’ work resides. The ideological setting shapes the nature of the textual orchestration of the production process that forms the details of the college operational infrastructure work regarding class and course formations that Chapter 6 describes and analyzes. I argued that how program curricula and classes are organized by those who are not teachers influences the decisions that faculty can and can not make regarding curricula generally and course outlines specifically. In this chapter, I will highlight the production processes in which my informants could become complicit once they produce course outlines for their program. In this chapter, I will use five figures to map (see Figures 7.1-7.5), describe, and analyze the work sequences, actors, texts, and talk that faculty are involved with in advance of any actual course outline, curriculum, and/or teaching and learning work. These figures will highlight the influence of five texts involved with moving course outline work along in time: the Workload Preference Listing, the faculty Course Picks List, the Standard Workload Form, the textbook order form, and the faculty timetable.

This chapter provides vivid examples of how institutional texts shape college teachers’ work. As D. E. Smith (2005) tells us,

Institutions exist in that strange magical realm in which social relations based on texts transform the local particularities of people, place, and time into standardized, generalized,
and, especially, translocal forms of coordinating people’s activities. Texts perform at that key juncture between the local settings of people’s everyday worlds and the ruling relations. They come before us as something to read, watch, or listen to. (p. 101)

The Workload Preference Listing Activates Faculty Course Choices

This section maps (see Figure 7.1), describes, and analyzes how the completion of the Workload Preference Listing activates faculty work of choosing courses to teach in the winter 2007 semester.

Data

Course choice work can be divided into two sections:

1. The operations support staff create a Workload Preference Listing document for his or her school. An operations support staff member sends the form by email
attachment to all full-time faculty members in the school. In the email, the operations support staff members instruct full-time faculty to indicate their first, second, and third choices regarding the courses they wish to teach in the upcoming semester.

2. Faculty fill out and return the full-time faculty Workload Preference Listing text to operations support staff.

Analysis

The social relations of course organization. Because faculty Workload Preference Listing texts are created from programs that have been marketed through program brochures and calendar information that specify specific courses and course hours, faculty are not necessarily able to teach courses that align with their area of expertise or interest. Certainly, they are not able to teach courses organized the way they would prefer to teach. The work that college teachers can and can not do is connected to the power invested in the Academic Employees Collective Agreement (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005), Article 6.01 that permits deans to organize programs, courses, and classes into the forms they choose and present in the regulating texts of the calendar and the Workload Preference Listing. Faculty members act as the agents of this text when they fill it in.

How courses are organized affects the social relations amongst full-time, part-time, and partial-load faculty. For instance, when I first started teaching at Fleming College, communications courses (courses common to all programs) were three distinct seminar hours each week. Each teacher of each course was in charge of writing the course outline and teaching the students within the course. In this way, full-time, part-time, and partial-load faculty exercised relatively equal faculty autonomy over each course of the same name that they taught. These rather equitable
teaching conditions\textsuperscript{9} were eclipsed with the advent of the business accounting efficiencies influence on the organization of college work, as McCoy (1999) indicates. When I finished teaching at the college, most communications course sections were organized around large lectures with a one-hour computer lab and a one-hour seminar. Teachers taking on the seminar and lab sections of the course were expected to follow like a docent the prescription of the standardized course outline whether they were new to college teaching or very experienced teaching the course material and students. This large lecture with smaller lab and seminar sections meant that faculty members teaching only these parts of the course were put in a subservient position to the lecturer of the course and had their teaching expertise suppressed. These changes in how communications courses and classes were organized demonstrate how imposing business efficiencies on college work can delete equitable teaching relations amongst college teachers.

For faculty associated with loosely structured programs, as my informants are, having their program described within the calendar in the universal, dominant, yet fragmented way that other programs are described becomes a means by which their own and any other alternative way of organizing curriculum becomes eclipsed. Alternatively, a faculty union and government identification of and commitment to optimum or at least adequate per-student funding of college education would prevent the erosion of reasonable teaching/learning conditions, an erosion that allows for the construction of hierarchical teaching/learning conditions.

The glossing over of the \textit{Academic Employees Collective Agreement}. The work that operations support staff do with the Workload Preference Listing and the Faculty Course Picks List stands in the place of Article 11.02 A 1 (a) in the \textit{Academic Employees Collective Agreement}

\textsuperscript{9} There was and still is a great difference in pay and benefits amongst full-time, part-time, and partial-load faculty.
(Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) that says, “Prior to the establishment of a total workload for any teacher the supervisor shall discuss the proposed workload with the teacher and complete the SWF” (p. 18). Over the years, especially the last few years, I found that supervisors initiated precious little discussion with me regarding my upcoming workload. My workload was constructed through the back and forth of the Workload Preference Listing and the Course Picks List construction that followed it. The work that operations support staff and faculty operations staff did with the Workload Preference Listing and the Course Picks List stands in the deleted space of the work that the manager should have done if he or she had followed the regulations in the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement*. At Fleming College, few faculty or management were in the habit of activating the regulation of this article. The content of the Workload Preference Listing and the Course Picks List texts are influenced by the texts that regulate them: the enrolment prediction document and the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement*. If faculty could reclaim their union contract authorized discussion of their workload with their supervisor, they would instigate some advantageous activities: the supervisor would be less likely to see faculty as robots teaching monocultural courses; faculty would be activating the work that the contract sets out for managers to do just as managers ensure that faculty work by all the details of the faculty side of the contract; and there might be fewer course arrangements that promote market economic efficiencies over teacher and student interests. For my informants, this managerial organization of courses and programs means that their decentralized way of organizing classes and curriculum can be eliminated, that their empowered way of teaching can be suppressed, and that a teacher disempowering method of curriculum organization can be privileged.

The next section looks at how faculty disputes over courses are resolved.
Completed Faculty Course Picks List Activates the Resolution of Faculty Course Choice Disputes

The next few paragraphs and map (see Figure 7.2) show how the completed Workload Preference Listing, which becomes the Course Picks List, activates the meeting and follow up activities that aim to resolve faculty disputes over what faculty are allowed to choose to teach.

Figure 7.2. Completed Faculty Course Picks List Activates the Resolution of Faculty Course Choice Disputes

Operations Support Staff (OSS) and Faculty Operations Coordinator (FOC) review faculty course choices highlighting situations where more faculty want to teach a particular course than there are course repetitions, sections, and/or student numbers. They create a filled in by first choice department faculty Course Picks List, a draft Course Picks List.

Faculty read draft.

FOC meet with department faculty to “resolve” the duplicate pick problem.

Various techniques are used to “resolve” this problem.

Dean can decide who teaches what.

Academic Employees Collective Agreement

Draft FT Faculty Course Picks List
Data

Two main activities are involved at this stage of course assignment. First, the operations support staff and faculty operations coordinator review faculty picks noting situations where more faculty want to teach a particular course than there are course repetitions, sections, and/or student numbers. They draft a semi-completed faculty Course Picks List for each department. The draft of a full-time faculty Course Picks List is sent to faculty by email attachment, rather than being negotiated in person. Second, the faculty operations coordinator sets meeting times and meets face-to-face with faculty department groups to address any problems such as three faculty wanting to teach the same course that is only offered once. In the meeting, faculty mull over the overlaps on the draft of the Course Picks List. Various solutions are devised. Over the next few weeks, some faculty change their course picks to accommodate other faculty choices. Other times coordinators and deans make suggestions. According to the Academic Employees Collective Agreement (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005), management can decree who teaches what no matter how the consultation conversations go, subject to the teachers’ right to refer the matter to the Workload Monitoring Group, described in Articles 11.02 A 1 (a) and 11.02 A 4.

Analysis

Course distribution method creates alienation. Having the courses available for faculty to teach oriented to the vocational programs and the numbers of students who enrol in them as well as the construction and implementation of such texts as Course Picks Lists being organized in a way that privileges efficiencies contributes to faculty’s alienation from their labour. Marx and Engels (1844/1976) suggest that when a person’s activity is involuntarily divided, his or her “own deed becomes an alien power opposed to him [sic], which enslaves him [sic] instead of being controlled by him [sic]” (p. 53). For instance, although a particular faculty
member may have done the original course development work for a course and taught it first, that particular faculty member has no guarantee of how many sections of that course she or he will be allowed to teach, or whether any at all, even if she or he wants to. The college owns the faculty members’ course work and managers can distribute it however they wish. In the Academic Employees Collective Agreement (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005), Articles 6.01 and 13.01\textsuperscript{10} are the texts that give managers this power. This document gives managers authority to colonize and/or appropriate faculty work.

**Course distribution method increases objectification.** Again much of the work done at this stage by the operations support staff and the faculty operations coordinator stands in place of the “consultation” that the manager is supposed to do with the faculty member according to The Academic Employees Collective Agreement (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005), Article 11.02 A 1 (a). This conversation that the manager doesn’t have with full-time faculty actually supports the objectification of faculty’s work as it is easier for managers to organize courses in a way that privileges “efficiency” over the needs inherent in human diversity when managers don’t have to regularly associate particular faculty members with particular courses. This way of dealing with the interchange between the production of the faculty Course Picks List and the production of Standard Workload Forms (SWFs) texts makes it easier for support staff and managers to objectify faculty and their work.

Once faculty course pick issues have been resolved, faculty SWFs can be activated.

\textsuperscript{10} Article 13.01 has to do with copyright and emphasizes that work that a college teacher produces in connection with her or his college employment is the property of the College.
Completed Course Picks List Activates the Production of SWFs

This section maps (see Figure 7.3), describes, and analyzes how the completion of the Course Picks List activates the production of the faculty SWFs. The SWF is the next text that regulates what faculty may or may not do with their course outline and consequently regulates how they teach any course assigned to them.

Figure 7.3. Completed Course Picks List Activates the Production of Standard Workload Forms (SWFs)

1. Operations Support Staff (OSS) in consultation with a faculty operations coordinator produces SWFs that are somewhat based on full-time faculty (FTF) course selections from Course Picks List document.

2. Individual FTF SWFs are produced.

3. Dean signs SWFs.

4. FTF decide if they agree or disagree with their SWFs.

5. They may or may not sign them.

- Work done by college employees.
- Texts physically present in the setting.
- Texts produced in multiples.

Time: winter/spring 2007
Data

There are five parts to this stage of the orchestration of faculty work:

1. Operations support staff in consultation with the faculty operations coordinator and with dean oversight produce faculty SWFs somewhat based on the choices faculty have made on the Course Picks List.

2. The SWF, according to the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005), Article 11, identifies what faculty will teach, how they will teach, and how their teaching time will be allotted. The faculty SWF contains information connected with a course indicating maximum class size, whether the course is mainly self-directed, online, hybrid, organized around a mass lecture, has a computer lab hour, and/or has a seminar hour. These details are taken from the Course Picks List. This list also contains details specifying the method of evaluation to be used in the course. These details are taken from the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* and previous evaluation factors used for the course. Article 11.01 E 1 specifies that more weekly time will be granted on a faculty member’s Standard Workload Forms for evaluation that is essay or project connected, less for routine or assisted evaluation and even less for in-process evaluation. (The concept of evaluation will be analyzed in a later chapter.)

3. The dean usually signs the SWF and then a support staff member puts the Form into faculty mailboxes. Article 11.02 A 1 (a) of the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) states that the Standard Workload Form is to be given to full-time faculty “not later than six weeks prior to the beginning of the period covered by the timetable.”
4. According to the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005), Article 11.02 A 4, faculty who are “not in agreement with the total workload and [wish] it to be reviewed by WMG [College Workload Monitoring Group], . . . must so indicate in writing to the supervisor within three working days from the receipt of the SWF.” If they don’t, management can assume that the faculty member is in agreement.

5. Faculty may or may not sign the SWF and return it to the operations support staff. Many faculty members do sign and return it. How many I don’t know. I do know that some do not.

**Analysis**

Here are the aspects of ruling relations inherent in this stage of faculty work distribution:

1. To reiterate, the work done by operations support staff on SWFs stands in place of Article 11.02 A 1 (a) that states that supervisors “shall discuss the proposed workload with the teacher.”

2. The SWF is a regulating text, set within a regulating text, in the recursive sense that G. W. Smith (2006, pp. 54, 70) describes. The SWF regulates faculty work. The details that go into the SWF gain their authority from being a part of the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005), which according to Article 6.01,

   gives managers authority to manage the College and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, the right to plan, direct, and control operations, facilities, programs, courses, systems and procedures, direct its personnel, determine complement, organization, methods and number, location and classification of personnel required from time to time, . . . the scheduling of assignments and work, the extension, limitation, curtailment, or cessation of
operations and all other rights and responsibilities not specifically modified elsewhere in this Agreement. (p. 5)

The SWF with all its schematic parts frames how managers think about faculty work, courses, and classes. The SWF becomes a model for faculty work, course and class arrangements that managers want all college teachers to conform to, my informants included. The SWF construct coupled with this college’s adoption of post-industrial operating infrastructure and procedures for the production of classes and courses suppresses alternative ways of organizing classes and courses, such as the ways that my informants organize their programs.

3. Even though faculty may be surprised by the content of their SWF and disagree with it, many accept it without argument because there is extra work involved in disagreeing with a SWF, work that takes time away from home life and work and can be emotionally draining.

4. According to the Academic Employees Collective Agreement (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005), only full-time faculty members were to be notified of their workload and timetable well in advance of the semester start. Partial-load and part-time faculty enjoy no such contractual arrangement. They may or may not get notice well in advance of the semester start. Many are hired even after the semester starts and scramble to prepare their course work. They feel that they are treated as if they are dispensable. Some of my part-time informants emphasized this point.

Once the SWFs are completed, various other work processes can be activated, ordering texts being one of them.
**Completed SWFs Activate Textbook Order Work**

This section maps (see Figure 7.4), describes, and analyzes how completed SWFs activate textbook order work.

![Figure 7.4. Completed Standard Workload Forms (SWFs) Activate Textbook Order Work](image)

**Data**

Textbook order work seems straightforward.

1. Once most full-time faculty have been assigned courses, a bookstore employee sends an email to program and subject coordinators indicating that a textbook order form will soon be put in their faculty lounge mailboxes and that the textbook order forms
should be given to the relevant faculty so that course textbooks can be ordered. The textbook order form includes information regarding the previous fall semesters’ enrolment\textsuperscript{11} for the course and a box for faculty to fill out specifying whether a textbook is required, suggested, or not needed. The textbook order form authorizes that the same textbook(s) be ordered for one course number, even though several faculty members may be teaching the same course to students enrolled in a variety of programs and program sections within one school.

2. Program and subject coordinators distribute the textbook order forms to the relevant faculty.

3. Faculty read and fill out the textbook order form and return it to the bookstore employees.

4. The bookstore employees process the textbook orders.

Analysis

Ruling relations can be seen when this work is examined.

The faculty reading the textbook order form will go along with the idea of one text, or set of texts, meant to be the same for several sections of students. The form does not allow for reading it in alternative ways. It does not allow teachers to select several different texts to be used with several different sections of students. Teachers follow the “rules” that this text sets out and become its agent. In these ways, the textbook order form is a ruling text with which college teachers have no choice but to comply.

\textsuperscript{11} If faculty members know that the projected enrolment for a particular course is expected to dramatically change from the previous semester, they may let a bookstore employee know. With this information the bookstore manager can adjust the textbook orders.
When I first started teaching at Fleming College, the bookstore was a college-operated department. Bookstore employees did little to influence the kinds of textbooks faculty ordered. For instance, faculty members teaching a first semester communications course would order a variety of texts to suit the way they would teach the courses and the student groups they were to teach. Once the bookstore became a separate corporation, bookstore employees began to influence faculty decisions regarding textbooks. For instance, several years ago a bookstore employee approached our department coordinator to suggest that our department reduce the variety of texts we ordered for students taking first and second semester communications courses. That person offered convincing arguments for doing so: a reduced variety in textbooks would reduce student confusion about which text to purchase for a course, reduce the student cost for textbooks because of the bookstore’s ability to get better prices when buying larger quantities of the same book, and increase the amount of money that students could receive after the end of term when the bookstore bought back used texts to resell the following semester. The communications coordinator passed these suggestions along to communications faculty. We agreed with the suggestion and did reduce the variety of books that we selected for first and second semester communications courses. In this way, communications faculty became complicit in the shift in the way course texts were selected and hence in the work that was necessary to increase the standardization of first year communications courses. We also became complicit in increasing the profit of the bookstore corporation and in giving the bookstore the authority to standardize course text selection. Along with my colleagues, I was complicit in this decision that set the tone for further interactions.

The conversation about textbooks shifted the inter-individual territorial understanding of the function of the textbook order form from a form that permitted the ordering of multiple texts for first semester communications courses to a form that limited the choice to one text for a school.
In this way, the textbook order form became one of the ruling texts over faculty course outline and subsequently teaching work. This version of the textbook order form represents a deleted space, the space where faculty autonomy and professional judgment to choose a text has disappeared. In this way, market economic needs influenced what students could and could not learn. Faculty’s textbook choices are now aligned to assist the publishing corporation more than the interests of students and teachers. With this shift in book orders, the bookstore corporation gained efficiencies (read profit) due to the reduced bookstore labour needed to order a couple of shrink-wrapped books from one publisher versus ordering ten different texts from four different publishers that the communications faculty might have ordered in previous years. This deleted space could be reclaimed should faculty be interested in doing so. My informants would come to be in the position of knowing the difference between having the freedom to choose their own teaching resources and having this freedom constrained.

While completed SWFs permit the activation of textbook ordering, this action also permits the activation of faculty timetable work, as this next section describes.

**Completed SWFs Activate the Production of Faculty Timetables**

This section maps (see Figure 7.5), describes, and analyzes how the completion of the faculty SWFs activates the production of faculty timetables. In Figure 7.5 the numbered elements correspond to the descriptions that follow them.

**Data**

As the following figure reveals, a lot of texts and work precede the production of faculty timetables.

---

12 I’m using this number as an example because I can’t remember exactly how many different texts we might have ordered.
1. Before timetables can be completed, an operations support staff member sends out by email attachment a Faculty Restriction Form to all full-time faculty members.

2. If faculty have authorized reasons for having timetable restrictions, such as confidential doctor-identified reasons or college committee or coordinator work, they are to indicate their needs on this form and return it by email attachment to the dean. The dean gives the restriction information to the timetabler.
3. According to Article 14.02 C 1 of the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005), “A full-time faculty may request and, with the approval of the College, may undertake less than a full-load assignment for a mutually agreed period.” Faculty who choose to do this must then fill out a reduced workload agreement to reduce the number of courses that they would normally teach. Their salary would then be reduced by the percentage of reduction in their workload. Faculty who choose to do this must find the document online within the human resources section of the college internal website. This document needs to be approved by the dean. Copies of the signed document are to go to the employee, the operations manager, the dean, the timetabler, human resources, the local union president, and payroll.  

4. An operations support staff member sends the SWF information to the timetabler. The timetabler also receives information about faculty restrictions or workload reductions.

5. Once most of the course hours have been allotted through the production of SWFs and partial-load and part-time teaching contracts, the timetabler produces timetables for all full-time, part-time, and partial-load faculty. The timetables are loaded onto the intranet system so that they are available to faculty, all college employees, and students to see.

---

13 It is common for departments to have one or more faculty member on reduced workload. Faculty request reduced workloads for a variety of reasons: to accommodate health issues, to ease into retirement, to free up time needed to attend to a family issue, to help ease an onerous workload, and combinations of all of the above.
6. According to Article 11.02 A 5 in the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005), “The timetable shall set out the schedule and location of assigned workload hours reported on the SWF, on a Timetable Form to be provided by the College, and a copy shall be given to the teacher no less than two weeks prior to the beginning of the period covered by the timetable, which shall be the same period as that covered by the SWF.”

**Analysis**

This timetable work reveals the lack of input that many faculty have over their teaching schedules. Personally, I have experienced both extremes on the continuum of little to major influence over my timetable and course selection. One year when I taught students in the Intensive English as a Second Language Program (IESL), I and the other advanced IESL teacher worked out a recommended timetable of courses for the students in the program based on how we hoped to divide the course work between us. The student course timetable we received worked out to be quite close to the one we had recommended, so we could easily divide the course work between us and make up our own timetables. On the other hand, during the last spring/summer semester I taught at the college, both the postsecondary SWF and the timetable I was initially given were broken into two sections. One combination of the SWF and timetable was for the first seven weeks of the spring/summer semester; the other combination was for the last seven weeks of the semester. Even though I was the only faculty member within the Communications Department teaching through both portions of the spring/summer semester, for one course, I was given one program group of students for the spring semester and a different program group of students for the summer semester. Before the summer semester began, I managed to convince the timetabler that it would be in the best interests of the students if they had the same teacher for the entire semester rather
than switching teachers after June, especially since I was going to be teaching both semesters. It became clear, when one class had no teacher in July, that my workload and timetable had originally been built to avoid hiring a part-time teacher during the summer. This kind of planning of workloads and timetables that had spring/summer semester students experiencing one set of teachers in May/June and another set in July/August privileged cost efficiencies and suppressed the optimum teaching and student learning interests of having the continuity of the same teacher for the entire spring/summer semester.

Ironically, the Fleming College Strategic Plan 2005-2010 had as its first value putting student learning first. It goes like this:

**Put student learning first**

Student learning is at the heart of what we do. We strive to inspire students by making them full partners in a challenging and engaging learning experience. Our commitment to “put student learning first” guides our work and our decision-making throughout the College. [bold in original] (p. 3)

In the example I just described of my spring/summer semester experience, the value of efficiency and “reducing waste” took precedence over putting “student learning first.” This can happen when learning is treated as a commodity. Notice in this strategic value how learning is disembodied from the student in the phrase “student learning” as opposed to the phrase “students’ learning” in which students’ possess their own learning. Note as well how teachers have disappeared from the students’ “learning experience.”

On the Faculty Restriction Form, faculty cannot request times that align with their optimum ability to teach. The form does not permit this reading or filling in. Part of the reason for the restrictions on the form relates to the difficulty the timetabler has processing personal requests that are outside “authorized reasons,” especially when many teachers’ timetables connect with a large
lecture. Ironically, the way that courses are organized to have a common lecture creates this timetabling difficulty. Faculty members who teach courses that have no common lecture are more able to suggest optimal times for their teaching should their deans permit it.

Before the standardized online course outline was enforced, the actual course days and hours that appeared on my timetable influenced how I organized a course outline. For instance, finding out that one section or course had an 8:00 a.m. class, a late Friday afternoon class, or classes missed because of holidays would cause me to reorganize a course outline to suit the calendar and timetable diversity for that particular group. The enforcement of one standardized course outline for one course number encouraged teachers to try to make students’ learning fit the one course outline and students’ timetable situation as best as they could. This is an example of how the monoculture online course outline became more of a ruling text than a guiding text. For example, teachers would try to teach faster and get students to learn faster if they were assigned to the course section that missed several classes due to holidays and snow days.

The monocultural online course outline connected to a variety of student/teacher attendance and timetable situations encouraged teachers to objectify rather than personalize the students whom they taught. The strategic value, “put student learning first,” allowed college employees to attempt to disembodied the learning from the actual student, as if that were possible. The monocultural online course outline permitted further blending in of market economic efficiencies into what college teachers could teach and students could learn.

Once my informants produce course outlines for their program and have their work subject to being inserted into the college’s teachers’ work, class, and course production schedule, they may also lose control of organizing their class hours. Now they organize their program hours to suit the needs of the other teachers and students. Once their courses are mixed in with all the other courses
that the college timetabler organizes, they may find that they are timetabled in a way quite inconvenient to their needs. They may not be able to change this inconvenient order because, according to the Faculty Restriction Form, they do not have an authorized reason.

**Conclusion**

This chapter emphasizes the actors, work processes, and texts involved in setting up the material restrictions and standardization placed on college teachers’ work. College teachers are made aware of these restrictions through their reading and possibly signing of documents that describe these restrictions. The work described in this chapter represents the web of boundaries that will restrict my informants’ ability to be creative teachers who respond to their students’ everyday needs. At the same time, this is the work knowledge that my informants will need to learn to be able to deliver courses within this neoliberal version of college education. New teachers will learn how to read and fill out texts like those described in this chapter. In the process of becoming agents of these texts, they will learn how to become complicit in supporting a market economic system of college education.

Once the completion of the SWFs and partial-load and part-time faculty contract work is done, work on the “Who Is Teaching What” list can begin, as the next chapter explains.
In Chapters 5 to 7, I have mapped, described, and analyzed the teacher work, class, and course production preparation work, talk, and texts that shape what faculty can and can not make decisions about with respect to their curriculum and course outline work. In the last few weeks before a fall academic semester begins and once the semester is in play, faculty are organized by textual rule to work amongst themselves to do the remaining sequences of work activities connected to course outline work. This chapter focuses on these sequences of work, text, and talk.

At Fleming College, several texts activate the sequences of work that standardize teachers’ course outline work: the “Who Is Teaching What” list, the online course outline template, and the online student evaluation template. In the next few sections of this chapter (see Figures 8.1-8.3) I will map, describe, and analyze the actors, work sequences, and talk connected to these texts. I will do this to emphasize the extent to which my informants could become drawn into standardized teaching depending on the extent to which their course outline work becomes drawn into these kinds of institutional processes.

The first text that rules teachers’ work is the “Who Is Teaching What” list.
Completed SWFs Activate the Production of the “Who Is Teaching What” List and Course Outline Work

The map (see Figure 8.1), data description, and analysis for this section explain how the completed SWFs activate the production of the departmental “Who Is Teaching What” list. This text orchestrates work habits that draw faculty into concerted course outline work.

Figure 8.1. Completed Standard Workload Forms (SWFs) Activate the Production of the “Who Is Teaching What” List and Course Outline Work

1. Subject Coordinators produce a “Who Is Teaching What” list and send it electronically to all faculty in the department.
2. Faculty read this list to find out with whom they will be teaching; they then work to find a common meeting time.
3. The online course outline frequently is filled in by the lead teacher. It is produced by filling in shells that have already been constructed.

- Work done by college employees.
- Time: late August or early September 2007
- Talk produced by college employees.
- Texts physically present in the setting.
- Texts produced in multiples.
Data

There are three work activities to this stage of teachers building their ruling work.

1. Faculty subject coordinators refer to information on the SWFs and part-time and partial-load contracts to create a “Who Is Teaching What” list. The subject coordinator sends this list electronically to all faculty members in the department. Within the “Who Is Teaching What” list is listed a lead teacher designation for courses where several faculty teach the same course.

2. Faculty read this list to find out with whom they will be teaching. They work to find a common meeting time. In the course meeting they talk, as they are expected to, about coming up with common course outline details such as lecture topics, seminar topics, lab topics, assignments, tests, and the breakdown of the evaluation of student work.

3. The online course outline is frequently written up by the lead teacher. Sometimes this is a group project. A particular course outline is produced by filling in the online text shells that have already been constructed.

Analysis

This way of organizing teachers’ work has certain implications.

Decreased horizontal communication. When I first began teaching at the college in the late 1980s, the teams that I met with periodically consisted of the other program teachers who taught different subjects to the same students that I taught. In this iteration of institutional teamwork, I was under no pressure to teach exactly the same way as others who taught first or second semester communications courses. At that time, faculty wrote their own course outlines. Courses were arranged so that each faculty member was in charge of a group of students organized
by program. Each course grouping was timetabled for about three hours of class a week. There were as many different course outlines for a course as there were different teachers of that course. Program team discussions often involved how to best serve the varied needs of the students in a particular program. Team meeting time was not itemized on our SWF at that time. Program coordinators called for and arranged these meetings on their own.

These meetings were useful in many ways. I arranged a few of them when I coordinated the General Arts and Science program. The move from having program faculty meet according to need – meeting work that at that time was not itemized on a SWF – to having meetings concerned with the production and implementation of a standardized course outline actually itemized on the SWF connects with Foucault’s (1977) idea of the panopticon. He noted that the panopticon schema prevents “spontaneous organizations, coalitions – anything that may establish horizontal conjunctions” (p. 219) and it terminates “any relation that is not supervised by authority” (p. 239).

**Increased vertical social relations.** Having a lead teacher for a course is a relatively new designation that didn’t exist a few years before this 2006/2007 iteration of course arrangements and course outline production and implementation. The lead teacher designation becomes something that a college faculty member can put on his or her resume, but it also creates an additional layer of hierarchy amongst teachers and an additional mediation between individual teachers and their students. In a way, the lead teacher is positioned to take on the duties of the prison guard with the other faculty the prisoners when the panopticon schema exists in the organization of course teachers and course curriculum.
**Legitimized standardization work.** The talk that happened during the course meeting legitimized the standardization of the work that course teams did to orient faculties’ attention to producing a standardized course outline.

The work of filling in the slots in the online course outline, with the intention that this text would prescribe the way that several faculty members would teach the course to several different groups of students, orchestrates the standardization curriculum work of teachers for several sections of a course. As a faculty member who once contributed to this work, I was also agreeing to the production of a panopticon version of course arrangements and course outline curriculum production, and I became part of the panopticon mechanism. As Foucault (1977) indicates, “We are neither in the amphitheatre, nor on the stage, but in the panopticon machine, invested by its effects of power, which we bring to ourselves since we are part of its mechanism” (p. 217).

Several shifts assisted the move to the acceptance of relatively “fixed” courses and course outlines. My initially unaware complicity in the blending in of market-friendly course and course outline formats goes back to my interest in distance education. Initially, I launched three print-based distance education courses without a Centre for Learning and Design, technical support, or a course designer. I wrote, duplicated, and packaged the courses. As interest in distance education expanded, a Centre for Learning and Design was developed, and then course designers and instructional technologists were hired and attached to the work that faculty did on distance education, then online courses, then online lectures, and then hybrid courses, a combination of both. As more “support” people became attached to courses and course elements, some course formations and course elements became more “fixed.” When another teacher other than the
original author of the online course or course element was assigned to the course, next to no opportunity was created by management for the new teacher of the course to adapt the course or course elements to suit his or her teaching style and students. The expectation of having the online courses and course elements to be the same from one teacher to another became accepted by college employees and students. This shift and the associated reduced funding made it easier for college employees and students to accept and expect both monocultural online and face-to-face courses. In this way, what Marx (1939/1973) has said about the type of production creating commodities in a form that consumers want has come to pass.

**Decreased professional judgment spaces.** The right of managers to punish faculty is expanded through the production of the standardized course outline. Faculty who deviate from its details can be viewed as having committed a crime against “the course team,” rather than having exercised professional judgement. If faculty could again produce individual course outlines for the first semester in their first year courses and subsequent semesters that they teach, a deleted professional judgment space could be reclaimed. An opportunity to punish faculty as being deviant just because they used professional judgment could be erased.

Once teachers have written the monoculture course outline, the work of standardized teaching can begin.

**Completed Online Course Outline Activates the Production of Regulated Teaching, Learning, and Assessment**

When the online course outline is completed, it activates the production of regulated teaching, learning, and assessment. The following presentation of mapping (see Figure 8.2), data, and analysis explains how three texts, the “Who Is Teaching What” list, the online course outline template, and the online mark grid, shape the way many college teachers teach first semester
communications courses at this particular college. I will focus on just the face-to-face method of delivery of this course to simplify this stage of the description of the college course production process.

Figure 8.2. Completed Online Course Outline Activates the Production of Regulated Teaching, Learning, and Assessment

1. Lead faculty use info from evaluation section of the course outline to set up the marks for all the sections of the course on the online Learning Management System.
2. Faculty teach a specific course according to the course outline.
3. Course faculty meet weekly.
4. Many faculty prepare a compressed paper version of the course outline to give to students.

Facilitate discussion creating virtually identical assignments, learning activities, and tests.

Some faculty refer to the course outline as a learning contract.

Academic Employees Collective Agreement: Class Definition of “Professor”

The Standard Workload Form (SWF) lists a complimentary hour for course team meetings.

Faculty use the compressed paper version of the course outline to introduce their course.

- Work done by college employees.
- Talk produced by college employees.
- Texts physically present in the setting.
- Texts produced in multiples.

Time: Early September 2007
At this interchange, four activities set up regulated teaching, learning, and assessment:

1. Using the online Learning Management System, the course lead faculty member uses information from the evaluation section of the online course outline to set up the mark distribution for students in all the sections of the course. Any faculty teaching any section of the course can see all students’ marks. The Learning Management online student evaluation system ensures that all students taking a first or second semester communications course or any course within the college will have their work evaluated using marks. Those marks will be allotted in identical portions out of 100 for all students in the course.

2. All faculty assigned to a particular course begin to teach the course according to the details listed in the course outline.

3. Course faculty meet weekly. This weekly meeting is authorized by a complementary hour listed on the full-time faculty SWFs. Part-time and partial-load faculty can charge the college for this meeting time, as their contracts permit them to do. In these meetings, faculty discuss creating virtually identical assignments, learning activities, and tests. Faculty who participate in this work are described as “team players.”

4. Many faculty members prepare and duplicate a compressed paper version of the course outline to give to students in the first week of classes when they introduce the course. Many teachers present to the students the online course outline (whether compressed and on paper or not) as a contract between the teacher and the students.
Analysis

This work has several effects.

**Mini standardized evaluation panopticon created.** A mini online panopticon is created with the online course mark grid. Not only can all teachers teaching the course see all the marks for all the students in all the sections of the course (even those whom they don’t teach), but they can also survey the details of each teacher’s recording of those marks. They can survey how promptly this work is done and whether marks are high or low, for example.

Having all teachers evaluate students in the same way using marks that fit the online course evaluation section of the Learning Management System suppresses the options that some teachers would prefer, such as verbal feedback only, or formative evaluation, and/or an evaluation practice that comments on students’ competency level, and/or use of pass/fail or pass/incomplete.

This is exactly the dilemma that my informants take issue with as their program doesn’t lend itself to having marks attached to student progress. Should my informants be drawn into the online evaluation schema that goes with online course outlines, they could be forced by their supervisor to evaluate their students using marks even though their holistic growth-oriented teaching technologies are not conducive to evaluating their students with marks. Using marks to evaluate their students would change the way they would teach.

The monocultural course outlines and mark grids assist managers in the move to delete diversity around student evaluation. Again, this is a space worth reclaiming.

**Practice of deskilling teachers activated.** The online course outline acts as a ruling text that encourages college faculty to teach to the course outline rather than the actual interests and
needs of the students and teachers. This teaching oriented to the course outline encourages teachers
to objectify students. This orientation stunts their development as teachers.

**Deskilling and standardization of teachers’ work maintained.** The details of the SWF
specify team meeting time and activate and authorize the work that teachers do to talk about
constructing monoculture curriculum within their weekly meetings. There is pressure for faculty to
be “team players” in the way that they standardize their teaching. The standardized course outline
creates a panopticon technology of power that increases the scope that managers may use to
describe faculty as insubordinate and punishable should they deviate from the monoculture course
outline. This power to punish has been built in the way that Foucault (1977) describes: “What
generalizes the power to punish, then, is not the universal consciousness of the law in each juridical
subject; it is the regular extension [of], the infinitely minute web of panoptic techniques” (p. 224).

**Course outline as contract concept activated.** Presenting the course outline as a
contract between the teacher and the students allows the course outline to become a ruling text
rather than a guideline for learning, as many teachers referred to it especially in the early years of
the college. Having even one teacher in the group present the course outline as a contract
between teachers and students provides legitimacy to the idea of a curriculum text being a legal
contract that can authorize penalties and punishments. This view of the course outline also
suppresses the alternate idea of the course outline being a flexible learning guideline.

When online course outlines and online mark grids are used in the way described above
they become ruling texts that authorize the standardization of college courses and college
professors’ teaching. These ruling texts suppress the spirit of the *Academic Employees Collective
Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) Class Definition of
“Professor” that says, “Under the direction of the senior academic officer the College or designate, a Professor is responsible for providing academic leadership and for developing an effective learning environment for students. . . .” (p. 147).

I would suggest that more working at followership than leadership is demanded of faculty involved with these monoculture courses. I found it quite ironic that after 29 years of unblemished college teaching, one semester, after my workload had been changed several times, I ended up being directed to teach a course I did not choose and to be the teacher who followed a standardized course outline already written by someone else. Such an arrangement of my SWF might be viewed as being efficient college operations, but to me it was in violation of the human orientation of the Fleming College Strategic Plan core value “waste nothing – not time, not talent, or resources” (p.3). It took more time, talent, and physical and mental energy than I possessed to follow like a robot a course based on values I did not agree with. Acting like a deskillled teacher was not efficiency to me.

The next section emphasizes the problems of deskilling teachers that standardized curricula such as has been described here promotes.

**Regulated Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Orchestrate the Deskilling of College Faculty**

This section presents a work sequence mapping (see Figure 8.3), description, and analysis that reveals how the standardization of the teaching of first semester communication courses and the deskilling of teachers associated with these courses is connected to maintaining the use of particular texts that work to orchestrate teachers’ work. I have added numbers in the figure below to correspond with the verbal descriptions and make the progression easier to understand.
The standardization and deskilling of college teachers’ work continue throughout the rest of the semester:

1. The work of faculty and students is oriented to what is written in the course outline.

   The assignments, learning activities, and tests that faculty give to students are the same for several sections of student classes in several different programs.
2. Students work on virtually identical learning activities, assignments, and tests. Students submit assignments and tests to faculty.

3. Faculty mark assignments and tests and record students’ marks on the mark grid of the Learning Management System. The online mark grid gets filled up with students’ marks until a total is reached at the end of the semester.

4. Faculty submit final student course marks to the Registrar’s Office. Teachers have the option of sending students their course marks at the same time.

**Analysis**

This way of organizing teachers and curriculum opens up several opportunities.

**Opportunities to punish teachers increase.** Having professors teach to the course outline rather than the students is a departure from the holistic technology of teaching and the growth model of an organization that Franklin (1990) emphasizes is so important to people-related work, and especially education. The standardized course outline with its connected mark grid substitutes for the intelligence and judgment of teachers. In addition, teachers who deviate from the course outline by responding to the needs and interests of their students may be written up by their deans as being insubordinate, a method of potential punishment that could work well to discipline teachers to conform to the standardized course outline and standardized mark grid. Teachers who can not respond to students’ needs and interests may lose their ability to be effective teachers and their interest in college teaching. One of my informants chose to retire rather than submit to the choice of being written up for insubordination by her supervisor or conform to being a docent-style teacher.
Opportunities for students to cheat increase. When teachers are forced to use virtually identical curricula, students find it easier to copy one another’s work, and do so. A *Maclean’s* (Gulli, Kohler, & Patriquin, 2007) article indicates that the degree of cheating within postsecondary institutions is rising. As it suggests, “When put into historical context, the numbers for academic integrity across North America show cheating on a steady rise” (para. 4). Creating educational conditions that make it easy for students to cheat affects society. “A 2001 study of attitudes among business students published in the *Journal of Education for Business* found that those ‘who engage in dishonest behaviour in their college classes were more likely to engage in dishonest behaviour on the job’” (para. 9). For these reasons, and many others, it is inappropriate to continue to construct teaching arrangements that allow student cheating to flourish – unless, of course, having more graduates comfortable with corruption is a needed characteristic in a global market economic world.

Opportunities to rank students and teachers increase. Attaching marks to the assessment of student learning permits students to be ranked and stratifies the students within a course. It also permits teachers to be ranked as well. Such ranking supports the needs of a global market economic consciousness while suppressing the diverse consciousness needed for a healthy world. After experiencing such standardized courses, college students also become hooked into this market economic friendly version of education, come to expect it to be the pattern for college learning, and become less accepting of more diverse ways of learning.

Opportunities to suppress diversity increase. Installing the Learning Management System that includes the online course outline that is connected to the online mark grid and the managerial controls over how it is used activates both the standardization of course teaching and
learning and the way that student learning is evaluated. These key pieces of the Learning Management System are managed so that they create texts that suppress both diversity in teaching and evaluation. There is no room for the pass/incomplete style of teaching and evaluation, for example.

This suppression of diversity runs counter to a point in the Fleming College Strategic Plan 2005-2010 where the sixth strategic priority is

**Optimizing Organizational Culture and Development**

**Context**

Fleming has demonstrated a deep commitment to caring about students, faculty, and staff. We value collegial decision-making and wellness. However, to meet the needs of a more diverse student body and to incorporate wellness, openness to feedback, nimbleness in decision-making, and accountability, we need to evolve our culture so as to embed these values and behaviours in our operations.

**Goal**

By 2010, Fleming College will be regarded by its students, employees, and partners as a college that has fully incorporated its values into every facet of the organization. . . .

6.5 Evolve our culture to better support diversity, to exhibit wellness, to welcome feedback, to provide timely, sound decision-making and to act with accountability. [bold in original] (p. 11)

This emphasis on diversity within the strategic plan may help the college respond to its enrolment growth goal; that is, it may have more to do with recruitment and retention than it has to do with diversity and wellness within college teaching and learning work. The college needs to address the systemic lack of diversity within its curricula, particularly the course arrangements and course outline procedures. Until it does so, the college will not have addressed its goals regarding diversity and wellness within its culture.

Even though elements of Fleming College’s strategic plan indicates that many people in the institution are concerned with employee wellness, its systemic suppression of diversity in
education and hence college teachers’ professional judgment creates a lack of employee control over work. Reducing employee control over their work reduces employee wellness. Van der Doef and Maes’ (1999) research found that “employees working in a high-strain job (high-demand-low control) experience the lowest well-being,” and “control can moderate the negative effects of high demands on well-being” (p. 87).

**Opportunities to lose teaching resources increase.** Having all course outlines, learning resources, and assessment of student learning in one place – online – puts teachers at risk of losing all of their teaching resources, including assessment, should the online system fail, as happened at Fleming College in the summer of 2010. Quotes from the local newspaper reveal the emphasis that the institution places on giving students marks for their work, quickly processing them through the institutional hurdles, and identifying students by their marks. As Eagle (2010a, 2010b) reports,

A backup system failure at Fleming College has resulted in the loss of hundreds of students’ grades and has staff and faculty scrounging to find hard-copy marks so students can finish the summer semester uninterrupted. . . .

“In the majority of cases we have backup. Students will be graded using the original grading scheme,” [an administrator] said. “Our first priority is working with the current students to help them finish their semester on time.”

There will be some students whose grades cannot be recovered, [an administrator] admitted.

“In a limited number of instances, we may need to modify the (grading) elements and that will be done with discussion with the dean and the faculty member and the students,” [an administrator] said. (p. A1)

A week later the local paper (Eagle, 2010b) reports on the effects of the computer malfunction:

While the college wants to identify the source of the problem before the fall semester, [an administrator] said, its priority is getting the summer students through their last two weeks of school. . . .

The majority of teachers have hard copies of their grades, [an administrator] said. But *The Examiner* has spoken to students who say their final grades will be determined by a hodgepodge of assignments or their final exam because their instructors did not keep backups of grades. (p. A5)
It is evident from this quote that the college is oriented to having all students move in a lockstep manner in the way that they learn their curriculum – another monocultural aspect of the college curricula.

**Conclusion**

The mapping, description, and analysis presented here show that the organizational power that promotes the standardization of college courses is clearly not located in any one person, any one text, or any one work process. It is a recursive dialogical process. Yes, managers have influenced changes, but in many cases, they did not really know the damage they were causing as they were caught up within the constraints of government competitive funding, economic growth discourse, and a neoliberal orientation to public service. College faculty members have been complicit in the creeping standardization shifts, and yet they often made these moves to ease their onerous workload. The college union contract has enshrined the managerial power that permitted the standardization. The extra-locally owned bookstore contributed to the standardization of course resources, and probably most significant, the Learning Management System software and the way the college has used it has contributed to the alienation of some college faculty from their work as teachers. The opportunities for professional judgment in this iteration of course arrangements and course outline production have been deleted from the experiences of many college professors. The online course outline has its problems but the actual rules for course outline arrangements are more significant. If faculty were free to design their own course outlines many professional judgment opportunities would/could be reclaimed.

Looking across figures in Chapters 6 to 8, I can see no moment when a college teacher’s course outline work and consequent teaching work is not ruled by texts. All of the texts that rule
college teachers’ work decrease the diversity of teaching options that faculty have, increase efficiencies in institutional processes, and increase the span of managerial control over faculty work. These increases in the efficiencies of institutional processes have happened at the expense of students’ and teachers’ interests and needs. The purchase and particular use of online course outlines and mark grids have increased the acceptance of monocultural teaching and learning amongst those associated with colleges. The work processes that have been described here are the means by which increases in panopticon managerial control over college teachers’ work is increased and maintained.

How my informants will deal with the pressures to conform to the textual and work habits of standardizing class, course, and curriculum work that their program faces has yet to be worked out. They do understand that they will lose something in the process.

Informant: And there is a desire to make [our program] more formal, and very much college structured, but it’s only so possible. . . . The lack of structure does create problems, . . . but those are the things that we deal with. . . . And that we have to. You can’t try and make it more structured and more formal without losing what you’re supposed to do. . . . And that’s what I feel is happening. We will have to create an outline, a clear curriculum, kind of guide as to how things need to go and what we’re going to accomplish, week by week, . . . because it’s going to be put online. . . . But, it’s an outline, and an outline is just that – it’s nothing. It can’t be really detailed because there are too many things that come into play in that one [subject].

The next chapter examines how a set of college union negotiations texts create more textual power that supports the standardization of college teachers’ work and the deskilling of their development.
In the previous chapters, I have been explaining how the standardizing of college teachers’ work has been organized in coordinated sequences of work, over time, with a network of complicit actors, and through the power of texts in a way that does not favour the interests of college teachers, students, society, and the environment. Throughout the life of the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, the iterations of the Academic Employees Collective Agreement have played a key role in determining what college teachers can and can not do and what their managers can do through their panopticon-like surveillance and control. During the negotiations for the settlement of the 2009 Academic Employees Collective Agreement, several texts interlocked to constrict further college teachers’ freedom to teach. These documents are worth examining because they reveal the power of texts to act as regulatory frames to decrease faculty members’ teaching autonomy, increase the standardization of their work, and increase their deskilling.

In the following analyses of texts, I am influenced by my reading of D. E. Smith (2005) and what she has to say about the ability of texts to mandate, regulate, and support ruling relations:

Institutional texts are designed; they are . . . interlocking (rather than intertextual); setting their categories, concepts, and frames is highly politicized, not only in those settings ordinarily thought of as political. Texts are key to institutional coordinating, regulating the concerting of people’s work in institutional settings in the ways they impose an accountability to the terms they establish. (p. 118)

14 A very early version of this chapter was presented at the Canadian Federation for Humanities and Social Sciences, Canadian Sociological Association section, May 2009, Montreal, Quebec.
With respect to this textual analysis, I will focus on four Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology faculty workload-related texts that have an impact on the creation of college teachers’ course outlines: the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005), the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology *Workload Taskforce Report* (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009), the *Union Proposal of Settlement* (Ontario Public Service Employees Union CAAT-A Colleges Academic Division, 2010), and the *Management Offer for Settlement* (The Council Offer for Settlement, 2010). My area of focus will be the language around evaluation, course outlines, and collegiality that shapes the “what and how” of faculty course outline work.

**The Academic Employees Collective Agreement**

The *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) specifies in Article 11.01 E 1 that “weekly hours for evaluation and feedback in a course shall be attributed to a teacher in accordance with the following formula” (p. 14). The formula details the types of evaluation: essay or project, routine or assisted, and in-process and gives more weekly time to the first, less to the second, and even less to the third on a per student basis. The wording emphasizes that the evaluation type used in a course is attributed to the teacher of the course, not the course. Article 11.01 E 2 (iv) states that

> Where a course requires more than one type of evaluation and feedback, the teacher and the supervisor shall agree upon a proportionate attribution of hours. If such an agreement cannot be reached the College shall apply evaluation factors in the same proportion as the weight attached to each type of evaluation in the final grade for the course. (p. 15)
Article 11.02 A 4 indicates that

In the event that the teacher is not in agreement with the total workload and wishes it to be reviewed by the WMG [Workload Monitoring Group], the teacher must so indicate in writing to the supervisor within three working days from the date of the receipt of the SWF [Standard Workload Form]. (p. 19)

What is distinctive about these articles is that their wording associates connecting evaluation factors to an individual teacher, not the course, nor the entire group of teachers teaching the course. Disputes about evaluation are described as being between an individual teacher and a supervisor, not a supervisor and a group of teachers. This orientation permits diversity of evaluation amongst a group of teachers who teach the same course. This orientation also permits teachers to act as unique individuals.

The Academic Employees Collective Agreement (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) also describes the nature of the work that a professor does in its Class Definition. The following is a relevant excerpt of that description with a focus on the topic of evaluation:

Professor
Under the direction of a senior academic officer of the College or designate, a Professor is responsible for providing academic leadership and for developing an effective learning environment for students. This includes:

a) The design/revision/updating of courses, including: . . .
   - Defining course objectives and evaluating and validating these objectives; . . .

b) The teaching of assigned courses, including: . . .
   - Evaluating student progress/achievement and assuming responsibility for the overall assessment of the students’ work within assigned courses. (pp. 147-148)

The Academic Employees Collective Agreement (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) also makes it clear what Management Functions are. Article 6.01 says that management has the “right to plan, direct and control operations, facilities, programs, courses,
systems and procedures, direct its personnel” (p. 5). Article 6.02 states that “these functions will be exercised in a manner consistent with the provisions of the Agreement” (p. 5). Given this orientation, it makes sense that the bulk of the decision-making regarding the type of evaluation to be used in any one course would rest with each individual faculty member and be a reflection of what each faculty member would do in the course. In fact, the second sentence in Article 11.01 E 2 (iv) says as much: “If such an agreement [between the supervisor and the teacher] can’t be reached the college shall apply evaluation factors in the same proportion as the weight attached to each type of evaluation in the final grade for the course” (p. 15). According to the Class Definition of “Professor,” each college teacher is responsible for “evaluating student progress/achievement and assuming responsibility for the overall assessment of the student’s work within assigned courses” (p. 148); according to the Agreement, each college teacher is clearly responsible for the evaluation used in his or her course. And yes, management might want to override a faculty member’s evaluation plan for an assigned course, but to do so would be to violate Article 6.02 that says that Management Functions “will be exercised in a manner consistent with the provisions of this Agreement” (p. 5). A teacher’s responsibility for the evaluation used in her or his course is one of those spelled out provisions. Even if individual teachers and managers disagree about the evaluation used in a course, the Agreement offers a clear path for individual teachers to deal with individual workload disagreements.

The Academic Employees Collective Agreement (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) makes no mention of course outlines. Despite the clarity of the Agreement on the topic of evaluation, the Workload Taskforce Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009)
presents recommendations that suggest a shift in the decision making regarding evaluation, the faculty SWF, and the course outlines that are affected by the production of the SWFs.

**Workload Taskforce Report**

The *Workload Taskforce Report* (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) was a document largely supported by the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology union and management. The *Workload Taskforce Report* was produced as an extended result of the 2003-2004 negotiations and was directed in 2006 by Arbitrator Kaplan (p. 2). This Report indicates “there is a very high level of concurrence between managers and teachers that college faculty members have the skills and expertise necessary to teach the courses assigned to them” (p. 8). Even though the statement above indicates that faculty members are quite able to do their job as described in the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005), the Report authors saw fit to set up recommendations that micro-managed faculty work with regard to the evaluation used in a course. Because of the wording of this recommendation, a context was set up that would enable managers to force professors to follow monocultural course outlines written by others whether or not those course outlines suit their students or a particular teacher’s teaching style. The language of this text sets up, as D. E. Smith (2005) indicates, the institutional discourse necessary to set the terms of institutional accountability necessary to subsume the everyday (p. 113). The Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) also indicates that collegiality, academic freedom, and professional development are important, so much so that they recommend “mechanisms that will enhance” them (p. 30). On the contrary, I will suggest that their recommendations regarding evaluation and course outlines contradict the basic principles involved with collegiality, academic freedom, and the spirit of the Class Definition of
“Professor” as detailed in the Agreement (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005).

The *Workload Taskforce Report* (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) paraphrases the different methods of evaluation described in the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005). It also notes that there is an article in the workload section of the Agreement that describes how to deal with a blended evaluation situation. This Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) also notes that Article 11 in the Agreement does not make clear how the decision regarding the type of evaluation to be used with a course is made. The authors note that how the decision is made is connected to issues of “academic freedom, professional expertise, and collegiality” (p. 25).

The next paragraph in the Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) is problematic:

Our Teacher Survey tells us that the two most important factors affecting time spent on evaluation were the length and complexity of the assignments, and the number of students to be evaluated; however, the formula only takes into account the number of students. It does not tell us who makes the decision as to the types, numbers, and complexity of the assignments. If such decisions are left to individual faculty members, it is easy to see the potential for excessive (i.e. unremunerated) evaluation resulting from good faith zeal. A number of faculty at the regional meetings indicated that they spent far more time working on evaluation than had been credited to them. Conversely one can imagine situations in which individuals might manipulate their evaluation methods for self-interested reasons. The regional meetings revealed a perception among some faculty that some managers were sacrificing the appropriate evaluation factor for the expediency of meeting overall formula restrictions. Such a perception could be damaging to faculty morale. (p. 25)

These comments sit in stark opposition to the earlier comment in the Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) that said “college faculty members have the skills and expertise necessary to teach courses assigned to them” (p. 8). If faculty can teach, they can also make intelligent decisions about the evaluation of student work within any particular course. In fact, the
Academic Employees Collective Agreement's (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) Class Definition of “Professor” indicates that:

Under the direction of the senior academic officer of the College or designate, a Professor is responsible for providing academic leadership and for developing an effective learning environment for students. This includes: . . . evaluating student progress/achievement and assuming responsibility for the overall assessment of the student’s work within assigned courses. (pp. 147-148)

This Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) says that the evaluation formula for the SWF does not say who is responsible for “making decisions as to the types, numbers, and complexity of the assignments” (p. 25). The formula does not need to because the Academic Employees Collective Agreement (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) Class Definition clearly states that the professor is responsible for student evaluation within a course. Yes, according to the Agreement professors may be “under the direction of the senior academic officer of the college” (p. 5) when teaching, but if college managers interpret “direction” to mean micro-managing teachers’ work to the point of telling them what kind of evaluation they should use for a course, managers are contravening the spirit of the Class Definition that says the professor is to “provide academic leadership” (p. 147). This is especially true when college managers cannot possibly know the specific subject area and teaching expertise that individual college teachers have developed.

The Academic Employees Collective Agreement (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) indicates how faculty should respond to situations where they feel that the evaluation factors placed on their SWF are inappropriate. It indicates that they should indicate on the SWF that it should go to the College Workload Monitoring Group. If the authors of the Workload Taskforce Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) had thought about this
differently, they would not have had any reason to suggest changes be made to the wording of the evaluation section of the Agreement. As well, the wording of the article on evaluation does not have to be interpreted as being ambiguous. Following the spirit of the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) that says that college professors are to provide academic leadership to their students, the evaluation Article 11.01 E 1 says, “Weekly hours for evaluation and feedback in a course shall be attributed to a teacher in accordance [with their] formula” (p. 14), which can be read to mean that the evaluation factor on the SWF will reflect the kind of evaluation that the teacher actually plans to do and does. However, to enable the course outlines teachers use to teach to become less diverse, to enable managers to gain another way to control college teachers’ work in a way that allows the “scientific management” and a panopticon-style (Foucault, 1977) of the evaluation of college education to unfold, and to allow managers to squeeze one more opportunity to gain monetary “efficiencies” out of faculty work, an opening needs to be created to alter the wording of the Agreement to endorse more conformity within courses, course outlines, and consequently teachers’ course outline work. The evaluation section of the Agreement offers just such an opportunity. Here is the recommendation from the *Workload Taskforce Report* (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009):

> Our recommendation is designed to meet all these potential extremes. At the same time, it stresses another academic virtue, collegiality. What we feel is needed in this case is a method to balance pedagogical demands against the proper utilization of teaching resources in a more collegial fashion.

We recommend that for each program and/or course the evaluation methods be set in a consultative process by the affected faculty as a group and the academic manager and with the manager’s approval placed in the course outline. All teachers are to abide by that outline. Any disputes between the faculty and the manager emerging from the consultative process are to follow the normal dispute resolution procedure, i.e., the WMG and the WRA. [bold in original] (pp. 25-26)
This recommendation endorses the establishment of evaluation factors by faculty group and the establishment of course outlines for all courses. Previously, course outlines were not mentioned in the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005). The *Workload Taskforce Report* (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) also emphasizes that there be one course outline for each course to be taught by a number of different faculty. The sentence “All teachers are to abide by that course outline” (p. 26) permits supervisors to discipline a teacher who attempts to create a diverse course and/or course outline and evaluation methods even though this different teaching method may better suit the teacher and students being taught at a particular time than those specified in a monocultural course and/or course outline. This has been done at Fleming College.

The concept of “collegiality” can be seen as being used here as a technique of gaining legitimacy to organize the thinking of those involved with course evaluation to align with a monocultural approach to teaching and especially evaluation. This recommendation initiates in the faculty contract the institutional ruling discourse concerned with course outlines and evaluation. This is the kind of institutional discourse that D. E. Smith (2005) tells us subsumes individual particularities. It does so by establishing the concepts necessary to standardize work across local settings (p. 118).

Further comments in the Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) reveal the authors’ ideas regarding standardized curricula:

Our intent in making this recommendation is to stress that the determination of evaluation methods should flow from consultations between the instructor(s) responsible for delivering the courses(s) and the manager responsible for the overall program. Where teachers and managers cannot agree on evaluative methods, their dispute should be resolved through the existing appeal mechanisms and the decision of the WMG (or WRA). (p. 26)
Two important shifts have happened in the wording of this document to which both union and management have given much attention. (a) Evaluation methods are now being made in consultation amongst instructors and managers, and (b) these instructors are delivering courses, not teaching students. This shift in discourse objectifies teachers’ work. This wording reveals less emphasis on professors teaching students course material, with some reciprocity amongst teachers and students, toward more emphasis on a prescriptive delivery of courses to students. The Academic Employees Collective Agreement (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) describes the position of instructor in the following way. In this position,

The Instructor classification applies to those teaching positions where the duties and responsibilities of the incumbent are limited to that portion of the total spectrum of academic activities related to the provision of instruction to assigned groups of students through prepared courses of instruction and according to prescribed instructional formats; and limited to instruction directed to the acquisition of a manipulative skill or technique; and under the direction of a Professor. (p. 149)

The wording of this document almost forecasts a future intention of managers to use a standardized organization of courses and a standardized course outline as agreed to by groups of faculty. This justifies in the college context the use of more instructors, rather than professors, to deliver, rather than teach, courses and in so doing once again save the college money and build courses that are products that can be exchanged on the market rather than useful opportunities where students and teachers can learn. In this way, as D. E. Smith (1999) describes in Writing the Social, the language of the Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) helps to organize the consciousness (p. 145) of those connected to college education to accept a more standardized version of college education while at the same time reinforcing a hierarchy amongst faculty.
The next paragraph from the evaluation section of the *Workload Taskforce Report* (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) clearly departs from the spirit of the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) concerning the academic freedom of individual professors. It goes like this:

> We have used the generic expression “faculty group” as we assume that there is such a body, perhaps known under a specific name, in each department or program. Whatever its designation it is important to note that it is the collective, not the individual teacher, that is to reach an agreement with the manager as to the evaluation method to be employed and that has the power to refer disputes to the dispute resolution mechanisms contained in the collective agreement. (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009, p. 26)

There is no faculty autonomy or leadership if a faculty member must compromise with a supervisor and other faculty on the type of evaluation that he or she deems most appropriate for the students assigned to his or her course or class. Collegial means working together. It does not mean arranging to do exactly the same thing. It makes more sense to interpret collegiality to mean that in the spirit of cooperation and collaboration in department or program meetings, colleagues will not make rules that will restrict the academic freedom of any one of their colleagues. In fact, for many years that was how the department I was associated with operated when coming up with in-common descriptions for the types of evaluation used in a course that several faculty members taught. For instance, we might agree that a particular course would have an exam at the end, but we would not specify that the exam take the form of essay or assisted evaluation for any particular colleague. We left that decision to the individual professor.

Unfortunately, the last paragraph of the excerpt from the *Workload Taskforce Report* (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) locks in its recommended group and manager method of coming up with course evaluation factors, by indicating that the individual teacher can neither
make an individual decision about the nature of the evaluation used in her or his course, nor
individually dispute the imposition of an evaluation factor that he or she feels is inappropriate.

Whatever its designation it is important to note that it is the collective, not the individual
teacher, that is to reach an agreement with the manager as to the evaluation method to be
employed and that has the power to refer disputes to the dispute resolution mechanisms
contained in the collective agreement. (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009, p. 26)

With these words, a faculty member is made to feel guilty if she or he does not conform with the
“collective” should she or he wish to use evaluation factors that suit her or his teaching style and
students, but diverge from what other faculty wish to use. In this way, the evaluation aspect of a
college teacher’s course outline work is officially made monocultural rather than diverse.

With the wording of the *Workload Taskforce Report* (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd.,
2009) recommendation on course evaluation, not only is the evaluation of a course made officially
non-diverse amongst the faculty who teach a particular course, the wording of the recommendation
regarding the evaluation used in a course also makes room for managers to enforce one course
outline for one course number, a description regulation that curtails course diversity, academic
freedom, and any hope of a holistic approach to teaching. In the recommendation, the authors state:
“**All teachers are to abide by that outline**” [bold in original] (p. 26). This sentence would allow
managers to discipline faculty who used diverse methods of course evaluation.

Interestingly, when the authors of the *Workload Taskforce Report* conducted regional
meetings with college faculty, they did not find faculty saying they wanted more regulation of their
evaluation work. They found that “a number of faculty at the regional meetings indicated that they
spent far more time working on evaluation than had been credited to them” (p. 25). These faculty
also commented that some managers “were sacrificing the appropriate evaluation factor for the
expediency of meeting overall formula restrictions” (p. 25). It is somewhat ironic that, as a result of faculty criticizing managers’ use of the evaluation factor, the Workload Taskforce Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) authors would make recommendations that increase controls over faculty members’ teaching lives by stating that managers and faculty groups must agree on the evaluation factor used in a course taught by many different faculty members.

I have argued here that the Workload Taskforce Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) became the regulating text in orchestrating what union and management later put into their proposals for the next version of the faculty-related sections of the Academic Employees Collective Agreement (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2009). Although it was not followed to the letter, it did provide the instructions for what those in positions to influence college professors’ work were to emphasize. In the next sections, I will point out how two more union-related documents interlock with the Workload Taskforce Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) by picking up instructions from it. This analysis will demonstrate how, as D. E. Smith (2005) says, institutional discourse can prescribe action by “providing the terms under which what people do becomes institutionally accountable” (p. 113).

**Union Recommendation**

Rather than exclude the Workload Taskforce Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) recommendation regarding evaluation as being an invasion into the work that faculty should be responsible for as described in the Academic Employees Collective Agreement’s (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005) Class Definition of “Professor,” the Union Proposal for Settlement (Ontario Public Service Employees Union [OPSEU] CAAT-A Colleges Academic Division, 2010) included parts of the Workload Taskforce Report boldfaced
recommendation and elaborated on them. Here is what OPSEU proposed become inserted into the workload section of the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement*:

Article 11.01 E 3 applies to teachers who have the evaluation factor as a component of their workload.

Before the methods of evaluation and feedback are established for a course, the supervisor will discuss the method(s) of evaluation and feedback with the affected teachers, as a group. Normally, the group will consist of the teachers working within the affected program. The group may also consist of teachers teaching a course that is being taught across programs.

If only one teacher is assigned to a program, that teacher shall be deemed to be the “group” for the purposes of this Article.

The group of teachers and the supervisor shall endeavour, in a collegial manner, to agree upon the evaluation method(s) for the course. The teachers and the supervisor shall make every effort to decide in a collegial manner which are the most appropriate evaluation method(s) for the course. If a course requires more than one type of evaluation, a proportionate attribution of hours will be applied. The group and the supervisor shall endeavour to reach agreement in a collegial manner on that apportionment.

Where two-thirds of these teachers and the supervisor reach agreement, the evaluation method(s) agreed upon by the teachers and their supervisor will be placed in the course outline.

Where two-thirds of these teachers reach agreement, the evaluation method(s) agreed upon by the teachers will be placed in the course outline.

Where there is no agreement by two-thirds of the teachers on the evaluation methods, the supervisor shall determine the evaluation methods which will be placed in the course outline.

In all circumstances, the method(s) of evaluation must conform with the valid and relevant accreditation and evaluation requirements of external accrediting bodies.

All teachers assigned to the course shall abide by the approved course outline. Notwithstanding the preceding, where a teacher, teachers, or the supervisor believe that special circumstances justify a departure from the assigned methods of evaluation, they may amend the approved course outline accordingly, provided there is agreement upon the method(s) and apportionment to be assigned to the course. Such an amendment would apply to this teacher or these teachers only.

The appropriate factors relating to the method(s) of evaluation and feedback set out in the course outline shall be recorded on the SWF.

Any unresolved disagreements among the group and the supervisor concerning the method(s) of evaluation, or the proportionate attribution of hours where more than one evaluation method is to be used, may be referred by the teacher(s) or supervisor to the WMG and the WRA for resolution.
Any disputes between the teacher and the supervisor concerning special circumstances may be referred by the teacher to the WMG and WRA for resolution. [bold and underscore in the original] (Ontario Public Service Employees Union CAAT-A Colleges Academic Division, 2010, pp. 2-3)

It is clear from the text above that the union (in its negotiations that included this wording for evaluation), while attempting to leave room for individual teacher differences with evaluation, is generally in agreement with a teacher group and supervisor process to decide on the evaluation method. With the emphasis placed on the sentence “All teachers assigned to the course shall abide by the approved course outline,” it reaches beyond the concept of standardized evaluation to imposing the concept of the standardized course outline on all faculty members.

In three spots in the right margin of the original document, as well as in three spots in the text of the suggested amendment to the contract, the Union Proposal for Settlement (Ontario Public Service Employees Union CAAT-A Colleges Academic Division, 2010) evaluation text comments about the process being a “collegial method” of decision-making. In this way, the Union Proposal for Settlement text has endorsed the concept of “collegiality” as a technique of control to organize a monocultural approach to evaluation and course outlines. The way these texts, the Union Proposal for Settlement and the Workload Taskforce Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009), interlock institutional discourse of evaluation, collegiality, and course outlines represents an example of the concerting of the organization of work to support ruling relations, about which D. E. Smith (2005) writes. These terms control and organize “interaction, including that between the text and the reader” (p. 110). Within these documents, a text-reader conversation can be observed.

Spoken conversations take shape as each speaker responds to the other, whereas, in text-reader conversations, one side is fixed, predetermined, and remains unchanged by the history of its reading (though, of course, a reader’s reading of it may change). One “party” to the conversation is fixed and nonresponsive to the other; the other party takes on the text, in a sense becoming its voice – even, as we shall see, its “agent” (D. E. Smith 1990b,
1999d) – and at the same time, responds to, interprets, and acts from it. (Smith, D. E., 2005, p. 105)

The Union Proposal for Settlement (Ontario Public Service Employees Union CAAT-A Colleges Academic Division, 2010) text, in this case of following a text-reader conversation from the Workload Taskforce Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) back to itself, has taken up the Workload Taskforce Report discourse concepts. Despite some interpretation of it, the Union Proposal for Settlement text has essentially become the agent of the Workload Taskforce Report.

As the next section reveals, the Management Offer for Settlement (The Council Offer for Settlement, 2010) picks up the discourse that began in the Workload Taskforce Report (Marmik Resolution Services Ltd., 2009) and extends the interlocking text-reader conversation that began there.

Management Offer

The Management Offer for Settlement (The Council Offer for Settlement, 2010) included text on the topic of the evaluation factors placed on a faculty member’s SWF. This text became the wording that appears in the 2009-2012 edition of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Academic Employees Collective Agreement. Management indicates in their introductory summary statements that “all faculty will have the opportunity to participate in the establishment of evaluation methods” and “teachers will participate in the establishment of evaluation methods” (The Council Offer for Settlement, 2010, p. 1). The actual wording from management for the contract is

11.01 E 3 (New)

Before the methods of evaluation and feedback are established for a course, the supervisor will consult with the affected teachers as a group. Normally, the group will consist of the teachers working within the affected program. The group may consist of teachers teaching a course that is taught across programs.
If only one teacher is assigned to the program, that teacher shall be deemed to be “the group” for purposes of this Article. [bold and underscore in original] (The Council Offer for Settlement, 2010, p. 6)

Although the wording of this article is identical to that used at the beginning of the Union Proposal for Settlement (Ontario Public Service Employees Union CAAT-A Colleges Academic Division, 2010), the difficulty with its wording is that it shifts the onus of the selection of the evaluation method(s) for a course from an individual teacher as is emphasized in the original article within the Agreement by the statement in Article 11.01 E 1 that says, “Weekly hours for evaluation and feedback in a course shall be attributed to a teacher in accordance with [their] formula” (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005, p. 14) to a group of teachers in consultation with a supervisor. The Management Offer for Settlement (The Council Offer for Settlement, 2010) also provides text to authorize that the method of evaluation be the same for one specific course even though many different teachers may teach the course to students in many different programs and prefer alternative method(s) of evaluation to the ones decided on by the teacher group and/or the supervisor. As well, in management’s proposal there is a marginal comment that says this: “Provide teachers a collegial approach for establishing method(s) of evaluation used in program(s)” (p. 6). This comment does not appear in the 2009 Academic Employees Collective Agreement but it does indicate the concerted thinking regarding the concept of “collegiality” that began with the Workload Taskforce Report, invaded the Union Proposal for Settlement text, and entered the Management Offer for Settlement text. In each of these texts “collegiality” is to be understood as faculty being subject to group monocultural decisions that restrict their freedom to choose evaluation methods that suit their teaching styles and the interests of their students. This coercive collaboration interpretation of “collegiality” reduces the application of the concept of
subsidiarity with respect to faculty choice of evaluation method. It also provides an example of the way, as D.E. Smith (1999) suggests, that language can control meaning (p. 114). Nevertheless, management instructions exist in the 2009 version of the Agreement and exert their monocultural power even though the wording of the original article remains.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have considered the evaluation section of the typical course outline by looking at the impact that the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005, 2009) and related texts have on teachers’ autonomy over the evaluation they use in the courses they teach. It is clear from my analysis that a shift in the Agreement language has activated more management textual control over teachers’ choices for course evaluation, creating stronger ruling relations between managers and teachers than previously existed. As managers use their surveillance power gained from the Agreement and its heightened control over such aspects of teaching freedom as evaluation and course policies, teachers lose opportunities to interact creatively with the unique students within their classes and their unique understanding of their subject matter. Under these circumstances, it becomes difficult for teachers to author “their own words, their own actions, their own lives, rather than playing a scripted role at great remove from their own heart” (Palmer, 1998, p. 133). If college teachers do not have control over the evaluation techniques that they use within their courses, they lose a fundamental connection to their teaching, their students, and themselves.

The textual regulation necessary to make standardized course outlines and course commodities for all programs is made more real by the interlocking discourse amongst the three
texts I have examined. This is the reality that my informants confronted when their supervisor decreed that their program was to have course outlines.

The union could help college teachers reclaim some of their academic freedoms by becoming less agents of management with regard to faculty work when negotiating and more advocates for faculty development.

In the next and last chapter, I will make some concluding remarks about who benefits and who pays for these educational arrangements. As well, I will make suggestions about further related research.
Chapter 10

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR
FURTHER RESEARCH

Responding to the Opening Questions of the Thesis

As I began this research into the ruling relations involved in college teachers’ course outline work, I had several questions about who and what helped shape the increasing constraints on college teachers’ work. Here is what I have found out. The problematic that my informants and I have faced (having more and more of our work energy being diverted to serve the interests of global market economics instead of the interests of students, teachers, society, and the environment) has many extra-local influences. Ultimately, college teachers’ experiences with course outlines have been influenced by the shift from Keynesian economics to global monopoly-finance capitalism. International organizations and transnational corporations with their competitive and colonizing agendas have laid the groundwork for the conceptual consciousness that privileges market economic democracies while suppressing alternatives. These corporate agendas are maintained when unions and ministries of education develop policies concerned with college program standardization and curricula with a high vocational orientation that college administrators and teachers are obligated to follow. The college teachers’ union contract has been written up as a regulatory text that gives managers the authority to direct college teachers’ work to such an extent that certain college managers may enforce the use of standardized curriculum from course outlines to course work to course tests, assignments, and evaluation. College bookstores have asked faculty to standardize their course resources and faculty have complied. College
strategic plans concerned with constructing efficiencies, reductions in college revenue from the state, and a state college funding formula forcing colleges to grow, influence colleges to organize teachers’ work, classes, courses, and hence course outlines into standardized commodities. Faculty members have agreed to offer standardized courses: sometimes as a means to ease their onerous workload, other times because their supervisor has enforced such work. All of these pressures have suppressed opportunities for diverse student, subject, global, local, social, and environmentally responsive curricular development by college teachers. This lack of diversity in college teaching conditions has contributed to the deskilling of college teachers. To reverse this trend, those who influence college education need to create more opportunities for college teachers to be in control of their own work and suppress the conceptual, textual, and operational constraints that prevent college teachers from responding to the diverse needs of their students in diverse ways. College teachers need fewer, not more, constraints on their teaching so that they are more able to assume the role of public intellectuals, “gain control over the conditions of their work, . . . and model what it means for intellectuals to exhibit civic courage by giving education a central role in constructing a world that is more just, equitable, and democratic” (Giroux, 2013, p. 175).

I found that although institutional ethnographic research that focuses on the extent to which market economic ideology shapes the standardization of college curricula and the deskilling of teachers can be depressing, studying the work of scholars such as Shiva (1993, 2005) provides a lovely antidote. For example, the concepts she presented in *Earth Democracy* (2005) provide clear and healthy alternatives to the monocultures of the mind approaches to knowledge production and being in the world.
Concluding Remarks

The combination of the expansion of managerial authority given in the *Academic Employees Collective Agreement* (Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, 2005, 2009), the monocultural online course outline, and the standardized online mark grid creates an enclosure that imprisons faculty in the Foucaultian (1977) sense of *Discipline and Punish* and manifests the technologies of power that maintain this imprisonment. These technologies of power over college faculty serve to subordinate them to management power and adapt to market, post-industrial, and military models of employer-employee relations so needed in a global monopoly-finance capitalist society.

The Textual Ruling Weight

The weight of textual ruling relations that college teachers carry is emphasized in the following illustration (see Figure 10.1), an adaptation of the hero from D. E. Smith’s (1987) *The Everyday World as Problematic* (p. 171). This is the textual weight that my informants’ may begin to carry once they produce course outlines for the courses in their program, outlines that will allow their work to be hooked into the college operational, course, class, course outline, standardized teaching, and evaluation work processes. This is the kind of textual weight that mediates many college teachers’ work.
Figure 10.1. The Institutional Texts that Shape a College Teacher’s Work

Purple boxes are for texts connected to international organizations, red ones for texts connected to the state, pink for texts connected to the union, and blue for texts connected to the college.

College teacher
Four nesting layers of work and texts have contributed to the weight of the mediation into the teaching that my informants will face as their work is inscribed by course outline ruling: the ideological work done by global monopoly-finance capital; the managerial work done to set up the operational/production planning of teachers’ work, courses, classes, and course outlines; the faculty complicity work that enables faculty to set up their own textual ruling; and the performing work that faculty do when they enact the textual rules of the their prescriptive course outline commodity work.

My research has revealed that college class, course, course outline, and student evaluation arrangements have reduced continuity of teaching opportunities and increased extra-local mediation into professional judgment by teachers. I have argued from my experience and those of my informants that these changes have reduced opportunities for effective teaching and learning and have increased opportunities for cheating. Whether or not students learn more or less, or cheat more or less, under this course arrangement system is not as significant to the institution as the fact that the ever more industrialized system of college education permits it to process more easily greater numbers of students. Then, also in the interest of finance capitalism, more students require and need to repay more and larger student loans. College employees and students become obedient subjects to the capitalist machine. “The individual body becomes an element that may be placed, moved, articulated on others. . . . The body is constituted as a part of a multi-segmentary machine” (Foucault, 1977, p. 164).

While college teachers teaching in a course group with a standardizing curriculum focus are supposed to meet each week to talk about their standardizing work, there are isolating aspects to this work. The course outline “rules” create a certain type of isolation. The teacher is isolated
from the in-the-moment needs of his or her students; the teacher is isolated from the teachers’ own background and teaching style; and the students and the teacher are isolated from relevant local and current events. This is achieved in ways that Foucault (1977) describes “by the termination of any relation that is not supervised by authority or arranged according to hierarchy” (p. 239). Panopticon schema can be seen during the construction of the online course outline. The dean and coordinator can monitor its construction in process since they have the authority to have technological clearance to see the course outline once online writing begins. The lead faculty, often the lecturing faculty, can monitor whether or not the other seminar teachers are following the course outline in his or her meetings with the students of the course. Following the course outline is almost forced by certain course segment arrangements such as having the seminar and computer lab class linked to the lecture, a course organization common at Fleming College at the time of this research. The dean has the textually granted power to discipline any teacher who does not follow the course outline as written. The course outline and course arrangements create an enclosed community and a Foucaultian (1977) version of surveillance and normalization that act as instruments of power (p. 184).

The movement from course diversity reflecting teacher and student diversity, needs, and interests to standardized courses subject to surveillance represents an example of Foucault’s (1977) idea of “the regular extension, the infinitely minute web of panoptic techniques [which] by being combined and generalized . . . [attain] a level at which the formation of knowledge and the increase of power regularly reinforce one another in a circular process” (p. 224). In this case, the development of information technology knowledge happened to be used to increase panopticon schemas and work practices within the college setting such that college employees and students
behave more like prisoners subject to “a schema of individual submission and of adjustment to a
production apparatus, . . . carrying out the task[s] imposed on them” (Foucault, 1977, p. 243).

**The Service of College Failures**

Veblen (1918/1957) notes that the large size of higher educational institutions almost forces
them to take on “central administrative machinery,” which is “detrimental to scholarship” (p. 162).

He explains:

Such a system of authoritarian control, standardization, gradation, accountancy,
classification, credits, and penalties will necessarily be drawn on stricter lines the more the
school takes on the character of a house of correction or a penal settlement. . . . The
intrusion of business principles in the universities goes to weaken and retard the pursuit of
learning, and therefore to defeat the ends for which a university is maintained. This result
follows, primarily, from the substitution of impersonal mechanical relations, standards, and
tests, in the place of personal conference, guidance, and association between teachers and
students; as also from the imposition of a mechanically standardized routine upon members
of the staff. (pp. 162-165)

If one is to assume that the orchestration of the standardization of education is a failure (and
certainly Veblen (1918/1957) saw “foolish results as fast as the system of standardization,
accountancy and piece-work goes consistently into effect” [p. 166]), then it is worth asking the
question as Foucault (1977) asks about the failure of prisons (p. 272): “What is served by [such]
failure[s]”(p.272)?

Concerning prisons, Foucault (1977) points out that even though, from its inception, the
prison system was supposed to reduce criminality, it did not. Instead, “for the past 50 years the
proclamation of the failure of the prison has always been accompanied by its maintenance” (p.
272). Foucault suggests that the prison system continues to exist because

The penalty does not simply ‘check’ illegalities; it ‘differentiates’ them, it provides them
with a general ‘economy’. And, if one can speak of justice, it is not only because the law
itself or the way of applying it serves the interest of a class, it is also because the
differential administration of illegalities through the mediation of penalty forms part of
those mechanisms of domination. Legal punishments are to be resituated in an overall strategy of illegalities. The failure of the prison may be understood on this basis. (p. 272)

The failure of the prison system exists to serve the system of domination, as do failures in college education such as the standardization of college curricula as has been emphasized. Two other college activities previously identified as being inappropriate deserve further explanation: forced college enrolment growth and the deskilling of teachers.

What purpose is served by forced college enrolment growth? At the same time as the province of Ontario has decreased the amount of funding for college education, it has increased marketing to increase the numbers of students who go to college, while maintaining a competitive forced student enrolment growth college funding system. As a result, colleges have asked the government for permission to increase student tuition and have done so. Together these developments have increased the amount of average per student loans that students have needed and have increased the number of students needing student loans. Financial capitalism\(^{15}\) benefits both from increases in financially indebted higher education graduates\(^{16}\) and decreases in diverse college curriculum practices that result from various college and organizational orienting to increased efficiencies in the face of more students and less operating money. Financial capitalism especially benefits from decreases in those diverse practices that open spaces to critique market economic discourse. The construction of a college system that increasingly produces graduates

\(^{15}\) Foster, McChesney, and Jonna (2011) indicate that since the 1970’s corporations have turned to “the associated speculation in the financial superstructure of the economy. The financial realm responded with a host of financial innovations, encouraging still further speculation leading to an economy that, while increasingly stagnant – i.e. prone to slow growth at its base – was being continually lifted by the growth of credit/debt. This phase in the development of monopoly capital is, we believe, best described as a shift to monopoly-finance capital” [italics in original] (p. 26).

\(^{16}\) Fairbanks (2011) indicates that in the US national student loan debt exceeds national credit card debt such that by the end of 2011 student loan debt is likely to be at a trillion dollars (para 7). The Canadian Council on Learning (2010) reports that “between 1990 and 2000, the average debt for a university graduate more than doubled” (para. 2).
who are heavily in debt due to student loans also serves to perpetuate class inequality; the students of more well off parents are most likely to have no student debts shortly after graduating, while the less well off students are likely to have heavy student debts. The Canadian Council on Learning (2010) found that postsecondary graduates who had substantial tertiary school debts (over $20,000) “were less likely to own their own homes or to have saved for retirement than graduates who were debt free” (para. 5). Clearly, forced college enrolment growth serves to market the interests of market economics.

What purpose is served by deskilling teachers? The construction of deskilled teachers that the course organization described here produces serves market economics in several conceptual ways. First, it legitimizes standardizing and commodifying education. Creating a growing acceptance amongst college teachers and those interested in a college education program consisting of courses as standard commodities lays the groundwork for the further industrialization of college education and the transition to private for-profit college education. These legitimatizations further suppress the relevance of locally generated, socially just, and environmentally sound education. Second, deskilled teachers are more likely to be compliant teachers and therefore manipulable in dominant market economics and further developments in the commercialization of education. Third, compliant deskilled teachers are more likely to accept assessment procedures that are connected to provincial, national, and international educational research standardized panopticon schemas that support organizations with a market economic orientation such as that of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).
The Market Economic Circuit

The following figure and analysis (see Figure 10.2) explain how several activities connected to college course outline work processes support the domination of market economics.

Figure 10.2. Continuity Amongst Elements in the Competitive Market Economic Circuit

Transnational organization employees such as those at the OECD normalize and maintain the dominance of competitive market economic democracy through founding texts and the habits they authorize.

State employees fund postsecondary education in such a way that colleges are forced to increase their enrolment every year. The state also promotes the discourse that says that more postsecondary education is needed to help the economy grow.

College managers need to engage in competitive marketing with other colleges to get and keep more and more students. Using an inappropriate business accounting orientation and inadequate state funding for operations forces colleges to suppress diversity in curricular offerings.

College teachers face increases in numbers of students to carry, increases in monoculture panopticon technologies of curriculum control, and increases in opportunities to become deskilled teachers.

Transnational corporate employees use their power to maintain the market economic circuit.

Students attend colleges in increasing numbers and hook into the market economy through the purchase of market economic oriented courses, texts, student loans, and diplomas or degrees.

The corporate media employees work to maintain the market economic circuit.

The promotion of unlimited college enrolment growth, the promotion of competition amongst colleges for students and funding, the frequent decrease in faculty autonomy and curricular diversity amongst generic courses (like the communications courses I taught so often), and the
promotion of the dominance of vocationally oriented curricula for college students allows for the dominance of knowledge production that favours market economics and suppresses knowledge production that favours earth democratic thought. A market economic circuit (see Figure 10.2) is created from the student, to corporate employees, to transnational organizations such as the OECD employees, to state employees, to college managers, to teachers. A web of panopticon surveillance has been built and activated from the organizing texts of transnational organizations such as the OECD through to the organizing text of the standardized online course outline. The media has played a huge role in shaping this market economic driven version of postsecondary education. Herman and Chomsky (2002) indicate that much of what appears in the media is controlled by “the powerful societal interests that control and finance them” (p. xi), a control that exists because “by one count, 20,000 more public relations agents were working to doctor the news than there are journalists writing it” (p. xvii). As a result, as Shiva (2005) tells us, “more pages in the media are devoted to the ‘health of the market’ than to the health of the planet or the well-being of people” (p. 15). Perelman (2011) has noticed that most newspapers have hefty sections devoted to the “health of the stock market,” but “almost no papers today keep a reporter to cover the workers” (p. 108). As Perelman emphasizes, this orientation serves market economic needs because it deflects attention from workers, what they do, and their working conditions. This market economic circuit needs to be interrupted for the sake of our social and environmental well-being.

Suggestions for Future Research

This examination of two sites of college teachers’ experiences with course outlines and the examination of union-related texts provides an opening into understanding the extra-local influences over college teachers’ curriculum and course outline work. Institutional ethnographic
research located in other Ontario and Canadian college and university sites could help to validate the extent to which these standardizing and deskilling pressures are similar and different.

Institutional ethnographic research located in colleges and universities in other countries could help validate the extent to which such influences are international and if and how they might be countered. In addition, the standpoint of students, parents, administrators in educational institutions, quality assessment administrators, support staff, international corporate leaders, and financial capitalists could be included in further research to better document the influential role of market economic ruling relations over teachers’ curriculum and/or course outline work in elementary, high school, college, university, and private educational institutions.
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Sample Course Outline

SPEAKING EFFECTIVELY TO GROUPS

Course Outline
Course Number: COMM31

2008 Winter
Sir Sandford Fleming College

Program: Various
School of Interdisciplinary Studies

Course Format: In Person
Hours:

Faculty: Mary Dunn Office: 602C
Office Hours: As posted

Availability:
Email:

Coordinator

Dean:

Additional Comments:

Dean Approved: 2008/01/04

Note to Students:
We urge you to retain this Course Outline for future reference. Course Outlines may assist with portfolio development, credit transfer, PLAR, advanced standing, and accreditation with professional associations.
Course Description:

This course focuses on presentation skills necessary in the workplace. Students will learn how to research for a presentation, organize it, use visual aids, and handle public-speaking 'jitters'. They will learn how to prepare and give an interview, an informational, persuasive and group presentation.

Prerequisites:
Communicating at Work (COMM2)

Corequisites: None.

This course contributes to the following learning outcomes or essential knowledge and skills required by learners as defined by Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities program standards, employers, industry and professional organizations.

Vocational Outcomes

Core Competencies and Essential Employability Skills

The student has reliably demonstrated the ability to:

7. Communicate clearly, concisely and correctly in the written, spoken, and visual form that fulfills the purpose and meets the needs of the audience
8. Analyze, evaluate, and apply relevant information to solve problems and make effective decisions
9. Create novel ideas/practices to enhance personal/professional success; adapt current ideas/practices in response to emerging needs.
10. Locate, select, organize, and document information using appropriate technology and information systems; use educational, presentation and information technologies to learn, collaborate, and communicate.
11. Establish and maintain positive relationships in ways that contribute to the achievement of goals.
12. Manage oneself and one's resources to achieve goals

Aim:
This course provides the student with a theoretical understanding and a practical application of the basic skills needed to prepare and give effective presentations, as an individual and as a group member.

Learning Outcomes:

Upon successful completion of this course the learner will be able to:
8. Understand and be able to control presentation anxiety.
9. Use appropriate nonverbal communication to support an oral presentation.
10. Use appropriate visual aids to support an oral presentation.
11. Provide effective self and peer feedback of oral presentations.
12. Work effectively with a group to deliver a successful group presentation.
13. Conduct an effective interview and be an effective interview candidate.
14. Give effective informational and persuasive presentations.

Additional Learning Outcomes Comments:

Learning Sequence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wks/Hrs Units</th>
<th>Topics, Resources, Learning Activities</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 14 &amp; 16 Jan.</td>
<td>Understanding and using effective nonverbal communication. Learning to give constructive feedback. Giving introductory presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Introductory presentation, 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3 21 &amp; 23 Jan.</td>
<td>Analyzing the audience. Using visual aids. Introductory presentations continued.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Introductory presentation, 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4 28 &amp; 30 Jan.</td>
<td>Understanding how to prepare and present narrative presentations. Presenting narrative presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Narrative presentation, 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5 4 &amp; 6 Feb.</td>
<td>Understanding how to prepare and present process informational presentations. Giving process informational presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Process informational presentation, 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6 11 &amp; 13 Feb.</td>
<td>Understanding how to prepare and present compare/contrast informational presentations. Giving compare/contrast informational presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Compare and constrast informational presentation, 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>Preparing for and delivering persuasive presentations</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Checking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Understand and be able to control presentation anxiety.
9. Use appropriate nonverbal communication to support an oral presentation.
10. Use appropriate visual aids to support an oral presentation.
11. Provide effective self and peer feedback of oral presentations.
12. Work effectively with a group to deliver a successful group presentation.
13. Conduct an effective interview and be an effective interview candidate.
14. Give effective informational and persuasive presentations.

Additional Learning Outcomes Comments:

Learning Sequence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wks/Hrs Units</th>
<th>Topics, Resources, Learning Activities</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 14 &amp; 16 Jan.</td>
<td>Understanding and using effective nonverbal communication. Learning to give constructive feedback. Giving introductory presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Introductory presentation, 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3 21 &amp; 23 Jan.</td>
<td>Analyzing the audience. Using visual aids. Introductory presentations continued.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Introductory presentation, 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4 28 &amp; 30 Jan.</td>
<td>Understanding how to prepare and present narrative presentations. Presenting narrative presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Narrative presentation, 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5 4 &amp; 6 Feb.</td>
<td>Understanding how to prepare and present process informational presentations. Giving process informational presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Process informational presentation, 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6 11 &amp; 13 Feb.</td>
<td>Understanding how to prepare and present compare/contrast informational presentations. Giving compare/contrast informational presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Compare and constrast informational presentation, 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>Preparing for and delivering persuasive presentations</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Feb.</td>
<td>presentations. Practice persuasive presentations/</td>
<td></td>
<td>comprehension of critical persuasive comprehension factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>Independent Study Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 Feb.</td>
<td>Giving persuasive presentations</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Persuasive presentation, 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10</td>
<td>Roles, responsibilities, and possible topics involved in group symposium presentations.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Checking comprehension of critical group presentation factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 &amp; 12 March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 11</td>
<td>Roles and responsibilities connected with job interviews: the interviewee and interviewer.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Checking comprehension of critical interview factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 &amp; 19 March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 12</td>
<td>Giving group symposium presentations</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Group presentation, 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 &amp; 26 March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 13</td>
<td>Giving group symposium presentations</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Group presentation, 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March &amp; 2 April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 14</td>
<td>Being an effective interviewer and interviewee</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Job ad, covering letter, resume, interviewer role, interviewee role, 20%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 &amp; 9 April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 15</td>
<td>Being an effective interviewer and interviewee</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Job ad, covering letter, resume, interviewer role, interviewee role, 20%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 &amp; 16 April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Sequence Additional Comments:**

**Learning Resources:**

Handouts will be supplied for this course.

**Assessment Plan:**
### Item/Date: | Percent: | Description:
--- | --- | ---
Weeks 2 & 3 | 10 | Introductory Presentation
Week 4 | 10 | Narrative Presentation
Week 5 | 10 | Process Informational Presentation
Week 6 | 10 | Compare and Contrast Informational Presentation
Week 9 | 20 | Persuasive Presentation
Weeks 12-15 | 20 | Group Symposium Style Presentation or Job Interview Presentation
Weeks 2-15 | 5 | Being a Moderator
Weeks 2-15 | 15 | Self and Peer Feedback and Participation

### Additional Assessment Comments:

Presentations will be marked for these four areas: content, structure, style, and techniques.

### Prior Learning Assessment and Recognition:

**PLAR** uses tools to help learners reflect on, identify, articulate and demonstrate past learning which has been acquired through study, work and other life experiences and which is not recognized through formal transfer of credit mechanisms.

### PLAR Assessment Options:

These include authentic assessment activities designed by faculty. Learners may also be encouraged and supported to design an individual documentation package that would meet the learning requirements of the course.

### PLAR options and contact for this course:

### Exemptions contact for this course:

### Academic Responsibilities:

Mutually, faculty and learners will support and adhere to college Academic Regulations and Student Rights and Responsibilities. In addition, the following guidelines have been developed to support the learning process.

In order to meet all Learning Outcomes, the Oral Presentation assignment must be attempted in order to complete the course.

### LATE POLICY

You must submit/present all written/oral assignments on their assigned dates unless you make specific arrangements in writing/voice mail/e-mail with your professor at least one day prior to the
due date in question. In the case of any emergency, make arrangements (in writing, if necessary) immediately upon your return.

Your professor will make special arrangements for valid reasons only. In the case of illness, you may be required to provide a medical note. Other extenuating circumstances will be discussed on an individual basis.

A penalty of 10% per day will be applied to an assignment not submitted by the original or extended due date. An assignment more than three days late will receive a grade of zero ("0"). No assignment will be accepted after the last day of classes without prior arrangement with your professor.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The College views very seriously any form of academic dishonesty, such as plagiarism, submission of work for which credit has already been received; cheating, impersonation; falsification or fabrication of data; the acquisition of confidential materials, e.g., examination papers; misrepresentation of facts; altering transcripts or other official documents.

PLAGIARISM

In essence, plagiarism is the submission for credit of work taken without due documentation from an existing source. One form of plagiarism involves direct incorporation, without proper credit, of phrases, passages of text, images, or data of any kind from an existing source. A second form involves using data or information without proper credit (even though the incorporated information is paraphrased or otherwise not in direct form).

Much time this semester will be spent discussing, identifying and avoiding plagiarism. Because of the seriousness of a breach of Academic Integrity, you are strongly encouraged to seek clarification during the classes devoted to this topic prior to the submission of your work.

A plagiarized assignment will receive a grade of zero.

Use the excellent site by Diana Hacker (http://www.dianahacker.com/resdoc/) to review the mechanics of citing sources.

Know the course and college rules about plagiarism Section 6.6.0 of Fleming’s Academic Regulations.
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Fleming College Strategic Plan 2005-2010
The Past Points to the Future


Vision
Students succeeding through opportunities, challenge and support.
Our college thriving through values, innovation and achievement.

Mission
Fleming champions personal and career success through applied learning.
We contribute to community success and environmental sustainability through programs, services and applied research.

Approved by the Board of Governors
June 1, 2005
Values

At Fleming, we

Put student learning first

Value people and community

Commit to our environment

Waste nothing -- not time, talent or resources

Take inspiration from Sir Sandford Fleming. Innovate with vision, then implement with excellence
Values

Put student learning first

Student learning is at the heart of what we do. We strive to inspire students by making them full partners in a challenging and engaging learning experience. Our commitment to “put student learning first” guides our work and decision-making throughout the College.

Value people and community

We support and develop faculty, staff and administrative leaders as employees and as individuals. We focus on creating a healthy, open and diverse college community for our students and employees. We value our communities and work with partners to contribute to community success.

Commit to our environment

Fleming practices what it teaches, emphasizing sound and sustainable environmental practices at our campuses, in our facilities, and in all our work.

Waste nothing -- not time, talent or resources

In both long-term planning and daily actions, Fleming employees seek to reduce waste. Through these actions, we focus our time, talents and resources on student success and on living by our values.

Take inspiration from Sir Sandford Fleming.
Innovate with vision, then implement with excellence

We are named for a great innovator. On the Canadian and world stage, Sir Sandford Fleming created bold ideas and made them real. We are inspired by his legacy and we follow his example.
2005 - 2010 Strategic Priorities

1. Achieving Excellence in Student Learning

2. Providing Superior Services and Facilities

3. Leading in Environmental Programs and Practices

4. Growing with Positive Results

5. Building Community Success

6. Optimizing Organizational Culture and Development
1. Achieving Excellence in Student Learning

Context
At Fleming, we actively support student success. At the same time, as we strive to "put student learning first," we have identified further ways to improve student learning and program quality. These include articulating our educational philosophy, expanding our emphasis on applied education, increasing our expectations of students, extending educational pathways, and enhancing student/faculty interaction.

Goal
By 2010, Fleming College will be known for programs and a learning experience that provide:

- A sound foundation in learning principles, core competencies and integrated assessment
- An emphasis on applied learning
- An approach to student success that effectively combines high expectations and high levels of support for students by faculty and staff
- Better and more pathways from secondary schools to college and on to further education
- Outstanding student/faculty interaction

Strategies:

1.1 As a foundation for excellence in teaching and learning at Fleming, build on and implement our learning principles, core competencies and integrated assessment for graduates.
1.2 Differentiate education at Fleming by ensuring that all programs emphasize applied learning.

1.3 In our program design, curriculum, assessment, policies, learning strategies and faculty/staff interactions with students, set high expectations so that our students succeed and our graduates have high levels of confidence, capability and career preparation.

1.4 Create a comprehensive learning support program to enable early identification of students at academic risk. Provide interventions that are appropriate to the learning needs of the student.

1.5 Since effective teacher/student interaction is a recognized key to a good college education, we will continue to build on our strong record in this area and continue to focus on achieving outstanding teacher/student interaction as a hallmark of a Fleming education.

1.6 Improve pathways into Fleming and between Fleming and university partners. The main focuses will be (1) pathways to the College from schools in our counties and (2) pathways between Fleming and Trent University and (3) pathways from and to the workplace.
2. Providing Superior Services and Facilities

Context

Our services and facilities support student learning and success and enhance the total student experience at Fleming. Students comment positively on Fleming services and facilities, generally ranking them as *above average*. Yet that is not enough: we are committed to providing and demonstrating clearly *superior* support for our students.

To accomplish this, we also need to provide a high level of support for our employees. This involves improving internal services and resources, enhancing the working environment, and upgrading key systems and processes so that staff have the tools to streamline their work and ultimately contribute to student success.

Goal

Fleming will provide a clearly superior level of services and facilities to its students and employees. Student success, student satisfaction and employee satisfaction ratings will reflect that our services and facilities are in the top quartile among Ontario colleges.

Strategies

2.1 Implement departmental plans to improve services, resulting in student satisfaction ratings in the top quartile of system KPI ratings.

2.2 Implement integrated human resource, financial and student systems to streamline work, improve service levels, enhance the student experience and better support teaching and learning.

2.3 Improve facilities and campuses to provide a healthy, supportive and attractive learning and working environment for both our students and employees.
3. Leading in Environmental Programs and Practices

Context

Fleming is committed to the environment. This is reflected in our program offerings and our institutional practices. We believe that we can do more and that this will set Fleming apart from other institutions.

Goal

By 2010, Fleming will be known for its leadership position among Ontario’s post secondary institutions with respect to environmental program specialities and sustainable practices.

Strategies

3.1 Further develop our established reputation for program offerings in the environmental and natural resource sciences.

3.2 Adopt and achieve a recognized standard of excellence for sound and sustainable environmental practices.
4. Growing with Positive Results

Context

Several factors suggest that Fleming can and should grow in the next few years. These factors include a growing demand for post-secondary qualifications, provincial demographic forecasts and anticipated government initiatives in areas of specialization (e.g. apprenticeship) and for various populations (e.g. underserved groups and international students).

At the same time, it is important that growth does not have negative side-effects. In fact, the College needs a growth plan with positive benefits in terms of program health and quality, financial viability and diversity in our college community.

Goal

To grow by approximately 2-3% per year in full and part-time enrolment, with specific, campus-based growth targets. Targets may be adjusted annually in response to fluctuations in the labour market and in higher education enrolment across the province.

Strategies

4.1. Develop and implement growth plans for all campuses to realize an overall annual college growth target of 2-3%. The growth plan will include marketing, recruitment and program plans to attract students from growing markets including the Greater Golden Horseshoe, International and University Graduate markets.

4.2. Expand part-time activity levels consistent with or above the overall college growth target.

4.3. Expand skilled trades opportunities and enrolments consistent with provincial initiatives and policy priorities.

4.4. Develop and implement pathways and programs aimed at students who have not previously chosen or been eligible to pursue post-secondary education.
5. Building Community Success

Context

In addition to our mandate to provide career-oriented, post-secondary education and training, Fleming has a mandate to "meet the needs of employers and the changing work environment and to support the economic and social development of [our] local and diverse communities." We are mindful of that mandate to contribute to community success along with student success.

Goal

Fleming College will make a valued and noted contribution to the vitality and economic development of our communities.

Strategies

5.1. Sustain and develop the Fleming role in contributing to community and economic development in Peterborough, the City of Kawartha Lakes and Haliburton.

5.2. In consultation with potential partners and clients, develop and implement a viable and sustainable longer-term plan for programs and services in Northumberland County.

5.3. In consultation with potential partners and clients, develop and implement plans for the role of the McRae Campus in the delivery of adult education and community services.

5.4. Sustain and build on our commitment to Aboriginal communities and Aboriginal students through our programs and services.

5.5. Engage in applied research activities that enhance student learning and community economic development.
6. Optimizing Organizational Culture and Development

Context

Fleming has demonstrated a deep commitment to caring about students, faculty and staff. We value collegial decision-making and wellness. However, to meet the needs of a more diverse student body and to incorporate wellness, openness to feedback, nimbleness in decision-making, and accountability, we need to evolve our culture so as to embed these values and behaviours in our operations.

Goal

By 2010, Fleming College will be regarded by its students, employees, and partners as a college that has fully incorporated its values into every facet of the organization.

Strategies

6.1. Champion a process to encourage employee behaviours that support our values.

6.2. Modify our organizational structure to reflect and support the evolving priorities of a new strategic plan.

6.3. Align with our values the policies and practices used to attract, retain and reward staff.

6.4. Enhance the capabilities of our staff in the areas of teaching/learning, leadership and service excellence to enrich the student experience.

6.5. Evolve our culture to better support diversity, to exhibit wellness, to welcome feedback, to provide timely, sound decision-making and to act with accountability.
In Closing

In developing this strategic plan, we have been inspired by our heritage and guided by the aspirations of our students, employees and communities. We thank them for their input and for helping to shape Fleming’s next five years.

Our strategic plan provides a broad and brief framework to guide our efforts in three contexts: as a college, within our respective work areas, and as individual employees.

The first and broadest context is our work as a college. Implementation of our plan will involve a number of decisions and actions affecting the college as a whole.

At the same time, far more decisions and actions will be carried out within the second context: our respective work areas. Within campuses, schools and departments, our leaders will work closely with faculty and staff to evaluate strengths and weaknesses and to formulate, propose and implement specific operational plans.

The third context, our work as individuals, is equally critical. For our plan to succeed, on a daily basis, individual faculty, staff and administrative leaders will seek the means to live by our values and provide Fleming’s best to our students and communities.

Through these means together, we will work toward our vision of

Students succeeding through opportunities, challenge and support.

Our college thriving through values, innovation and achievement.
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