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Abstract

There has been a significant growth in the number and types of degrees offered by a wider variety of Canadian post-secondary institutions. This expansion of degree access is the legitimate response to various forces, both social and post secondary. However, as a result, there has been some confusion regarding the meaning and value of the new degrees offered by the increasing variety of institutions. This paper examines the forces that have led to this proliferation of degrees and discusses the problem and controversy that is brewing regarding the recognition of these new degrees for further study. In particular, it is proposed that an examination of both the substance of various degrees and the nature of the institution offering the credential can provide a context for understanding the meaning of various degrees.

Recommendations to help resolve the growing concerns in this area are provided for non-university degree granting institutions, Canadian universities, and provincial governments developing degree granting policy.

Résumé

Depuis quelques années, on assiste à une augmentation et une diversification notables des diplômes proposés par les établissements postsecondaires canadiens. Si cette expansion est une évolution légitime par rapport aux changements sociaux et/ou postsecondaires, il faut reconnaître qu’il règne une certaine confusion quant à la signification et à la valeur de ces nouveaux diplômes. Dans cet article, nous présentons un historique de cette situation, et traitons du problème de leur reconnaissance pour la poursuite des études universitaires. Tout en donnant un contexte permettant de comprendre cette évolution, nous analysons tant la signification de ces diplômes que la nature des établissements qui les proposent. Afin de répondre aux interrogations de plus en plus nombreuses à ce sujet, nous soumettons des recommandations qui devraient aider les établissements non-universitaires proposant de nouveaux diplômes et les universités canadiennes, ainsi que les gouvernements provinciaux qui doivent instaurer de nouvelles politiques dans le domaine des études postsecondaires.
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A noticeable change has occurred in the delivery of undergraduate degrees in Canada over the past 15 years. The Canadian undergraduate market has gone from consisting primarily of public university delivered credentials, to an environment with a variety of new undergraduate degrees delivered by myriad of institutions. Table 1 shows the various types of undergraduate degrees and degree granting institutions now available in Canada. While most students are enrolled at the traditional Canadian public university, the choices are growing at a rapid pace.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Bachelors Degree Type</th>
<th>Institution Type¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical/Research University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Degree (e.g. B.A., B.Sc.)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year General (e.g. B.A., B.Sc.)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-year General (e.g. B.A., B.Sc.)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (e.g. Nursing, Education)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year Applied Professional (e.g. Interior Design)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Vocational or Technical (e.g. Bachelor of Applied xxx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology (e.g. BTech)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Degree (e.g. Associated Arts) British Columbia Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This rapid growth of non-university undergraduate credentials has led to: a study of the effect of these reforms on access (Dennison and Schuetz, 2004) a study of the effects of the examination of Canada’s processes for accrediting university institutions (Marshall(a), 2004), a discussion of the role of colleges in granting degrees (Skolnik, 2004), a consideration of the effects of such degree proliferation on degree inflation (Marshall(b), 2004), and a study of the effect of membership in the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) on student acceptance for further study at Canadian universities (Marshall(c), 2004).

However, this expansion of degree types and degree granting institutions continues to result in confusion about the meaning and value of new degrees delivered by non-university institutions. As the graduates of these degrees enter the workforce and typically seek further credentials, confusion will arise regarding the preparation of these graduates for further study. This paper examines the issue of degree differentiation in Canada and the implications of this differentiation for both the degree granting institutions and the degree recipients.

The Forces at Play: How did we get here?

All degrees offered in Canada require provincial government approval. Consequently, the forces that have led to the approval of alternative degree-granting institutions and degrees are primarily those related to the political pressures. Typical of most political action, the response is based on a combination of fact and myth: the specific combination usually depending on the success of lobby efforts swaying public opinion (and often the willingness of the media to promote it).

The following are some of the forces, myths, facts and assumptions that have led to the proliferation (government approval) of alternative degree sources.

**Creeping Credentialism and the Value of the Degree.** The degree has gradually become the professional and employment credential of choice. More and more professional groups, from accountants to health professions, have changed certification requirements to require a university degree for certification or entry into the profession. In some cases, this has had a relatively minor effect; but, in others, (e.g., teacher education several decades ago and nursing today) and in the aggregate, these changes have caused a significant increase in demand for the degree credential.

**Perceived Elitism of the Gatekeepers.** In Canada, the gatekeepers of the degree experience have been the publicly-funded universities. While participation rates at universities
have significantly increased in the past 35 years, there is a lingering perception that the traditional university monopoly on the degree experience has artificially limited access and, therefore, limited the economic progress of our country and its citizens. While governments control the number of places that are funded, it is universities that take the brunt of the criticisms regarding restricted access to degree programs.

Satisfaction: The Undergraduate Crisis and the Postsecondary Gap. Perhaps as early as the 80s, (but most assuredly by the 90s), there was growing public discontent with aspects of the Canadian post-secondary system. At the college level, many parents, student and employers were concerned that some of traditional college credentials were no longer sufficient for entry to the workplace. The shift in requirements for a CGA designation from a college diploma to a university degree is an example of one challenge facing the college credential. In the early 1990s almost every province initiated some sort of college system review process examining the purpose and structure of the provincial college model (Pitman, 1993). Efforts to increase transfer arrangements to universities, a renewed focus on “learner centered” organizations and the introduction of applied degrees in several provinces are examples of an evolving college system responding to these concerns (Skolnik, 2004).

The discontent, however, was perhaps more obvious at the university level. At one end of the university role, the intense lobby to enhance the research capability (as a key to Canadian competitiveness in a new “knowledge” economy) has resulted in increased investment in the research agenda at all Canadian universities (House of Commons Standing Committee of Finance, 2004). This has motivated even the smallest of Canadian universities to turn to the traditional university research and scholarly mission. In many instances, this research focus has stretched the gap between the college and university sectors. In this instance, federal rather than provincial funding has changed the research/teaching balance in some Canadian universities.

At the other end of the university role, there continues to be growing discontent with the instructional and/or undergraduate environment. Stuart Smith’s 1990 federal “Commission on Post Secondary Education” was one of the first to criticize Canadian universities for their disregard for both teaching and the undergraduate student (Smith, 1991). Pocklington and Tupper’s 2002 book No Place to Learn repeated much of Smith’s observations on the state of undergraduate education in Canadian universities (Pocklington and Tupper, 2002).

Demography: The Baby Boom Echo. In addition to the increasing participation rate at universities, the size of the 18-29 age group is projected to increase over the next decade.
Demography alone suggests the need for more places in Canadian universities and a proportionate increase in demand for degrees (AUCC, 2002).

**Increased Demand = Increased Profits.** Governments are often more sensitive to the complaints of citizens who cannot get into programs than the complaints of citizens who are unable to turn their particular degree into a job. This could be because the employment rate for graduates from the existing universities is in the high 90 percent (Government of Ontario, 2004). Nonetheless, governments and ministries are likely to respond favorably to private, for profit proposals to alleviate the demand for alternative degrees. As long as the private universities see a demand for degrees that outstrip supply, they will see profit, and in the name of profit, they will lobby hard for degree-granting privileges.

*Mid-Career Education and Lifelong Learning.* The mid-career, mature learner has been largely ignored by the mainstream university (except the executive MBA) but embraced by alternative degree-granting institutions. Royal Roads, Phoenix and Athabasca Universities are places that respond to mid-career needs and provide delivery models outside of the eight month, residential traditional university format.

*Degrees with Special Meaning.* There are those who believe that their special degree interest or learning need cannot be met by the traditional university model. Applied degrees supposedly combine the best of the vocational preparation model with the best of an academic theoretical experience. Religiously affiliated institutions provide a learning environment and perspective that is not possible in the publicly-funded university. The University of Ontario Institute of Technology has stated that its degrees will be work-place oriented, building the rationale for their institution on the assumption that the existing degree model somehow falls short in this regard. The new Thompson Rivers University and the proposal by Mount Royal in Alberta to change from a college to a university are initiatives to establish “instructionally” focused universities.

*A Government Agenda.* Non-university delivered degrees would solve several of the degree-access problems from a government’s perspective.

- Governments traditionally have more control over non-universities than universities.
- Governments and (college-level institutions) can avoid “bicameral” governance and the perceived problems of faculty control over academic decisions.
- Governments can ensure faculty teaching loads that are, in some instances, twice that of the university setting.
Governments can separate research from teaching and have degree-granting institutions where the faculty role does not include research.

Perhaps most importantly for some governments, because of the above, there is an assumption that an undergraduate degree from a non-university environment can be delivered for less cost (to the taxpayer and the student) than at a university.

There may be other permutations of these forces, facts and myths that lead to enhanced degree-granting opportunities in Canada, but in general, the result has been the willingness of almost every government in Canada to crack the university monopoly on the degree-granting experience. The result is a proliferation, over the past decade, of new “degree” experiences that are delivered by private for profit, private not-for-profit, non-secular, virtual and non-university institutions. As Table 1 shows, the “credentials” are coming in an array of degree labels from associate degrees to applied degrees to professional degrees to graduate and executive degrees that are clearly differentiated from the degree label and degree experience previously offered only in the mainstream Canadian university.

The Problem and the Controversy

The meaning, purpose, value and ultimately the recognition of all of these different types of degrees are a growing concern in Canada. Currently, the discussion is similar to the debates that have occurred about the recognition of college-level credits at the university level. These discussions started with colleges demanding one-to-one credit recognition for college course transfers to universities (Pitman, 1993) and universities either ignoring the issue, or stating that current college credit transfer was sufficient. Although still under discussion, the credit transfer issue has been addressed in several ways. Colleges have agreed that credit transfer should not be automatic and there are many variables that affect the transferability of credits (affinity, purpose, curriculum etc). Universities have agreed that relevant prior learning should be recognized in some way at all levels of the post-secondary system. While some provinces have developed transfer guides and provincial transfer polices, some university organizations have begun to develop policies regarding the acceptability of different types of degrees (Marshall-Patterson Memorandum, 2004). The debate about the acceptance of full degrees is relatively new since it is only recently that the graduates from these institutions have hit the employment or further study market. The substance of the previous debates about credit transfer is being repeated in the discussion about degree recognition.
There are, however, some differences between the credit transfer issue and the issue of full recognition of degrees. Recognizing a parallel credit is much different than recognizing a complete course of study. The proliferation of new degrees from non-university institutions has left many universities uncertain that these degrees provide the outcomes necessary for further study.

Does an applied-type degree have a curriculum that allows for the depth and breadth of study traditionally associated with the baccalaureate label?

Could an institution grant one or two credible baccalaureate degrees that achieve the accepted degree outcomes when these degree enrolments represent a small or a minority percent of the institution’s enrolment?

Can a degree offered in an environment where academic freedom is not ensured represent the breadth of knowledge expected from a baccalaureate degree?

What role does research and scholarship play in the degree environment and meaning?

Is bicameral governance necessary to ensure academic autonomy and continual quality assurance in a degree granting environment?

While the problem derives from the proliferation of the new types of degrees, the challenge comes from the ongoing disagreement between the university and non-university sectors about the implications for future study of either the substance of the undergraduate curriculum or the institutional environment.

The Recognition of Bachelors Degrees

Even before the current expansion of degree and institution types, there was differentiation of degree and institutional type within the Canadian university system. At the undergraduate level, there have always been: three-year general degrees, four-year general degrees, honours degrees, professional degrees, and even applied degrees (some engineering degrees have been called Bachelors of Applied Science). There has also always been a range of public institutional types in Canada, from the smaller undergraduate focused universities (and some affiliated colleges) to the large urban research and graduate focused universities. Yet, there was no mistaking that these were all university-level institutions and there was very little questioning of the value or substance of the degrees delivered. While there never was any guarantee that a student would be admitted to a graduate or professional school, it could at least
be guaranteed that they would be eligible for admission. This guarantee was based upon assumptions about both the institution offering the degree and the substance of the degree itself.

The Substance of the Degree

Considerable worldwide progress has been made over the past decade in describing the meaning of the bachelor’s degree and the substance of the various degree labels. For example, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation Board in the United States provides the following distinction between the degree and other credentials.

“Other kinds of credentials can, in their own particular contexts, be worthy and valuable. The degree is distinguishable by its requirement, in general, that a greater number of credits, representing a broader scope of study, be accumulated; by its general education expectations; and by its emphasis on the life of the mind. While some of the benefits of the degree can be obtained by other forms of credentialing, the degree uniquely represents the capacities and skills identified above.” (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2001)

In Canada, both the Ontario Post Secondary Education Quality Assessment Board (PEQAB, 2006) and the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) have developed clear outcomes that should be expected for each of the different degree labels. In addition, the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) is working on a potential pan-Canadian protocol on degree outcomes that could be adopted by all Canadian provinces. These degree outcome exercises in Canada and elsewhere play a critical part in resolving the growing confusion about the meaning of new degrees.

However, the important issue for this discussion is that it has always been assumed that these outcomes (breadth and generic skills) have been achieved by any baccalaureate holder, and consequently graduate or professional schools have built programs based upon, rather than repeating, these knowledge areas. Thus, a post degree B.Ed. or a LLB program is built upon the assumption that the degree holder has the requisite subject matter background, and a breadth of knowledge and literacy as well. A graduate school assumes that the degree holder is sufficiently grounded in the basics of scholarly work and research before starting the graduate curriculum. Consequently, the substance of the degree forms a major part of the basis for any future study.
The Nature of the Institution

One of the significant challenges for the various degree outcome exercises is to determine how outcomes would be measured and how to ensure that the delivering institution is able to deliver these outcomes. Simply claiming the outcomes for graduates may not be enough. Short of requiring some kind of national standard exam for all degree holders, the answer to this issue rests at the institutional level. One way of addressing this challenge has been to assume that there is a link between institutional environment and quality assurance.

In Canada, the university-level degree environment is defined by membership in the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC). The assessment for membership in AUCC is primarily an “institutional” assessment, examining the institution for the requirements necessary to deliver the degree outcomes expected of a bachelors or higher degree. These internationally accepted characteristics of a university-level institution include: the legislated authority to offer university-level degrees, the appropriate qualifications of faculty, the support for scholarly work for faculty and students, and the appropriate educational (library and labs) facilities. AUCC also insists that a university-level institution in Canada have clear academic freedom policies, that the majority of the students in the institution be enrolled in programs leading to university credentials, and have a process whereby:

“Authority vested in academic staff for decisions affecting academic programs including admissions, content, graduation requirements/standards, and related policies and procedures through membership on an elected academic senate or other appropriate elected body representative of academic staff;” (AUCC)

Degree recognition processes are based upon the principle that a university-level environment is necessary in order to ensure the graduate outcomes described by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), the Post Secondary Quality Assessment Board (PEQAB), Council of Ministers of Education Canada (CMEC) and others. Today AUCC membership is a convenient proxy in Canada for the affirmation of “university level.” In the absence of AUCC, neither the principle nor the criteria would likely change; validation would just occur in a different manner.

Differentiated Degrees: Understanding the Difference

It is obvious that degrees are differentiated by their label. A B.A. is different from a B.Sc. and a B.Sc. is different from an applied degree, etc. Less common in Canada is the
“typology” of different degrees where the degree is defined by the delivering institution. For example, the United States accreditation system accredits institutions by “type”7 and this classification implies a certain meaning and value to the degrees that the institution offers.

Different types of degrees will have different meanings, different purposes and therefore different values. While a traditional liberal arts or science degree might be a perfect background preparation for professional school such as law or education, it is not usually seen (perhaps inappropriately) as a direct route to any specific vocation. Conversely an applied degree, such as interior design, might be a direct route to the practice of that profession, but a poor background for other professional or graduate programs. A performance-based music degree might be perfect preparation for a music-related career, but unless the degree has a breadth and depth of study in areas other than music it would be a poor degree for a teaching career. A technical degree from a polytechnic will be a good workplace credential, but is not likely to be seen as a good preparation for graduate school or professional school. These different meanings and values are reflected in the degree outcome exercises mentioned earlier.

Perhaps most controversial is the notion that the nature of the institution will affect how both employers and other institutions will view the degree, despite the fact that membership in AUCC unquestionably plays a large role in determining the acceptance of any degree within and outside of Canada. Since AUCC was never established as an “accreditation” agency, it is often said that it is inappropriate to use AUCC as a filter for degrees, especially those already approved by a provincial government. As discussed above, the AUCC membership requirements simply reflect the commonly held criteria defining a university-level institution.

**Some Observations and Conclusions**

Alternate types of degrees and institutions are a growing reality in the Canadian post-secondary environment. The issue of the meaning, value and recognition of degrees will continue to be debated between the delivering institutions (universities and non-universities) and the provincial governments that approve them.

Perhaps the most controversial issue in the degree recognition discussion is the use of AUCC membership as a proxy for institutional accreditation. If there is disagreement, then the argument should be with the idea that a degree from a university-level institution is different than a degree from a non-university institution, and not an attack on AUCC for defining the difference. Even if another national organization established an alternate accreditation process to
AUCC, it is unlikely that it would use any different criteria than those already established through the AUCC process, and it will always be the prerogative of receiving universities to use this information in any way they see fit in their admission processes.

While AUCC membership is currently a major factor, the acceptance or recognition of any particular degree will continue to be based upon a number of variables, including the nature and substance of the degree held, the type of institution offering the degree (membership in AUCC), and curriculum requirements of post-degree programs. Other variables that affect the value of a credential for the purposes of further study include the affinity between the first degree and higher credentials (i.e. a Bachelor of Technology does not easily lead to a M.A. in English), the subject matter breadth (i.e. high school teaching qualifications usually require enough subjects to have two “teachables”), and the amount of field study as part of the degree (some applied degrees have a full year/two semesters of work placement). In addition, the curriculum requirements of the post undergraduate degree can vary from province to province and affect the kind of undergraduate degree required for professional admission.\(^8\)

Since this issue affects the futures of both institutions and individuals, it will continue to be a topic of some controversy as increasing numbers of “non-university” degree graduates hit the advanced degree and employment markets. The following are some suggestions for various stakeholders as Canada continues to address the challenge of increased differentiation of baccalaureate degrees.

To the non-university institutions:

- Recognize that increasingly there are different degrees with different purposes, meanings and values. All degrees should not always lead directly to the same place.
- If the graduates of any particular degree program are facing difficulty in being recognized for further study, then they and the offering institution might be better served by examining the variables affecting admission to a particular degree before accusing the receiving institution of inappropriate admission requirements or engaging in lobby efforts to have policies changed.
- Provincial (or even United States accreditation) approval does not automatically mean that the degree should, (or would!) be accepted as an eligible degree for further study in Canada.
• Admission policies at Canadian universities are made at the “senate” level (and enforced by administration) and individual admission decisions are made at the department or faculty level. It is unlikely that any politician could mandate a particular admission policy or decision.

• University admission policies are not capricious and are based upon the variables discussed in this paper.

• If a degree has all of the components for eligibility for further study (breadth and depth, scholarship, subject affinity), then many universities will be open to agreements to provide eligibility for graduates of specific degrees from non-university institutions.

• In developing degrees that are intended to transition to further study, the curriculum should be consistent with the curriculum needs of the graduate and professional programs.

• At the same time institutions communicate the special strengths of their degrees, they should communicate that the degree holder may not be automatically eligible for admission to graduate or professional school at Canadian universities.

To Canadian universities:

• Start to recognize that the non-university degree is a growing reality. You do not have to accept these graduates, but you must develop and communicate your admission policies to these students.

• As with transfer of credits, it will be necessary to identify the “principles” regarding your institution’s degree eligibility and apply these fairly to all degree granting institutions.

• Recognize that there is a growing set of hybrid institutions, bringing together elements of the college environment and the university environment.

• Recognize that not all non-universities are the same. Support the development of a typology of degree-granting institutions with different cells of a typology representing a different level of acceptance of the institution degrees.

• Recognize what special attributes non-traditional degree holders could bring to graduate and professional programs.
To provincial and national organizations:

- No province can act independently. There must be collaboration and cooperation across the country. That is, a province cannot approve non-university degrees and then ask the rest of the country’s universities to accept them.

- Communicate to students the nature of the degrees you approve. Some provinces have already approved bachelors degrees that they know will not be accepted by many universities, yet there has been no communication of this fact. Transparency of credit recognition has been a fundamental principle behind the development of course transfer guides in British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan.

- Co-operate nationally to establish a degree outcome framework for each type of degree offered in the country and do not approve a degree with a label that does not meet this outcome.

- Provide institutions with the resources and support necessary to provide the outcomes of a particular degree. An applied degree seeking workplace recognition would require different resources than a foundational degree requiring academic approval.

- Provide degrees of the same name and same outcome expectations with the same level of support. That is, provide the same level of support for the same degree in a non-university environment as in a university-level environment. This would ensure that all degrees are valued the same.

- Accept that provincial level degree quality assessment (e.g. Ontario PEQAB, Alberta’s Campus Alberta Quality Council) is only the first of a two-step process to ensure that degree graduates are automatically accepted by Canadian universities. The second step would require institutional quality assessment or recognition by AUCC or a similar process.

- Any national accreditation exercise to replace AUCC as the institutional “accreditation” will only work if Canadian universities accept the measures, criteria or conditions already in place in the AUCC exercise. These have been developed and honed over many years by the Canadian universities and are not likely to be quickly abandoned.

- One method of combining the two steps could be for either AUCC to “license” provincial assessing bodies to do the AUCC-level assessment at the same time that assessment is made for new degrees from new, non-university institutions or the provincial assessment body to contract AUCC to do the institutional accreditation part of the assessment.
It is perhaps time to recognize the realities of degree differentiation in Canada. At risk is the exceedingly strong reputation of the Canadian baccalaureate degree and the future of the growing number of students soon to graduate with these degrees.

The reality is that provinces are not going to all of a sudden stop approving degrees from non-university institutions. Universities across the country are not going to stop giving preferential consideration to the graduates of AUCC-member institutions for graduate and professional schools. Provincial governments cannot simply “go around” AUCC and existing university admission policies. Universities cannot simply ignore the advanced education policies of provincial governments.

To everyone involved in this issue, colleges, universities, new college-university hybrids, governments, and assessing agencies, I would suggest that it is time to put aside jurisdictional squabbles and work towards a national framework that will help students, employers and parents understand the meaning, value and purpose of all degrees offered in Canada.

Additional documents available:  http://www.mtroyal.ca/president/speechespresentations.shtml
Notes

1 Not all institutions in a category offer all degrees noted. For example, at this time only one community college has approval to offer honours degrees.

2 Non-university, for the purposes of this paper, is defined by membership in the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. http://www.aucc.ca/about_us/membership/criteria_e.html

3 There are no definitive statistics on the number of students that pursue further study after completing a first degree, but estimates would range from a low of 20 percent to as high as 60 percent depending upon program of study.

4 The colleges and universities of Ontario achieved an agreement on a framework for degree-completion agreements between the two sectors of the provinces’ post-secondary education system. The Ontario College-University Degree Completion Accord (Port Hope Accord) was signed at Queen’s Park on May 6, 1999 by representatives of The Council of Ontario Universities (COU) and The Association of Colleges of Applied Arts & Technology of Ontario (ACAATO). http://cucc.cou.on.ca/_bin/publications/newsletters/number1.cfm

5 There can be different levels of “recognition” of degrees. The most common usage is that graduates from “recognized” degree programs are eligible for admission to a particular advanced degree, but not guaranteed that all credentials will be assessed equally in admission decisions.

6 This specific issue has meant that some faith-based institutions in Canada have been delivering provincially approved bachelors degrees that are not recognized by universities in Canada for either graduate school or professional school.

7 The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. In 1970, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education developed a classification of colleges and universities to support its program of research and policy analysis. Derived from empirical data on colleges and universities, the “Carnegie Classification” was published for use by other researchers in 1973, and subsequently updated in 1976, 1987, 1994 and 2000. A new classification scheme was announced in 2006. For over three decades, the Carnegie Classification has been the leading framework for describing institutional diversity in United States higher education.

8 For example, Alberta, British Columbia and Saskatchewan require two years of study after a first Bachelors degree to obtain a B.Ed., while Ontario requires only eight months (including ten weeks minimum of practice teaching). This means that the Ontario Faculties of Education have different expectations of what knowledge the student brings to the post degree B.Ed. than might the other provinces. Specifically, assuming that all teachers in all provinces end up at the same point after the BEd, and given that they have only eight months to prepare the graduates, the Ontario Faculties expect the students to arrive at the B.Ed. with the breadth and depth of study and scholarly depth mentioned earlier in this discussion.
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